



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Tuesday, November 27, 1962
to Tuesday, March 5, 1963



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, November 27, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 27, 1962

Speech from the Throne, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor	3
Dependents Relief Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	14
Eulogies to deceased members, Stanley L. Hall (Halton), C. Harry Lyons (Sault Ste. Marie)	15
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	16

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, November 27, 1962, being the first day of the fourth session of the Twenty-sixth Parliament of the Province of Ontario for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable J. Keiller Mackay, Lieutenant-Governor of the province.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1962

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor entered the House and, being seated upon the Throne, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

Hon. J. Keiller Mackay (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly of Ontario:

I am very happy to welcome you today as you resume your duties at this fourth session of the twenty-sixth Parliament of Ontario. Several of the honourable members who were with us as the last session ended, have since been taken by the hand of Providence, and to their families, my condolences are extended.

Since the close of the last session, our province has been honoured by a visit from H.R.H. Prince Philip; Her Majesty, the Queen Mother; and from H.R.H. the Princess Royal, Princess Mary; as well as from the Right Honourable Harold Macmillan, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. These distinguished guests were made most welcome by our people and their visits indicate the close continuing ties linking us to the Royal family, whose gracious head is Queen of Canada and the Head of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The Ontario economy is experiencing one of its best years on record and outstanding economic achievements have been a feature of 1962. Economic growth continued unabated following the strong upswing that began in 1961. More persons are employed and more goods are being sold than in any previous year. The continued high rate of output in the steel industry and the spectacular increase in production in the motor vehicle industry are indicative of the encouraging resurgence in manufacturing.

Nearly every sector of the economy is achieving new records in sales, output and income. Farm incomes will likely exceed last year's high level. Mining output has been high, with the most marked improvement being in iron ore production. The

general advance in the productive sectors of the economy means that the personal incomes and expenditures of our people will reach the highest level in history.

The increased pace of economic activity has resulted in a heartening decrease in the level of unemployment. In 1962, the year-to-year drop in the numbers of unemployed was the greatest since the end of the war. Unemployment has been well below the national average, with seasonally-adjusted figures in Ontario for October standing at 3.7 per cent of the labour force, compared with 6.1 per cent for Canada.

In the light of the government's efforts to increase the trade opportunities of our industries, it is also worthy of note that Canadian export figures so far indicate a considerable increase over 1961. We are optimistic that with the continuation of our present growth policies, we may look forward to further improvements in production, sales, employment and income in all sectors of the economy.

During the coming session, you will be requested to give consideration to many important bills and to approve funds for many far-reaching measures which will enhance the opportunities and well-being of our people and promote the expansion of our material resources and industries, to help us to meet the many challenges of this decade. World trade patterns and industrial methods are shifting in ways whose full import is not yet clear and whose complete effect may take some time to work out.

Confronted with these developments, all segments of our society must work together as never before in dealing with the problems that face us during the 1960's. Old patterns can no longer be followed blindly and new methods must be sought and tried, on a basis of orderly and dynamic change, in order for us to continue the unparalleled economic progress which we have experienced. Your government intends to continue the outstanding economic advances we have

made and to promote further opportunities for our people and increased expansion for our industries. Among the many forward-looking measures that will be introduced are the following:

MEDICAL HEALTH INSURANCE—My government endorses the principle of medical health insurance. In realization of the present-day concern of our people about the crippling financial costs of illness and their desire to be able to obtain proper medical treatment when required, legislation will be introduced which will ensure that medical health insurance from insurers, by arrangement with the government, will be available to all our people, regardless of age and physical condition. The government will also accept the responsibility of providing coverage for those who, for a variety of reasons, may be deemed not to be able to provide for themselves.

Because of the many problems involved in bringing this plan into operation and the many groups who will be affected by it, a committee composed of representatives of medical, hospital, insurers, labour, agriculture and other groups will be appointed to examine the legislation and to receive representations from all interested parties before the provisions of the bill are brought into effect. Your government is also of the opinion that before any consideration can be given to benefits broader than those mentioned, the report of the Royal Commission on Health appointed by the federal government and any recommendations it may contain, particularly in regard to participation by the federal government, must be examined.

The success of the Ontario hospital insurance plan is evidenced by the fact that enrolment has now risen to 97 per cent of our population. You will be asked, for the third successive year, to provide the sum of \$50 million in order to enable the government to continue to stabilize at their present rates the premiums paid by subscribers to the plan.

ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT AGENCY—The overriding goal of my government's economic policy is the achievement of a rate of growth sufficient to provide the job opportunities that will be required in Ontario in the coming years for a growing labour force and, at the same time, increase our incomes and living standards. An important measure designed to achieve this objective for our people is the establishment of an Ontario Development Agency.

This will enable the province to provide financial, managerial, technical and other forms of assistance to those enterprises and

communities located in Ontario that can qualify for such assistance and can demonstrate an ability to contribute significantly towards Ontario's economic growth. The government is prepared initially to guarantee loans amounting to a total of \$100 million, but this limit will be raised if necessary.

The department will also encourage the establishment of Community Development Corporations. These corporations will assist with local or regional industrial development and will raise funds and finance their operations on a regional and community basis. They will be supported by the Ontario Development Agency in cases where the proposed regional or community projects can qualify for such assistance.

JUNIOR FARMER ESTABLISHMENT LOANS ACT—The future of Ontario agriculture, to a large degree, is directly dependent upon the young farmers and rural youth. In order to strengthen their position, The Junior Farmer Establishment Loans Act will be reinstated and there will be introduced amendments which will greatly increase its scope and effectiveness. These amendments will also recognize the changing aspects of the family farm unit and the need to provide ways and means whereby the family farm can be expanded and preserved as the mainstay of rural Ontario. The current credit problems being faced by our farmers in the day-to-day operation of their farms will also be dealt with.

MINIMUM WAGES—Your government believes that fair wages are essential to a healthy economy. In order to provide leadership in the first instance, we will require fair wages to be paid on all government contracts for the construction of highways and buildings. In addition, The Department of Labour is assessing the need, with a view to bringing into effect, where necessary, minimum wages for the protection of the workers of the province.

PORTABLE PENSIONS—In keeping with the efforts of the government to provide mobility for the older workers and to increase their job opportunities and security, the House will be asked to pass the Ontario Portable Pensions bill. Embodied in the bill will be the results of new suggestions advanced at the hearings recently held by the portable pensions committee.

ASSISTANCE FOR RETARDED CHILDREN—In keeping with the government's interest in the education and care of the less seriously retarded children, several new measures will be

introduced which will provide greater assistance for them. There will be introduced The Homes for Retarded Children Act, which will enable grants of \$2,500 per bed to be made to local associations which provide residential facilities for the less seriously retarded children who do not require care in an Ontario hospital, as well as provide maintenance assistance for children in such residences.

CIVIL SERVICE—My government is aware of the very fine work performed by our civil servants and is most appreciative of the excellent standards of service maintained by them. With this in mind, matters affecting their employment and working conditions are under constant study and review. In the light of the latest studies and to encourage the maintenance of this high standard of excellence, legislation will be introduced having particular regard to the establishment of a joint council to negotiate matters concerning the terms of employment of our civil servants and of a Civil Service Arbitration Board to arbitrate in the event of failure of the joint council to agree. The position of civil servants in regard to municipal elections and political activity will also be clarified and modernized.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO COUNCIL FOR THE ARTS—Many important developments have been taking place in the cultural life of this province. New theatres have been opening, and a greater interest in painting, music and the creative arts generally is in evidence, particularly among our young people. In order to support these cultural advances, many of which are developing at the local level, and in order to ensure that our smaller centres of population will benefit from these developments, the government will set up a Province of Ontario Council for the Arts. This council will administer funds your government will make available to further the development of the arts.

SHORELINE AND PARKS ACQUISITION PROGRAMME—The growing industrialization of our province makes it necessary for the government to commence immediately to acquire parts of the shorelines of the Great Lakes and other needed lands. These lands will be necessary if we are to provide future parks and recreational facilities for the growing numbers of our industrial population. We will start at once on a \$200 million, 20-year land acquisition programme designed firstly, to acquire parts of the shoreline of the Great Lakes and secondly, other needed lands, so as to provide for future park and recreational needs, reforestation of the idle lands, public

hunting and fishing areas, and orderly commercial developments, with multiple-use management being stressed.

A new branch will be set up in The Department of Lands and Forests to study the needs and plan the development of the shoreline and other lands that will be acquired over the years. Expansion will continue of our provincial parks system, including a new, all-year-round park being established in the Killarney area, with a proposed extent of approximately 4,000 square miles.

SURVEY OF MARINE RESOURCES—A joint survey of the marine resources of the province will be carried out by The Department of Lands and Forests in conjunction with the federal government, and the House will be asked to provide funds for Ontario's share of the studies, the results of which will also be of great value to our tourist industry. Such a survey will include safe harbour, breakwater and dock facilities; adequate markings of wilderness anchorages; improved channel markings on navigable waters; the evolution of policies regarding the provision of public docks and marina facilities, with a view to attracting more pleasure craft to Ontario; the development of park land along the water routes; and the availability of boat launching ramps.

AGRICULTURAL REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT ACT—In order to foster our natural resources of land and ensure the development of a healthy agricultural economy, a provincial Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act will be introduced. This plan will enable the carrying out of such projects as the development of community pastures, drainage and reforestation, and alternate land use, in co-operation with agricultural groups, with the overall aim of utilizing to the best advantage the rural resources of Ontario and improving the general rural prosperity.

MEAT INSPECTION—Having the interests of consumers, producers, and processors at heart, my government will introduce a bill to ensure the inspection of all meat and poultry produced and sold in Ontario.

FOOD COUNCIL—Because of the importance of the agricultural and food industry in Ontario and the interest of our consumers in it, there will be established a Producers, Processors and Consumers Food Council, made up of representatives of these three broad segments in our society. The committee will have the two-fold purpose of advising the government on general problems of concern

to the whole of agriculture and the food industry, and providing a meeting place for these three groups. The objective is to enable a greater understanding of each other's problems and the bringing forward of possible recommendations for policies which would assure the well-being of the agricultural and food industry of the province while maintaining the interests of our consumers.

PHYSICAL FITNESS—A vigorous and fit population is necessary to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing society. Your government will, under its physical fitness programme, expand the services given to citizens and organizations with interests in fitness and amateur sport. The Ontario Department of Education, in co-operation with the federal authorities, is planning to offer expanded informational services, research projects, co-ordination of effort, and training programmes to lead to greater participation by the individual. It will be the aim of the physical fitness programme to encourage the participation by the individual in many different forms of activity at the community level.

As part of the physical fitness programme, the junior ranger work of The Department of Lands and Forests is being extended so that the number enrolling may be doubled for the next year. During the past five years some 3,000 young Ontario boys have been introduced to our northern life as junior rangers, and have contributed to the programmes of the department.

TEACHING OF FRENCH—Your government recognizes the increasing interest of our people in the teaching of conversational French, especially at the elementary level. To help meet this need, a teachers' college will be built at Sudbury. This teachers' college will be bilingual and, along with the bilingual teachers' college at Ottawa, will ensure that an adequate supply of French-speaking teachers will be available in the province.

ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPAL ROADS—The Department of Highways will, in the next year, place even greater emphasis on assistance to the municipal roads systems by way of increased and extended subsidies. There will be an increased development road programme whereby greater government assistance will be given to counties and townships on some of the more important of their roads.

COMMUTER SERVICES STUDIES—The combined research and statistical facilities of The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport will be made available to conduct studies, in conjunction with the muni-

cipalities concerned, into the commuter services running into and from Metropolitan Toronto.

The measures just described form a brief part of the comprehensive programme which your government is presenting for the continued well-being of our people. These government policies will increase their opportunities and promote their security by way of education, health, welfare, municipal, human rights, labour and other measures, as well as further the development of our industries and natural resources, the continued expansion of which is necessary to provide the base upon which employment opportunities and security measures rest.

EDUCATION

The opportunities of our children are being advanced in many ways designed to ensure that every student achieves the education for which his talent and interest fit him. More than 1.5 million students are now enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools. Increased grants for school purposes will be provided during the coming year, including the provision for grants to the local home and farm owner to ease local taxation. Next year, these latter grants will be paid at the rate of \$40 per vocational school pupil, \$30 for each secondary pupil and \$20 per elementary school pupil, an increase from the \$15 for each elementary school pupil and \$5 per secondary pupil paid during the current year. Very exhaustive studies are presently being carried out of the entire educational grants structure with a view to developing a plan for the revision of these grants for future years.

The government has achieved gratifying results in its extensive teacher training programme. With the opening of the new teachers' college in Windsor this September, the immediate needs of accommodation for teacher education for the elementary schools have been met, and no college is now operating on a two-shift basis. As additional accommodation becomes necessary, plans call for the establishment of a further teachers' college at St. Catharines as well as the one at Sudbury previously mentioned.

For several years, in addition to the teaching instruction given at the Ontario College of Education in Toronto, summer courses for secondary school teachers have been operated at Kingston and London, and it is now intended to put this instruction on a more permanent basis. Work will be carried out on a new college of education to be established at London and completed by the fall of 1964, and plans will be developed for a college of

education at Kingston. An addition to the college of education at Toronto, which will stress increased vocational teacher training, is also planned.

The post-school institutions operated directly by The Department of Education have been providing ever greater service to the students using their facilities. The government operates institutes of technology at Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, Windsor and Kirkland Lake, the latter of which was opened in September, 1962, and the Institute of Mines at Haileybury.

Work will begin on the new building for the Eastern Ontario Institute of Technology at Ottawa and construction will be completed on the buildings now under way at the Ryerson Institute of Technology, which will provide several thousand additional pupil places by the fall of 1963. The whole matter of increasing enrolments in the institutes of technology and the future demand for this kind of training is being studied to determine the need for additional institutes or the expansion of existing ones.

The government operates three institutes of trade in Toronto. Two of these provide training for indentured apprentices and the retraining of the unemployed under the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreement, while the third, the Provincial Institute of Trades and Occupations, provides training for the unemployed only. Plans are under way to set up three new provincial institutes of trades, which are expected to be ready for operation in September, 1964. These will be located in London, Ottawa and Sault Ste. Marie and are designed for enrolments of about 800 students each.

Under the Dominion-provincial training agreement, classes for the training of unemployed persons are being conducted in 29 centres throughout the province and, so far, over 8,000 students have received benefit from this type of training. As most of the students lack sufficient academic background to benefit from the courses in skill development, academic upgrading is now a part of this programme. It is estimated that over 80 per cent of those who have taken these courses are now gainfully employed, and the co-operation of industry in this respect is most gratifying.

Many new steps are being taken to modernize our educational facilities. Over a period of years, curriculum course revisions are being introduced in all grades in the elementary and secondary schools. A committee to study matters relating to textbooks is proceeding. Studies are under way concerning

the value and place of Grade 13 in our educational set-up, as well as of the role that may be played in education by television.

At the university level of our educational system, the new Trent University at Peterborough and the new University of Windsor will be established. Generous financial provision for our Ontario universities, on both the capital and maintenance side, will again be made, including a special development grant of \$3 million to permit the Laurentian University of Sudbury to proceed with work on its new 500-acre campus and a new site for York University in the north-west of Metropolitan Toronto.

Additional assistance in the amount of \$3 million will be given to those universities which carry out a graduate-training programme to enable them to expand this sector of their work. You will be requested to provide additional funds to enable an expansion of the province's scholarship bursary and loan programme to students at the post-high school level, including the provision of \$1 million for the first year of the new programme of graduate scholarships, which will be granted, at the rate of \$1,500 for a normal university year, to eligible students taking graduate work in Ontario universities.

Additional funds will be requested to develop further our system of local public libraries and to permit the department to carry out increased extension work with them.

Construction is continuing on the junior school for the deaf at Milton, and planning will proceed on the new senior school buildings there, on a vocational shop at the Ontario school for the deaf at Belleville and on a new dormitory at the Brantford school for the blind.

HEALTH

Progress in the care and treatment of the mentally disturbed is going forward rapidly. During the past year, over 3,000 longstay patients have been discharged from the treatment wings of Ontario hospitals. Since these are mainly elderly persons without homes or relatives, their maintenance remains the responsibility of the province and parts of ten hospitals have therefore been set aside as residential units to house and care for them.

The Department of Health's programme of building new mental hospitals and rebuilding the older facilities is continuing apace. The government has begun the necessary planning to establish three community psychiatric hospitals in northern Ontario, to treat the mentally ill from that area who now depend on the North Bay hospital. The 300-bed

infirmary-type institutions to be located at Timmins and Sault Ste. Marie will form part of the Ontario hospital system. The third, at Sudbury, will likely become a project of the Algoma and Sudbury Sanatorium Association, under The Community Psychiatric Hospitals Act, and discussions are in progress with the board. When these programmes are completed, it is the intention to move patients to them from the department's present North Bay facilities and use the latter as a hospital-school for the seriously mentally retarded children in north-eastern Ontario, while keeping a small wing for other patients.

The new Ontario hospitals at Goderich and Owen Sound and the clinical services building at the Port Arthur hospital have been almost completed. The first stage of construction is under way at the Palmerston location. The rebuilding of the Orillia hospital is continuing, with a 300-bed pavilion being about two-thirds finished. Construction is nearing completion on projects at the London, Byron, Woodstock and Whitby hospitals. As part of the government's continuing programme of providing community psychiatric facilities, space is being taken over in sanatoria at Ottawa and Windsor for the care and treatment of psychiatric patients. Planning is proceeding on the reconstruction of the Ontario hospital at 999 Queen street west, Toronto, and on a 400-bed replacement at Penetang.

The programme of post-recovery treatment of tubercular patients is being extended. Changes in the pattern of treatment of tubercular patients have shortened the patient's stay in hospital, but not the actual total time required for medical treatment. Because of the growing numbers of these patients under treatment outside of the sanatoria and the need for regular medical follow-up, the government proposes to undertake this follow-up care, previously done largely by voluntary agencies, as part of the treatment programme, in order to ensure for the patient continuous and effective care and also to provide still better control of tuberculosis.

Several new departmental programmes are beginning or are in progress. These include further development of the bursary plan for medical and dental students who intend to practise in designated areas where there is need.

Construction on the new Department of Health laboratory on the western outskirts of Toronto will get under way next year and, when completed, it will enable the department to improve and expand its various laboratory services.

WELFARE

As a result of a further review carried out in connection with the province's provision of welfare services for families and individuals, several new measures will be introduced, in addition to The Homes for Retarded Children Act. Legislation entitled The Children's Institutions Act will be presented for the purpose of extending the provincial assistance provided to charitable institutions to those that provide instructional care for children who require specialized attention and services in a group setting. As well, this Act will increase the financial support given by the province, and encourage the development of specialized facilities and proper standards of group care and service. Legislation will be brought forward to place the assistance provided to all Indian mothers on the same basis as that given in the rest of the community.

MUNICIPAL

Municipal problems of a varied nature have been considered by your government, and The Department of Municipal Affairs will provide local government units throughout the province with the greatest possible assistance in their efforts to meet the needs of their citizens. An increased total of municipal grants will be distributed, to help these basic organs of our government meet their financial obligations. Amendments will be presented to a number of municipal Acts, including The Metropolitan Toronto Act.

The select committee reviewing the municipal Acts is continuing its work and it is expected that a further report will be presented, with recommendations that will be fruitful in legislative amendments that will improve our municipal statutes.

In connection with the far-reaching reorganization being continued in The Department of Municipal Affairs, further sums will be requested for administration purposes, including a new branch to deal with all aspects of municipal finance, a consolidation of several branches in order to provide improved service, and a considerable extension of the present activities of the other branches.

A major objective of the reorganization is the undertaking of special studies on both a provincial and regional basis of the fundamental problems involved in local and regional municipal organization and planning, especially in view of the increasing need to adapt the existing municipal system to the vast changes in social and economic conditions which have occurred in recent years. To continue with the improvement in the working conditions of the staffs of the municipalities

which was brought about at the last session by the establishment of the municipal employees retirement system, additional funds will be requested for its organization work.

LABOUR

The continued progress of labour will be furthered through the passage of a number of bills to be presented for your consideration and the provision of funds to enlarge The Department of Labour's administrative and inspection staff in a number of directions. The organization of the department is presently under review to ensure that the services it has to offer are readily available to the public.

The conciliation service occupies an important place in labour relations and this service is being extended, while amendments will be made to the legislation. One of the important recommendations of the Royal commission on the construction industry was that the Minister of Labour convene a conference of labour and management in that industry. The first sessions of the conference have now been held and discussions useful to both labour and management have taken place on problems affecting the industry. Committees have been established to study specific matters of mutual interest and the full conference will resume early next year. The government believes that joint conferences of management and labour, sponsored by The Department of Labour, will be of major importance in establishing an appropriate atmosphere for these two important segments of the economy of the province to work in harmony for their mutual benefit. Such conferences will be arranged early in the new year.

Industrial safety is of great concern to the government. A construction safety branch is being established and a greatly increased number of safety officers are being appointed. A committee has been appointed to hold public hearings in respect of The Operating Engineers Act, which has an important bearing on industrial safety. The Legislature will be asked to amend safety legislation, including The Construction Hoists Act, The Construction Safety Act and The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act.

The Department of Labour is presently reviewing all social legislation involving wages, working conditions and related matters. The Industrial Standards Act is an important item of our social legislation and an inquiry is presently under way into the Act in order that the government may improve this legislation in the light of present-day conditions.

The Ontario Human Rights Code, passed by the Legislature at the last session, went into force in June, and, since then, the Human Rights Commission has engaged a full-time staff and is conducting a vigorous educational, research and investigation programme, designed to guarantee every person equality of opportunity in employment and equality of treatment in other respects.

In order to assess the situation arising from automation and rapid changes in technology, a select committee was appointed at the last session and is studying the broad field of manpower training and apprenticeship procedures. Its report will undoubtedly affect the apprenticeship system and the type of education and training which will be provided to develop the skills required by our labour force.

REFORM INSTITUTIONS

The progressive extension of the various programmes of The Department of Reform Institutions is continuing. Nearing completion is a new clinic for the treatment of female drug addicts. This clinic will, in many respects, be unique as regards research, personnel, and duration and techniques of treatment. The reorganization of the parole and rehabilitation services is continuing and the opening of regional offices, three of which have already been set up in Toronto, London and Ottawa, will be extended to other centres.

The training school programme will be extended at Bowmanville, where, for the first time, the boys will be accommodated in a forest camp, partly erected by themselves. The academic programme in the training schools is being further developed. The new Lindsay training school for girls and the Simcoe training school for boys are now in operation, furnished with the most modern equipment and staffed with fully qualified teachers and clinical personnel.

With a total of 11 training schools in the province, including a reception and diagnostic centre for girls, we are well equipped to provide a variety of programmes and clinical services designed to meet the specific needs of each individual child and as part of this continuing programme, plans are now under way to establish a reception and diagnostic centre for boys. A clinical team of specialists will make a comprehensive study of the individual needs of each boy and recommend his transfer to the training school best able to provide the treatment necessary for his re-establishment in the community.

HOUSING

The continuation and expansion of the government's housing programme form an important part of our policies of furthering the well-being of our people. The rent certificate plan has proved its usefulness in the Metro Toronto area, as a supplement to federal-provincial low rental housing, and it will be extended to other communities. A grant of \$903,000, or \$1,000 per unit, is being made to the Toronto housing authority's limited dividend housing project in the Moss Park redevelopment, to permit the rent structure to be held down. Under the federal-provincial rental housing and land assembly programme, significant progress is being made. This progress will be reflected in the coming year in at least 29 new housing and land assembly projects, which will involve some 2,700 rental housing units either built, planned or for which commitments will have been made, along with 1,500 serviced lots for public sale.

The Ontario housing advisory committee has been constituted and comprises representatives of ten Ontario associations intimately concerned with housing, together with a number of representatives from various parts of Ontario.

As a result of studies undertaken to determine the best means of promoting rehabilitation of existing housing in redevelopment areas, a pilot project will be started early next year; this should encourage private owners to follow suit, with the assistance of provincial loan guarantees under the housing programme announced last winter. The housing needs of Indians are receiving special attention and studies are progressing, with the objective of providing housing accommodation for Indians who live off the reservations.

INDUSTRIAL AND TRADE

The government's policy, in addition to setting up the Ontario Development Agency, is to consolidate, expand and perfect the programme of The Department of Economics and Development which was introduced last spring to promote an economic climate favourable to industrial expansion, resource development and employment.

Foremost among these activities is the Ontario Trade Crusade, aimed at improving our balance of trade and providing the job opportunities we require. It is a many-sided programme involving sales opportunity missions; manufacturing co-operative agencies; trade offices abroad—including a new office to be opened at Milan; manufacturing

opportunities shows—3 more of which will be held next spring at London, Cornwall and in northern Ontario, and the establishment of a marketing division with the function of setting up trade missions and assisting Ontario manufacturers in marketing abroad and foreign manufacturers to get established in this province.

Yesterday the government announced plans to accelerate the trade crusade programme at the consumer level, with the appointment of a woman as chief of the consumer branch, to act as the liaison between the department and the women's organizations of the province. The first women's consumer conference will be held in the city of Toronto early next month.

Your government, during the coming year, will undertake several important conferences and study groups of manufacturers and labour to encourage the standardization of parts used by manufacturers in Ontario.

It is essential in this age of change that we know what training and skills will be needed in our economy. We also need to appreciate and understand the social and economic challenges and their consequences that face this province and its people. Every segment of our society, labour, management, government, finance, social agencies and schools, has a vital need to be aware of what challenges we face. The government of Ontario under the sponsorship of The Departments of Economics and Development, Education and Labour will launch a conference in the spring of 1963 on automation and social change. Such a conference, in the government's view, will be a vital step in meeting the challenges of this decade.

Much more attention must be given to new products and new techniques in our economy. To this end, your government will sponsor a products and techniques exhibition to promote the new products and advanced techniques which have been developed and which are available in Ontario.

WINTER WORKS

Because of the difficulties of seasonal employment, which results from Canadian climatic conditions and which has therefore been a perennial problem, the programmes of winter works which were initiated 5 years ago as a provincial-municipal measure and are now operated on a federal-provincial-municipal basis, will be continued. The programmes not only involve major municipal construction and maintenance work but also our departmental parks and picnic areas.

NORTHERN ONTARIO

The expansion of our northern areas is continuing as part of the overall economic development programme for the province. Work is beginning or continuing on a variety of highways, public works of various kinds and hydro projects. The \$7 million extension of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission communications systems will, it is expected, be completed in 1963 and will more than double the facilities available for commercial communications in northern Ontario. The sub-committee on northern development of the Ontario Economic Council which was established to consider the needs and problems of the northern part of our province will continue its work.

ENERGY RESOURCES

Plans are proceeding to develop additional supplies of electric power in all parts of Ontario. In order to meet forecast increases in demand, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission has under construction or planned new generating facilities with a total capacity of close to two million kilowatts, more than three-quarters of which will be provided in steam units. A large part of the commission's current programme is at the Lakeview generating station, where the second of the six 300,000 kilowatt units will be ready for service by the end of this year, while installation of the third, fourth and fifth units is scheduled by 1966.

The programme also includes the construction of four hydro-electric stations in the Moose River watershed. Work is beginning on the diversion of the Little Abitibi River, in order to increase substantially the dependable capacity of the Otter River station and the value of two potential hydro sites further downstream on the Abitibi. Scheduled for service in 1963 are two further units of the Otter River station and two units at the Little Long Lac station. Two units of the Harmon station are scheduled for service in 1965 and two units of the Kipling station in 1966. Provision will be made at these four stations for the possible later installation of additional units.

The half million kilowatts of power from the units now scheduled for installation will be collected at the Pinard transformer station now under construction, and transmitted over a new extra-high-voltage transmission line, which will eventually extend southward for more than 400 miles, with completion planned to Sudbury by 1963 and to the Toronto area by 1966. It is planned eventually to feed power from this line into an extra-high-voltage system extending across southern Ontario.

The nuclear power demonstration plant at Rolphton, which was designed as a pilot plant to provide information for a full-scale nuclear-electric programme, is now delivering power to the commission's system. It is noted as the world's first nuclear power station to use natural uranium as a fuel in a reactor moderated and cooled by heavy water. Work is proceeding on the first 200,000 kilowatt unit at the nuclear-electric power station at Douglas Point and it is scheduled to be ready for service in 1965.

In connection with our energy and fuel sources, The Department of Energy Resources is proceeding with its review of codes and regulations concerned with energy production, distribution and utilization, and the Ontario Energy Board is continuing its studies of matters of compensation involving natural gas storage. The survey of energy and fuel resources is under way.

AGRICULTURE

In the field of agriculture, the government is presenting for your consideration a number of measures, including those already mentioned, to strengthen the family farm and the rural economy, including legislation to improve the position of the family farm enterprise. Recognizing the necessity of continually strengthening the position of agriculture in the general economy and, with particular attention to the requirements of the future, the agricultural legislation proposed will place rural Ontario in a strong position, comparative with the rest of the economy and will build a firm foundation for increasing strength and stability.

The marketing position of Ontario farmers will be further strengthened through amendments to The Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act.

The Ontario farm management programme which has been in effect for a number of years to assist the family farmer to keep better accounting records of his business is being expanded.

Amendments will be introduced to The Community Centres Act in order to have the Act apply to Indian reserves and enable adjoining municipalities to undertake joint participation in a project.

Legislation will be presented for the purpose of consolidating a number of related Acts dealing with drainage, with consideration being given to proper land use from a conservation point of view.

MINING

A number of amendments to The Mining Act will be proposed, dealing with the disposition of Crown lands for mining purposes. These amendments result from recommendations of the public lands investigation committee. Among the geological field work projects being carried out, a party will be engaged in the far north-west of our province to inaugurate a five-year programme of mapping in that area. The joint federal-provincial plan of aeromagnetic surveys, covering about 35,000 square miles, is continuing apace. The signing of the new uranium contract with the United Kingdom will maintain that important segment of the mining industry for a number of years to come.

CONSERVATION

An extensive programme is being presented to expand The Department of Lands and Forests' forest management, wildlife, parks and conservation programmes.

In addition to the new programmes already mentioned, other measures include the promotion of co-operative efforts in the management of our provincial resources for the benefit of our Indian population, in connection with an agreement signed with the federal government. It is planned to assist the Indians who now obtain their livelihood from traplines and commercial fishing, by developing a programme related to fish and wildlife resources, the management of wild crops, and forest operations for the production of pulpwood and sawlogs. Indians will continue to be employed in other activities of the department, such as fire prevention. Support is being extended to the programme of research into the physical qualities of the Great Lakes, being conducted by the Great Lakes Institute.

The department has begun a co-operative programme with the meteorological branch of the federal Department of Transport in connection with the Tyros series of satellites sent into orbit by the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration agency for the purpose of obtaining weather and related data. The first of the department's objectives is to determine means of fire detection through television signals from the satellite to receiving stations on the earth, while other possibilities include fire hazard measurement and a survey of snow cover for the purpose of relating it to the winter survival of deer.

Many projects of various kinds are under way in our conservation authorities, including work on the flood control plan of the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority flood control plan.

WATER AND SEWAGE

The Ontario Water Resources Commission will continue its programme of assisting municipalities in the improvement of our water supplies and the abatement of pollution. Works now completed and under agreement involve an expenditure of nearly \$100 million. Special emphasis is being placed on works to abate water pollution and use is being made of federal loans and subsidies to assist in this programme. In this connection, your government is pleased to note the recent announcement of the federal government that its programme of assistance to municipalities for sewage construction will be continued.

TOURISM

In connection with the tourist industry and its problems, your government has set up under the Ontario Economic Council, a tourist industry sub-committee which is investigating all aspects of tourism in Ontario and which has already made a number of valuable suggestions which are being acted upon. Funds will be requested to continue the system of grants to regional tourist associations to relocate reception centres at border-crossing points and, as a complement to the Ontario Trade Crusade, to place at Ontario House, London, a tourist officer to provide information on Ontario's recreational facilities.

It is the government's intention to review the policies of all departments and agencies with a view to achieving even greater co-operation on matters relating to tourism and to provide an even better climate for the expansion of the province's tourist industry. The Department of Travel and Publicity, in co-operation with The Department of Economics and Development, has begun a souvenir and handcraft programme. This venture embraces an inventory of manufacturers of souvenirs in the province; a design competition for distinctive Ontario souvenirs and handcrafts; and a presentation of these at a national gift show to be held in February.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

The operations of our highways and the problems that arise from the nearly 2.5 million motor vehicles using them, rank high in the consideration of your government. Our network of through highways is permitting a more efficient movement of traffic and transportation equipment. Work is progressing on all unfinished sections of Highway 401 and by the end of 1963, this controlled-access highway will provide a complete thruway from Windsor to the Quebec border, a distance of some 510 miles. Because of the

unprecedented growth of the traffic problem, a programme of widening the highway is beginning in certain sectors, particularly the section which passes through the fringes of Metropolitan Toronto, which will be extended to 12 lanes.

Construction is well under way on a number of other through highways and skyways: 403, which will connect the Queen Elizabeth Way with Highway 401 near Woodstock; 405, between the Homer Skyway and the new international bridge recently opened at Queenston; and the Ottawa Queensway, ten miles of which have been opened to traffic. The first stage of Highway 406 in the St. Catharines area will be begun in the next fiscal year. The Homer Skyway will be completed in the autumn of 1963. Negotiations on the \$10 million tunnel project under the Welland canal at Welland will proceed. This project is designed to relieve congestion in the Welland region and follows traffic studies carried out in this area.

There will be an accelerated programme in the northern areas of the province, including reconstruction work on a number of existing highways. The Rainy Lake Causeway, along with both the high-level bridge and the two low-level structures, will be completed during the present construction season and progress is being made on grading and structure work on a further ten miles of highway easterly from it. With the completion of this work, it will be possible to accelerate construction on sections of a further 63 miles of difficult country, the completion of which will close the gap separating the Causeway from the already completed highway westerly from Atikokan. More than 200 miles of roads-to-resources have been completed, with 23 additional miles under construction and 50 more miles being surveyed. Foremost in this programme have been the Foleyet-Chapleau connection and the Spruce River road in the Thunder Bay area.

To deal with a related field of transportation, further sums will be requested as part of the province's purchase of a total of \$60 million in Metropolitan Toronto debentures, to permit the completion of the new subway system two years earlier than would otherwise have been the case.

The implementation and extension of policies to ensure greater highway safety and to improve driving habits is being continued by The Department of Transport. The department's vehicle inspection service is being expanded and, as part of this programme, further portable inspection units will be loaned to communities wishing to conduct

highway safety checks for local motorists on a voluntary basis, as part of a community safety programme. The re-examining of selected driver groups is continuing. The demerit point system, after being improved as a result of actual experience during the first three years of operation, is proving very successful in encouraging safety-mindedness in the drivers of the province.

A booklet dealing with the operation of farm vehicles on the highways was produced as part of the department's continuing programme to promote the safe and efficient movement of traffic. The motor vehicle accident claims fund, which recently replaced the unsatisfied judgment fund and has limits of payment of \$35,000—the highest level set in any of the provinces—makes provision for out-of-court settlement and generally simplifies the procedure for making a claim, has been a resounding success and has greatly speeded up the processing of claims as compared with the previous method.

Plans are under way to begin the mechanical issuance of drivers' licences at the beginning of 1964, with licences being on a three-year basis and a permanent number assigned to each driver. Provision is being made for the quarterly issue of commercial motor vehicle licences beginning next year; this provision will be of great assistance to farmers and other groups which need to operate their vehicles in certain seasons of the year only.

The Department of Transport is continuing its negotiations with other provinces for a standard uniform identification card for drivers, and for reciprocity agreements in the operation of commercial motor vehicles, in addition to those which have been signed with Alberta, Saskatchewan and New Brunswick.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

In the field of law enforcement, many new steps have been taken. The Ontario Police Commission has been very active since its appointment and its recommendations have resulted in further strengthening the administration and working conditions of the Ontario Provincial Police. A detective division has been set up to augment the force's criminal investigation branch and the new rank of First Class Constable has been established. Increased efficiency in traffic patrolling and in the investigation of traffic fatalities has been obtained.

The Ontario Police College at Aylmer will be receiving its first trainees shortly and it is expected that over 400 provincial and municipal police will be trained during its

first year of operation. Proposals for implementing recommendations made in a survey of communication needs among police departments are under review. Consideration is being given to the appointment of an advisor of police service with the task of checking the standards of efficiency in police departments and assisting with advice when required. The police commission has recommended certain changes in The Police Act and regulations, and these are now being studied.

New appointments to our system of courts have reduced the time required for cases to come forward for a hearing. Pursuant to legislation enacted at the last session, the Chief Judge of the county and district courts of Ontario has begun his duties and the first provincially appointed Division Court Judge is now holding court in various parts of the province. Under the supervision of the newly appointed Supervising Coroner for the province, the coroner system has been revised and co-ordinated with the other branches of municipal and provincial governments and law enforcement.

The probation service continues to expand its work to meet the demands of the courts for pre-sentence reports, to supervise offenders and carry on other preventive and rehabilitative services. More than 15,000 persons are now under the supervision of probation officers. It is expected that in the near future there will be a complete coverage of the province by the juvenile and family courts.

The question of the validity of The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act has been taken for the final determination to the Supreme Court of Canada.

An expropriation procedures bill will be presented, which will simplify and improve the procedures presently employed. This bill implements a number of the more important recommendations of the select committee that recently reported on this subject.

The emergency measures branch of The Department of the Attorney-General is continuing its programmes and further funds will be requested for its purposes.

PUBLIC WORKS

You will be asked to approve and vote funds for a great variety of public buildings, including the government centre in the Queen's Park area and for many others throughout the province, including those which have already been mentioned.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

In the field of government administration, the government has taken a number of steps

to improve our practices. Reorganization has been proceeding in several departments to improve their efficiency and their service to the public. When the first volume of the federal Royal Commission on government organization, commonly known as the Glassco Commission, was issued, an inter-departmental committee of civil service experts was set up to study the report and advise the government of the applicability of any of the recommendations to Ontario conditions.

LEGISLATION AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Further to the legislation already mentioned, many new bills and amendments to existing statutes will be submitted for the consideration of the House. In addition to the public accounts for the last fiscal year, the budget statement of the Treasurer and the estimates of the departments for the next fiscal year will be presented.

I express the hope that Divine Providence will bless you and guide you in your deliberations.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to retire from the Chamber.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that in order to prevent mistakes I have obtained a copy of His Honour's speech, which I will now read.

(Reading dispensed with.)

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE DEPENDENTS RELIEF ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend The Dependents Relief Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Energy Resources (Mr. Macaulay) that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor to this House be taken into consideration tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I have received during the recess of the House notification of vacancies which have occurred in the membership of the House by the reason of the death of Stanley Leroy Hall, member for the electoral district of Halton; the death of Clayton Harry Lyons, member for the electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie;

and the resignation of William Kenneth Warrender, member for the electoral district of Hamilton Centre.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, you have referred to the vacancies in the House which have occurred by reason of death.

I would like to refer to Stanley Leroy Hall. His death last summer came as a great shock to many of us in the Legislature and to his great many friends across the province, and indeed across Canada. He had represented Halton riding in this Legislature since 1943. He was a farmer. He represented the rural point of view with great zeal.

He was a quiet man but he had a very understanding personality and he was well liked, in fact well beloved, by all of us. I think hon. members will all join with me in extending our most sincere sympathy to his wife and his family.

Harry Lyons came from Sault Ste. Marie, which he had represented here since 1951. Harry came of a political family, his father was a Minister in the government of G. Howard Ferguson in years gone by. Harry was a man who generated very strong loyalties. He was a man who offered great friendship to those who knew him.

He too will be greatly missed, not only by the hon. members of this Legislature but by many, many people in our province. He had been in ill health for some years, but even then his sudden demise came as a great shock to all of us.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we in the House regret seeing these familiar faces pass from the scene, for as they go, something goes which cannot be recaptured. We extend our condolences to the families of both these men.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to join the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in his remarks I would only attempt to underscore what he has already said. And that is that in the deaths of our membership in this Chamber there is always a note of nostalgia, as is the case now in the instance of the late Mr. Hall and the late Mr. Lyons.

The hon. Prime Minister has said that Mr. Hall served in this Chamber for 19 years, I believe, since 1943. He represented a typical Ontario riding. In his person and in his riding I think he represented in those years the transformation that has taken place in Ontario as it has moved from a rural to an urban society.

No riding was more representative of that dramatic change than the historic riding of Halton.

In the person, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, of Harry Lyons, we have the instance of a famous son following a famous father, a father who represented the constituency of Sault Ste. Marie for, I believe, 11 years as a Minister of the Crown in this very Chamber.

In these instances we are reminded of some of the personal characteristics, and certainly one in the person of Mr. Lyons was his cheerfulness under adverse and severe physical handicap; a challenge I am sure to all of us, something that we all admired. Their passing on we regret, and offer, through you, Mr. Speaker, our condolences to their families and others that they leave behind.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, one of the saddening features of the reconvening of our Legislature each year is to discover that some of our colleagues have departed from our midst in the intervening time. We shall miss the two hon. gentlemen, tribute to whose memories has been paid this afternoon. We shall miss them but their families miss them even more and I would like to join with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) in expressing our condolences.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would like, if I may, with your permission, to draw the attention of the hon. members and the visitors who are here today, to the ancient and historic mace that is resting on the table. This mace was used by Governor John Graves Simcoe, the first Lieutenant-Governor of this province, and his successors, beginning of course in the first Legislature at Niagara-on-the-Lake in 1792.

Perhaps hon. members might wonder why we have it here today, because we do not ordinarily use this mace in the House. But in 1813, during the war of 1812 with our American neighbours, the town of York which was then the capital of the province of Upper Canada, was raided by the American forces and this very mace that is here was carried away by the American forces of that day. It rested in the American naval base at Annapolis, Maryland, for a good many years and was returned here to old Fort York in 1934 as part of the centennial celebrations of the city of Toronto.

As a matter of fact, if one visits that American naval base, the Royal Standard which was removed from Government House in that raid is still there, together with the Speaker's wig of the day which was stolen at the same time.

It was through the good offices of the then President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, that the mace was returned here in 1934 and it was felt that at the opening of this, the 4th session of the 26th Parliament, we might use this mace simply to commemorate the 150th year of peace between the United States of America and Canada.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we have this very old and historic mace on the table today.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Frost moves—Mr. Robarts moves that this House do now adjourn.

I must apologize for my error. I admit that I was day-dreaming and thinking that it was far better that the Speaker lost his wig than his scalp.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, November 28, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Wednesday, November 28, 1962

Introducing Mr. Murray Gaunt, Mr. Robarts	19
Reading and receiving petitions	19
Motion for provision for printing reports, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	20
Motion to appoint standing committees, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	21
Motion to appoint select committees re standing committees, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	21
Motion to appoint Mr. N. Whitney as chairman of the committee of the whole, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	22
Guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario, bill to authorize, Mr. Macaulay, first reading	22
Statement re tobacco industry in Ontario, Mr. Stewart	24
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	27

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1962

The House met at 3.05 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery students from Hodgson Public School, Toronto.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the clerk had received from the chief election officer and laid upon the table the following certificate of a by-election held since the last session of the House:

Electoral district of Huron-Bruce: Murray Gaunt.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

This is to certify that, in view of a writ of election dated August 23, 1962, issued by the Honourable Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario, and addressed to William B. McCool, returning officer for the electoral district of Huron-Bruce, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of Huron-Bruce in the legislative assembly of this province, in the room of John W. Hanna, who, since his election as representative of the said electoral district of Huron-Bruce, hath departed this life, Murray Gaunt has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated October 19, 1962, which is now lodged of record in my office.

RODERICK LEWIS,
Chief Election Officer

Toronto, November 28th, 1962.

Murray Gaunt, Esquire, member-elect for the electoral district of Huron-Bruce, having taken the oaths and subscribed the roll, took his seat.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I on behalf of the government say a word of welcome to the new hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). I hope that he will enjoy his time in this House and I hope that he will obtain the same pleasure the rest of us do from serving our fellow citizens in whatever area we may come from. In his riding, of course, a high standard has been

set by his predecessor there, but I have no doubt that the hon. member will look after the people of the area with the same dispatch and efficiency that his predecessor did.

We welcome him here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the corporation of the city of Oshawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing the payment of compensation to three companies for loss they will suffer by reason of the removal of railway tracks from King Street.

Of the corporation of the town of Fort Erie praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement with the Buffalo and Fort Erie public bridge authority respecting taxation of the Peace Bridge property.

Of the George Taylor Richardson estate praying that an Act may pass winding up the trust and transferring the remainder to certain charities.

Of the corporation of the village of Bath praying that an Act may pass authorizing debentures for school renovation and equipment.

Of the corporation of the Sudbury youth centre praying that an Act may pass exempting it from provincial and local taxes; also, the petition of the Sudbury high school board and the high school board of the town of Coniston praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement for the accommodation of Coniston students in Sudbury secondary schools.

Of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec praying that an Act may pass giving the convention, when incorporated by an Act of the Parliament of Canada, power to acquire real and personal property in Ontario; and related powers; also, the petition of the public school board of the township of Eramosa to annul certain trusts; also, the petition of the public school board of the township school area No. 2 of the township of Erin praying that an Act may pass annulling trusts affecting certain of its lands; also, the petition of the corporation of the county of Dufferin

praying that an Act may pass validating a debenture by-law for highway construction.

Of the trustee board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada and the executive of the administrative council of the Presbyterian Church in Canada praying that an Act may pass empowering the board to retain property given or devised to the church; and related purposes; also, the petition of Herbert James Walker Taylor praying that an Act may pass winding up the John Taylor Evans Trust and the Esther Taylor Wood Trust.

Of the corporation of the city of Belleville praying that an Act may pass providing a two-year term for the mayor elected for the year 1964 and thereafter; also, the petition of the corporation of the city of Belleville praying that an Act may pass permitting the corporation to order the removal or demolition of premises which have been closed as unfit for human habitation or as dangerous to health.

Of the Boys' Home praying that an Act may pass enlarging its powers.

Of the corporation of the city of Guelph praying that an Act may pass re-incorporating the Guelph Home of the Friendless under the name "The Elliott", re-arranging its management and enlarging its powers; also, the petition of Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association of Guelph praying that an Act may pass authorizing exemption of its lands from taxation other than local improvement rates.

Of the Chatham Y.M.C.A. praying that an Act may pass exempting its lands from municipal taxes other than local improvement rates.

Of the corporation of the township of Bruce praying that an Act may pass vesting certain lands in the corporation.

Of the corporation of the city of Waterloo praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement with the Kitchener Public Utilities Commission for bus and trolley bus service in Waterloo.

Of the Beechwood Cemetery Company of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass changing the company's name to "The Beechwood Cemetery Company"; and for other purposes; also, the petition of the high school board of the township of Gloucester and the collegiate institute board of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement under which high schools in Gloucester will be operated and staffed by the Ottawa board.

Of Young Men's Christian Association and Young Women's Christian Association of

Cobourg praying that an Act may pass authorizing exemption of its lands from taxation other than local improvement rates.

Of the corporation of the township of Scarborough praying that an Act may pass respecting the composition of the township council; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of North Grimsby praying that an Act may pass validating the construction of its sewage plant.

Of the corporation of the city of Toronto praying that an Act may pass enlarging the residence qualification for members of The Parking Authority; and for other purposes; also, the petition of the corporation of the city of Toronto praying that an Act may pass providing for open meetings of the board of directors of the Canadian National Exhibition Association, and related purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Sault Ste. Marie praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws to impose special charges to pay for all or part of the cost of additional sewer or water supply capacity, upon owners of high rise or other buildings, and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of Innisfil praying that an Act may pass validating a by-law of the township respecting the construction of drains and issuance of debentures therefor.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I move during the present session of the legislative assembly that provision be made for the taking and printing of reports, debates and speeches, and to that end that Mr. Speaker be authorized to employ an editor of debates and speeches and the necessary stenographers, at such rates of compensation as may be agreed to by him. Also, that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports in the amount of 1,600 copies daily, copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the legislative assembly, to the legislative library, to each hon. member of the assembly, to the reference libraries of the province, to the press gallery, to the newspapers of the province as approved by Mr. Speaker, and the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the assembly as directed by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I move that standing committees of the House for the present session be appointed for the following purposes:

1. Agriculture;
2. Conservation, lands and forests;
3. Education;
4. Energy;
5. Game and fish;
6. Government commissions;
7. Health and welfare;
8. Highways and highway safety;
9. Labour;
10. Legal bills;
11. Mining;
12. Municipal law;
13. Printing;
14. Private bills;
15. Privileges and elections;
16. Public accounts;
17. Standing orders;
18. Travel and publicity.

Which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as shall be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) a question in relation to this setting up of committees. I notice that the public accounts committee was almost in the nature of an afterthought. My question is: is there any hope that this year the public accounts committee will operate on the traditional basis—in the British parliamentary tradition—rather than just a committee to look into charges?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have given this matter a good deal of thought. It was not an afterthought.

I have given a good deal of thought to the question of the public accounts committee. We have had some debate here about its function in other years. What I thought we would do this year is to appoint a small committee, probably only nine members, to the public accounts committee. We will refer the public accounts to that committee as soon as they are tabled and then I would ask the committee itself to draw up an agenda which it might follow during this

session. It could then come back and we could refer from this House to the committee the particular items that it might want to look at during this coming session. We could turn it into a really functioning committee for this session of the House and see how this works out.

There was a draft bill presented here last year by the select committee examining administrative and executive problems. I have gone over that bill very carefully. There are certain features in it, Mr. Speaker, that do not recommend themselves to me particularly.

In the first place, it is a statutory committee. It would create a committee by statute, which is a complete departure of the practice in this Legislature. In the second place, it would create a committee, the life of which would continue from government to government, although the personnel would change. In my opinion it removes from this Legislature the power to control these committees as they are established year by year.

Then there is a provision that all the hearings shall be public unless otherwise ordered. When I check into the tradition and custom of this House I find out that exactly the reverse is the case. In fact, all proceedings in the Legislature can be held *in camera* and the public are here by permission. This is referred to in the history of the matter as referring to strangers. Now in this bill it has gone the other way around, instead of starting from the usual premise.

My final objection is that I am not satisfied we cannot get at this problem in the present structure of our committees if we appoint a committee as I have suggested.

So my answer to the hon. member's question is, that we will follow the procedure I have outlined here and at the end of this session we will be able to assess whether in fact we have a public accounts committee that is performing the function which I think we all want it to perform.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that a select committee of fourteen members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient despatch lists of the members to compose the standing committee ordered by the House, such committee to be composed as follows:

Mr. Edwards (Perth), Chairman; Messrs. Carruthers, Cowling, Gomme, Gordon, Guindon, Lawrence, Mackenzie, Morin, Rollins, Thomas, Whicher, White and Whitney.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of four members.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I might say that in regard to the committees I am going to attempt this year to do a lot tighter timetabling than in the past, to keep more control over the matters which are referred to the committees in order that they not overlap.

I have considered the size of them and I cannot see how we can reduce the numbers because there are many hon. members who like to sit on quite a variety of committees since there are times when they want to attend the hearings and take part in the work the committee is doing. They are perhaps not interested in everything the committee does, but they want the right to go there when there is a matter before the committee which concerns them. I do not see how we can limit the number of committees a member wants to sit on, and therefore we have to have pretty large numbers on the committees.

The Wednesday committee day which was established two years ago, in my opinion, is not functioning very well. It seems to me, in the last year or so, Wednesday became almost a day off. I do not propose to eliminate sitting on Wednesdays unless the committee work gets so heavy that we cannot handle it in the normal morning hours. What I would like to do is sit on Wednesdays as usual and perhaps not have as many night sessions as the session goes along.

There will be a very definite attempt towards much stricter timetabling of the sittings of the committees so that they will not overlap, or will not overlap as much as they have in the past.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that on Friday next, and each succeeding Friday for the present session, this House will meet at ten-thirty o'clock a.m. and that Rule 2 of the assembly be suspended so far as it might apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think that motion is self-explanatory. I think we are all in favour of sitting on Friday mornings.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that Mr. Whitney, member for the electoral district of Prince Edward-Lennox, be appointed as

chairman of the committee of the whole House for the present session.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee.

House in committee of the whole; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Hon. members of the Legislature, I wish to thank the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer), and in fact all the hon. members, for the great honour that has been bestowed upon me. With your help and co-operation I will endeavour to deal impartially with the matters that come before us. I hope that we can transact the business of the committee of the whole in a business-like way and that we can leave a good impression of our system of government with the visitors who are with us daily throughout the session. Again, I want to thank the hon. members very much for this honour.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF ONTARIO

Hon. Mr. Macaulay moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to authorize the guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill and I thought that the hon. members of the House would be interested in a few words of explanation in relation to it.

The bill is designed to do a number of specific tasks and in this area I am hoping that it will be effective. We believe that by the introduction of this bill it will be possible to accomplish an increase in our employment.

It will be possible, second, to encourage industries in this province to replace manufactured goods which heretofore have been brought, as component parts or as a whole, into this country from other countries.

Third, we believe that the introduction of this bill will help us to create development in this province as part of a larger development programme, part of which I have presented to this House before and part of which was enacted or in any event put into effect this summer.

Fourth, I am hoping through the aegis of this agency or fund, whatever word most aptly describes it, that we can bring about a greater decentralization of industry in this province, and thus create opportunities where they may not exist now and spread industrial development across the province.

I think there is an important need for this kind of legislation. There is, I would say, in various quarters of this province, an opinion that this is properly the responsibility of private enterprise. There is, however, a feeling in our department, which I do not think is any secret to this House and which has been held by us for some time, that this is an instrument through which we can do a great deal of good for our own economic development in this province.

I had thought, and I think the House realizes this, of introducing this bill last winter, or a bill something like it, but frankly it has taken a considerable amount of negotiation and discussion with the various financial and industrial elements of this province. I am sorry we did not have it a few months earlier, but I am glad in a way—in most ways—that we waited because I think this is a better conceived bill. I think it will do a better job.

It might well be asked by the hon. members of this House what conditions must exist in order to obtain such a loan or such a guarantee.

The conditions are two in general—and we want to be flexible in this area. First, whatever company or organization comes forward and applies for a guarantee, we must be satisfied that in making the guarantee—offering the guarantee of this province—development will be brought about in this province in a field which is of importance to our overall economic programme. This applies both with respect to geographic areas of the province as well as types of manufacturing which we would like to see encouraged to give the maximum employment and the great-

est opportunity for our people. That would be the first condition, I think.

The second condition would be that whatever company or organization came forward, they would have been refused by a traditional financial institution. I think it is undesirable that the government get into the financing of industry directly if it can be done through the private enterprise organizations in which this government believes. I think that the financing of these things should be done in that way. But if it can be shown that the money is not available and the government is satisfied that it is in the interests of the development of the province, then guarantees will be given by the government, or by the province, to secure and obtain the loan.

I might say to the hon. members of this House that this bill goes somewhat beyond this in its ramifications. I will discuss that on second reading to indicate that accompanying this bill there will be two other steps taken, one a bill I will be introducing to the House in due course—it is not ready yet but it will be shortly—entitled something along the lines of a community industrial development corporation Act.

This is to enable and to assist regional, municipal and local organizations to help themselves by creating development corporations by raising their own funds, or contributing towards the equity in such a corporation themselves, and thus having an interest in their own development. Then the agency to which I have referred, the development agency, would be in a position, if that community industrial development corporation met the general conditions—namely, that it would contribute to the development of the province economically and that it was unable to raise the necessary money needed to carry out a project—we thought in the interests of development then the agency would be in a position to guarantee the required amount of money.

The second aspect of this bill is that we are creating in The Department of Economics and Development what one might call a counselling—and perhaps hon. members could call it a small business branch—so that we can offer a number of services that we think are not now available to many industries to make them, or to enable them, to become more effective competitors in the world and domestic markets. I will discuss this on second reading, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): I wonder if I may ask the hon. Minister a question. What

guarantee would the applicant have to give to the government in order to get this loan? For example, does the government intend to take mortgages or guarantees by directors or—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: No. What we have in mind, I would say to the hon. member, is the kind of thing which I anticipate will arise. A group of people, or a corporation or an unincorporated company, may go to their bank, or to the mortgage company or a trust company or some other financial institution, and not be able to obtain the funds from them simply because that institution is of the opinion that the loan would be out of the field of the traditional kind of loan that they would make. This might be because of the risk involved and no back history of income, or even perhaps of management experience or perhaps even no assured proof that the company could either make money or succeed.

I can tell hon. members of several inventions that have come recently out of the Ontario Research Foundation, for which I have responsibility to hon. members. There is an electrospectrograph that I recall, a very specialized kind of machine, and there is no place that this group of people who wanted to manufacture this kind of machine could get any financing. The banks and other people had turned them down because they felt it was too risky. This is the kind of thing which, however, a financial institution would lend money on if the province were to guarantee the repayment of the lending of the money.

Mr. Whicher: Might I ask how much would be given to any one project, what would be the maximum?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I do not think that we have set any such figure. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor yesterday indicated that the government was prepared to consider in the aggregate a total of \$100 million. I think that I would feel that we would have a greater freedom and we would have an opportunity to make the most majestic contribution towards the development of our country if we leave this at the moment. I would be happy to be guided by the observations of the hon. members of this House on second and other readings of this bill.

I would like to leave this as free as we can so that if there are small companies or large companies we could accommodate them. I think we would start to lose some of the vitality of this thing if we start to hedge it with maximums. Actually, I would say to

the hon. member we had not thought of any maximum. I hope it will not all go on one loan, but on the other hand we did not think of any.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister a question. Is it proposed that these guarantees will be available to municipal corporations as well as other corporations?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I will tell the hon. member what we have done. The only proposal that we have before the House—and it is not even before it, it is only indirectly towards it in that it arises from what I said and also what was said in the Speech from the Throne—is that we contemplate establishing a bill to enable community industrial development corporations to arise around the province. I would frankly say that I would have to defer to the hon. Minister who is in charge of these other matters relating to municipalities.

It was intended to promote industrial development, so unless the matter is in relation to industrial development and the giving of jobs in that way, I would be disinclined to think that, at this stage, in any event, we have in mind anything beyond it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to read a short statement concerning the tobacco industry in the province of Ontario.

We are most concerned with the current flue-cured tobacco marketing situation. On November 23 the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Marketing Board closed the tobacco auctions because of slow sales and a substantial percentage of tobacco going no sale. At this time there is no one particular reason which is apparent for the lack of confidence in the current tobacco market. There are, however, many divergent opinions.

We must recognize that the flue-cured tobacco marketing board has been extremely successful in the past in marketing this very important Ontario crop. They have been working strenuously and with some success to expand the sales of Ontario flue-cured tobacco.

On the other hand, we must also recognize that the flue-cured tobacco crop has a value of at least \$100 million in our provincial economy. Closely allied with the orderly marketing of the crop through producer organizations is not only the well-being of the

tobacco growers themselves, but the many people who are involved in handling and processing crops.

I think I should advise the House today, this afternoon, that since 11 o'clock this morning the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Marketing Board has been meeting with the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board. The Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Marketing Board are the officially elected representatives of the tobacco growers. I think that we should recognize as well that on the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board we have a group of practical people, starting with their chairman, Mr. George McCague, who have had very successful experience in agriculture and in dealing with agricultural problems and in whom I am convinced the public have a very great deal of confidence. I am hopeful that the current problems can be resolved through such discussions.

I would like to inform the House as well that a meeting has been arranged for Friday, November 30, between the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board and the tobacco buyers. I would like to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that every effort will be made through our farm products marketing board to resolve the current problems and to enable the tobacco auctions to reopen at the earliest possible moment.

With the recognition that the flue-cured tobacco industry in this province is an important and essential part of our agricultural economy, and recognizing as well that possibly some close study might result in expanding this industry even more, on October 17 I met with the members of the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Marketing Board in my office. Among other things, we discussed at that time the long-term interests and needs of the flue-cured tobacco industry in Ontario, and it was suggested that any long-term planning should be based upon all the known facts of the industry. I might say that this suggestion was received with enthusiasm by the members of the Flue-Cured Tobacco Marketing Board. It was emphasized, by all growers, however, that any study or inquiry which might be undertaken should be entirely independent.

There was some discussion as to the chairman of such a study or inquiry, and I was very pleased on October 25, to receive a letter from Mr. C. N. Heath, who is secretary of the Flue-Cured Tobacco Marketing Board, under date of October 23, with the heading: "Appointment of a Chairman to a Tobacco Industry Inquiry Committee" and to find that they were agreeable to the chairman of

such a committee being Dr. Ford A. Stinson of the Kemptville Agricultural School. Since receiving this letter we have been giving the closest study to suitable persons who might be qualified to act on such an all-important undertaking.

I am therefore pleased to inform the House today, through you, Mr. Speaker, that I am appointing an Ontario tobacco industry inquiry committee to inquire into, and report on, all aspects of the flue-cured tobacco industry in Ontario, including production, marketing—both domestic and export, processing and manufacturing; and further to make recommendations which will strengthen and expand this industry in the interests of agriculture and the overall economy of this province.

The chairman will be Dr. Ford Stinson of the Kemptville Agricultural School. Dr. Stinson has a farm background with a broad experience in tobacco. He is a graduate of the Ontario Agricultural College and carried out post-graduate studies in North Carolina on tobacco. He was in charge at one time of the Delhi tobacco research station, and among other things spent 5½ years in Rhodesia helping to organize the tobacco industry of that country.

The two members of the committee will be Mr. Lawrence Kerr, of Chatham, and Mr. Albert C. Ashforth, of Toronto.

Mr. Ashforth recently retired as president of the Toronto-Dominion Bank and is presently a governor of the Bank of Canada. He has had a lifetime of experience within the banking and financial world and has a broad and thorough understanding of both domestic and international trade and commerce.

Mr. Lawrence Kerr is a graduate of the Ontario Agricultural College and one of our most successful farmers. His farming operation is diversified; he has been a strong supporter of organized agriculture over the years, and has a thorough and sound knowledge of the business of farming, both production and marketing.

We are convinced that this committee will bring to this inquiry proven abilities, as well as analytical and independent approach. To help with the research necessary in connection with this inquiry, the firm of Price Waterhouse has been retained.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the hon. Minister (Mr. Stewart) in regard to the statement? Has he any figures on the total

number of jobs at stake in case of a failure to resolve this situation in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have only the paper reports, Mr. Speaker. I have no firm figures other than that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Might I ask a question with respect to the report of the hon. Minister of Agriculture?

In the minds of most farmers of this province, the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Marketing Board has had the right to restrict acreages and has done so for some years. It appears that in the last few months some farmers have contravened these regulations and there has been no punitive action taken by the board, so that it appears that the board does not have the right to restrict these acreages.

Since this has already been accomplished, as far as the breaking of the supposed regulations is concerned, does the hon. Minister feel that another investigatory committee will be able to report in time to keep the tobacco marketing board from breaking down completely as farmers make plans to market their tobacco outside the marketing board?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot, Mr. Speaker, define the date at which the inquiring committee could determine the presentation of their report. I may say that the problem the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has raised is one that is of active concern to us and is being considered by our Farm Products Marketing Board.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts).

Mr. Speaker, the question is this: Has the hon. Prime Minister received any report, verbal or written, from the chairman of the committee on redistribution? If so, will the hon. Prime Minister inform the House of the nature of the report?

In view of the absence of any mention of redistribution in the Speech from the Throne, does the hon. Prime Minister stand by his statement of last April that a redistribution bill can be expected at this session? And will the hon. Prime Minister assure the House that redistribution will be implemented before the next provincial election?

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in answering this question I shall anticipate one from the hon. leader of the

NDP group (Mr. MacDonald) in which he asks me to indicate whether it is the government's intention to proceed with the redistribution bill this session, as promised last April.

I would say first that I have had no report, verbal or written, from the chairman of the committee on redistribution, and, therefore, I have nothing to report to the House.

Redistribution was not mentioned in the Throne Speech simply because the whole matter was referred to a Royal commission by this government last spring. As soon as I have a report from that commission, then I will know what action it is possible to take. We appointed a Royal commission for the first time in the history of this province to deal with this problem of redistribution, and now we must wait until that commission makes its findings.

I think what is bothering everybody is whether there is going to be any delay, and I can assure hon. members that I, and we on this side of the House, are as interested in having an orderly redistribution as are the hon. members opposite. It was my intent and my hope that as soon as this report was available, we would implement its recommendations.

I do not know yet what the report is going to say, and until I do know, of course, I cannot tell hon. members what I am going to do. But I can assure them that I am as anxious as they are to proceed with it and as soon as I have some word from the commission I will take the appropriate action.

Mr. Wintermeyer: May I ask a supplementary question?

Would the hon. Prime Minister consider a delegation from the House, consisting of representatives from all three parties, to attend on the chairman to determine whether or not the report is in preparation at the present time, and can be expected within the reasonably near future?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it requires a delegation from this House. I will obtain this information—

Mr. Wintermeyer: And report back to this House?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We want some assurance. I can speak to the commissioner and find out how matters stand.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, a comment would really be out of order but in view of

the fact I had a question, my comment is in the nature of a supplementary comment and question.

I think we have rather an extraordinary situation here if we accept the words of the hon. Prime Minister at their face value. The chairman of the committee, as is now known because the press has so informed the public, has come to the leaders of both of the Opposition parties, and I think the most accurate description of the reaction one could get from his visit was that he tried to persuade us as to why they could not report at this session.

Now it would seem to me to be a very strange thing that the chairman should meet the leaders of the Opposition parties and try to persuade them why the committee cannot report, yet the hon. Prime Minister of the province has not had any representation from the chairman. If he has not had now, I think his intimation to the House that he is willing to get it, is not only appropriate but under the circumstances extremely necessary.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I answered a question submitted to me by the hon. leader of the Opposition, in which he says, "Has the Prime Minister received any report, verbal or written, from the chairman of the committee on redistribution?" and I have not received any report. I do not know what he is going to do.

I have had conversations with him since he has been appointed, certainly, but I assume that the hon. leader of the Opposition is asking me if I had any report as to what they were going to recommend and I have not. I can assure the House that I have no idea what he is going to recommend.

Mr. MacDonald: The effect of the representations to us is that it cannot report this session.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, that may be the report to the hon. member. That report has

not come to me and as the leader of the government I assume it will come to me when the chairman has finally made up his mind.

I read the news report—I do not know whether the hon. member gave it to the press or whether the hon. leader of the Opposition did—but certainly I read about it. But I can assure the House that I have no report from the chairman of the commission as to what he proposes to do. And I think this is what the hon. leader of the Opposition is asking.

Mr. Wintermeyer: All right. Then as a final question, will the hon. Prime Minister give his assurance to this House that he will bend every effort to do what he said he would do last April, and bring about redistribution before the next general election?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that the hon. leader of the Opposition is trying to get me into a position where it will appear that I do not want redistribution. But I can assure him that is not so.

It was this government that appointed the Royal commission, it is this government which faced the problem and appointed an impartial Royal commission, so he cannot get me in a position where I would appear to be against redistribution.

I will be more than happy to do everything I can to assure—

Mr. Wintermeyer: If he does that we will have redistribution.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow we will proceed with the moving and seconding of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Thursday, November 29, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Thursday, November 29, 1962

Reading and receiving petitions	31
St. Lawrence Development Act, bill to amend, Mr. Macaulay, first reading	31
Motion of thanks for Speech from the Throne, Mr. Harris, Mr. Morningstar	32
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Wintermeyer, agreed to	40
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	40

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1962

The House met at 3.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery students from the following schools: Barrie District North Collegiate and Ryerson Institute, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the incorporation of Trent University.

Of the corporation of the city of Windsor praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws for licensing, regulating and governing the conduct of bankrupt stock sales and other sales of a like nature.

Of the incorporation of the University of Windsor.

Of the University of Waterloo praying that an Act may pass granting it exclusive use of the name "Waterloo University"; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the town of Hearst praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to pass a by-law fixing the assessment of the property of Levesque Plywood Limited.

Of the corporation of the city of Port Arthur praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to convey all the lands lying east of the CNR right-of-way and east and south of the McIntyre River in fee simple, free of encumbrances.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT ACT

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Energy Resources) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Energy Resources): This is a procedural bill, Mr.

Speaker. It is intended to make way for the creation of a new appointment to the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission of a general manager in place of what has been an executive committee which has been responsible for managing the affairs of the commission. There has been in the past a commission and there will be a general manager as opposed to a commission and an executive committee. It is a procedural matter.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question which I would like to direct to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), a copy of which has been submitted to him.

Has the government taken any steps to enforce inspection among tobacco growers for crops suspected of having been sprayed with MH30? If so, at whose request was this action taken?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, for notice of which I thank him, I am not too clear on what he means by the inspection of the crop. Does he mean before it enters the auction building, or at the time of sale?

Mr. MacDonald: I am not certain exactly what time the inspection takes place, but I understand that a decision had been taken by the board that they were not going to inspect, and that the government was considering, or had moved to reinstitute inspection through other action.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. This is clear then, Mr. Speaker, and I only asked this for clarification. The Farm Products Marketing Board after approval of the recommendation that was made to it by the Flue-Cured Tobacco Marketing Board, that tobacco treated with MH30 be cited as a class of tobacco under The Farms Products Grades and Sales Act, approved this resolution and it then received approval by order-in-council today.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: First order, consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar), that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

To the Honourable J. Keiller Mackay, D.S.O., V.D., Q.C., D.C.L., LL.D., Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario.

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Speaker, it is only eight or nine short months ago that I first took my seat in this Legislature. As I have mentioned on other occasions, I well remember during the course of that first afternoon last February when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) announced to the House that Col. Glenn had successfully orbited the earth and had been plucked from the sea without mishap. That event to me is a very good example of the time in which we live and points out emphatically the challenges, the complexities and, more important, the opportunities of the next few years.

The programme that has been placed before us is designed to meet the problems of today and lay the foundation upon which we can build for the future. I was the first member to be elected to this government under the present hon. Prime Minister and I am grateful that I have the opportunity to participate in this session of the Legislature which will deal with the first complete programme to be introduced by the hon. Prime Minister. Its wide range of social and economic measures are worthy of our whole-hearted consideration and support.

At this time, it comes to mind that since the last session two outstanding figures of this Legislature have passed away. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Hall) and the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons). I was not well acquainted with these men but their respective records of long service to their constituents, to this House and to this province will stand as their memorial. My hon. colleagues in all parties will join with me, I know, in extending our condolences to the families and friends of these two fine men.

Mr. Speaker, in offering my congratulations on seeing you again preside over our deliberations, I am reminded that your position is one of the most ancient and honourable in Parliament. You are the number

one Commoner in this province. You have had to sever all ties with your party and preside in an impartial manner over the debates in this Legislature. This I have seen you do in a most able manner in the past and I commend and congratulate you. I am aware of the sympathy, dignity and understanding you possess and am happy indeed to have our deliberations directed in the best tradition of British parliamentary procedure.

Thinking of history brings to mind the Royal Family and the devotion of all peoples throughout the Commonwealth to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. Those of us who had the privilege of seeing and hearing H. M. the Queen Mother address us last summer on her visit to Toronto, were thrilled and proud that we in Ontario are part of this great Commonwealth. Much of the credit for the stability of the British institution must be allotted to the steadying influence of a fixed head to the British government, which tradition carries on in Canada to the Governor-General and the Lieutenant-Governor of our own province. In Ontario our Lieutenant-Governor ably represents and speaks for Her Majesty and, if I may be permitted, I would like to congratulate His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor upon the excellent manner in which he has discharged the high duty pertaining to his position. I also beg leave to express to Mrs. J. Keiller Mackay our appreciation of the dignified and courteous manner in which she carries out her onerous duties.

Just over a year ago 7,000 members of the Progressive-Conservative Party jammed into Varsity Arena. After a most exhilarating 3-day convention, they chose from 7 very able contenders the hon. member for London North (Mr. Robarts), as leader of the Ontario Progressive-Conservative Party. Two weeks later he became Prime Minister of Ontario. From that time—with a constant increasing tempo, we have been aware of a new sense of urgency to get things done and to make this province move ahead.

This was obvious in the last session when the hon. Prime Minister, by constant diligence, guided through this House the largest legislative programme of any session in over 30 years. Almost every area of life in our society was affected by various bills and amendments. Of almost equal importance is the way in which the business of the province is conducted between sessions. In my opinion, the hon. Prime Minister has worked even harder between sessions. Daily, he has

been available for all deputations, conferences and individuals throughout the province to hear their views.

The hon. Prime Minister's most significant recent move—which will help this province to push on at an even faster rate in all aspects—was the recent sweeping Cabinet changes made last month. The combination in this council of those men of more mature years, combined with the more progressive ideas of the younger men, has produced a team that will face with determination the problems that lie ahead, that will capitalize on the opportunities, and will lead this province to even greater heights.

It is not my intention to take time to review the careers of each of the 20 hon. Ministers who now make up the executive council. I will only say, first to the hon. Ministers who retain the same portfolios that they held last year: I commend them for a job well done and look for increased leadership from their departments.

To those hon. Ministers who have changed portfolios, I would say that they have given outstanding leadership in their former posts. While their new responsibilities will be even more demanding, I am confident they will meet them with determination and vigour.

The elevation of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. MacNaughton), former Minister without Portfolio to the very important post of Minister of Highways; the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Davis) to the Minister of Education; the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Auld) to the Minister of Transport; and the hon. member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Simonett) to the Minister without Portfolio—these changes will bring to the executive council additional initiative and enthusiasm that will keep Ontario forging ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate all these hon. Ministers.

It is with regret I note that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Daley) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) have indicated that they feel they must retire from the Cabinet. Their collective years of public service add up to an impressive record and their wise counsel and devotion to duty will be missed.

I am pleased that the hon. Minister from Northumberland (Mr. Goodfellow) is remaining on the job. He has given more than 19 years of his life to public service. The next few months will be of far-reaching importance to the people of Ontario and it is reassuring to know that this able administrator will lend the benefit of his long experience to the affairs of this province.

Appointment of my good friends, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) to second vice-chairman of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission; the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Guindon) to second vice-chairman of the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission, and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. W. E. Johnston) to the Ontario Racing Commission, are well deserved appointments. To each of them I extend my congratulations.

A short time ago the province of Saskatchewan was in the headlines daily with the turmoil and strife brought on by the introduction of compulsory health insurance. Feelings over the measure were so serious that the Minister in charge of that department resigned his portfolio and resigned from his party.

We in this province know that individual feelings run high on this subject, but I think it is incumbent on all hon. members of all parties to keep debates on this subject on a high level so that every view is clearly understood.

At this juncture I would point out that I have served for over 10 years on the board of the Toronto East General Hospital and am possibly more aware than the average person, of the part their government has played in this field by way of large grants to hospitals. This has made possible the tremendous growth in hospital construction throughout the province. But much remains to be done in this area and we must increase our efforts. The unequal bed distribution factor is still present in Metropolitan Toronto and many other large centres throughout the province. A special study is under way that will, when the report is completed, clearly define where the overall shortages are, and which areas are most in need of additional hospital accommodation.

I feel strongly that more hospital care units must be provided for elderly people who, because of their prognosis, cannot be admitted to general hospitals. The reason, of course, is that these general hospitals, without exception, have long lists of patients waiting for admission.

I am pleased to note additional buildings will be provided for the deaf at Milton and at Belleville and for the blind at Brantford, and that follow-up work will be done by this government in caring for those who suffer from tuberculosis.

As a parent with three children of public school age, I am aware of the tremendous assistance the present Ontario Hospital Care and Insurance Plan has been to me when serious illness has struck. I am sure that the

97 per cent of our eligible population covered by this plan are well satisfied with the benefits that accrue for a \$4.20 per month coverage for the family unit.

I believe basically that the opportunity for good health is a right possessed by every individual, no matter what his circumstances in life. I stated that view during my by-election campaign and many times since then, so it is with enthusiasm that in the Speech from the Throne I note that legislation will be introduced which will ensure that medical health insurance will be available to all our people, regardless of age and physical condition.

I welcome the proposal of a committee to examine this legislation and receive representations from all interested groups before the legislation is brought into effect. By seeking the medical profession's approval of the legislation, I am certain that this government will avoid the unpleasant situation that arose in Saskatchewan. In view of the fact that 65 per cent of our population is presently covered by private insurers, the extension of this form of insurance is in my view the logical and efficient means of providing universal coverage.

Of particular concern to me is the large segment of our population over 65 who have not in the past been eligible to participate in the majority of the private plans. In many cases widows, widowers, pensioners and many others in this group have found that one serious illness has ruined them financially.

I know that in the main this group of people over 65 are dignified and proud. Often, in the past, they have been the last to complain. I am pleased that the recommended legislation states that this group will be able to obtain coverage regardless of age or physical condition.

The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Haskett) is bringing vigorous leadership to his department. Ontario is the only province in Canada that has a Department of Correction. Here we have an excellent system of classification that, in effect, separates young offenders from old, first-timers from repeaters, prisoners sentenced for a short time from those serving long terms, and segregates such special problems from groups such as psychopaths, sex deviates, and so on.

Excellent trade and academic training is available and much useful employment is provided. The department also operates various clinics of very high order.

For some years expanding work with female drug addicts has been in progress at the Mercer Reformatory for Women. Now an unusual development is under way in the

establishment of an intensive treatment clinic for selected female prisoners, which is expected to be operating early in the New Year.

Another departure, which must receive general approval, is the opening of the new woodland camp at Cold Springs, north of Bowmanville, for a special group of older boys who will spend a half-day in the classroom and the other half-day in the outdoors doing forestry work. I want to congratulate the department on having these young men participate in the actual building of their own camp.

Many, I am sure, will learn with surprise that The Department of Reform Institutions is now supervising 11 training schools for wayward boys and girls, giving them elementary, secondary and technical education in accordance with the curriculum of The Ontario Department of Education. In keeping with its progressive attitude to this most important aspect of its whole programme, plans are now being made for a central reception and diagnostic unit for all boys committed to its care. Each boy will spend an initial orientation and diagnostic period and thence be referred to the particular school unit whose programme is best able to serve his particular needs.

The hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cathcart) has done a tremendous job to increase the in-flow of tourists into this province over the past few years. Having driven over 6,000 miles in the United States and Canada this past summer, I know that this government's sponsored tourist information centres are among the finest in North America.

It seems to me, however, that the winter resort operators in Ontario are entitled to just a little bit more consideration. Our tourist industry goes almost completely dead once the hunting season is over until May 24. I submit that if this government could make available to our resort operators low interest loans to enable them to winterize their accommodation, the small amount of money invested by the government would be returned many times over and many of our resort owners, instead of closing up for the winter, would become full year-round operators and our tourist industry would cease to be a seasonal business. Every day, more and more summer cottage owners are winterizing their cottages and I am convinced that, if low interest loans were available, resort owners would follow suit. In turn, the in-flow of tourist dollars would not be so sharply curtailed in the winter months.

During the last year and a half this government has done more in the field of education

than at any other time. For this I congratulate the hon. Prime Minister. Knowing the vigour, drive and enthusiasm of his successor, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), I am sure he will not slacken the pace.

In very short order this government has opened up new avenues to education through new terminal courses in high schools and additional ways of getting to university. There is a new awareness of the role our new technological institutions will play in the future as well as a reorientation of the thinking of our people on the importance of a technical and commercial education.

Vast strides have been made in the re-training of our unemployed. More than 8,000 students have received benefit from this programme in over 25 different courses in 29 different centres throughout the province. Most important is the fact that an estimated 80 per cent of the people who took advantage of this training are now gainfully employed. The additional institutes of trades that are expected to be ready for operation in the early fall of 1964 will bring an additional 800 student places to London and 800 to Ottawa. In Sault Ste. Marie there will be 750 student places.

I am pleased to note that the whole matter of increasing enrolments in the institutes of technology and the future demand for this kind of training is being studied to determine the need for additional institutes or the future expansion of the existing ones.

One night last week I attended a meeting at the Home and School Club of Malvern Collegiate Institute. A panel discussion took place on the subject "Is Grade 13 Too Hard?" One teacher said, "This grade is 20 times harder than it was 20 years ago." If this be so, I feel that Grade 13 should not be downgraded but the curriculum all the way up to Grade 12 should be upgraded, and I commend the government for the steps being taken in curriculum revision—in the study being made concerning Grade 13—and the committee that is now proceeding to study the matter of textbooks.

Education of handicapped children throughout the province has made vast strides during the past two years and much credit for this must be given to local boards of education. But inequalities in the handling of this problem do exist and the smaller municipalities and more remote areas have a difficult time coping with this situation. There are many children—e.g. those suffering from cerebral palsy—who are not able to receive the advantages of those in Toronto, who attend Sunnyview Orthopedic School, and who are

daily transported to and from their homes without any cost to the parents. In cases where children are not able to attend special schools, there are many residual costs that must be borne by parents.

As well as the problems of the handicapped children, life has already discriminated against the mentally retarded child and we, as a government, should face up to our responsibilities and do all within our power to ensure that these children are afforded an education equal to that received by normal children.

I welcome the proposal of legislation that will make available grants of \$2,500 per bed to be made available to local associations which provide residential facilities for the less seriously retarded children. Volunteer organizations throughout the province are doing a magnificent job in these fields and I hope the day will never come when, because of government participation, they will relax their efforts. But we in this Legislature are remiss in our duty if we do not help to provide a more equal opportunity for the education and maintenance of the retarded and handicapped children.

My recommendation to the hon. Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, would be that his department take over the complete cost of the education of mentally and physically handicapped children who cannot attend regular schools. I am not advocating in any way that we usurp the rights of individual boards of education, but I feel that in some of the areas of special education they would welcome our increased participation.

The establishment of Trent University at Peterborough, the University of Windsor, the \$3 million development grant for the Laurentian University at Sudbury and for York University in Toronto are projects that will be welcomed by all.

It seems to me that amongst our people there is sometimes misunderstanding about our universities. Universities are autonomous—every year financial support by government is increasing. Last year governments met over 63 per cent of university costs. For the fiscal year March 31st, 1961, our provincial government made grants to universities in this province of \$28,755,000. This figure will continue to climb. I believe universities should look harder for private assistance. Universities should press their cause with more vigour, make it clear what their financial needs will be and press Canadian industry for more money, who, after all, have a huge stake in higher learning and should give more to universities than they now do.

Last session I mentioned to this House the large number of constituents of different European origin in my riding who have now become true Canadians and are proud of their country and their province. Daily these people are helping to enrich the culture of our province with their contribution in almost every field of art, music and drama. Every Canadian, whether he arrived here one year ago or 100 years ago, will welcome the government's interest in cultural life. The proposed council of arts that will be set up to administer funds for the advancement of the arts will be received with enthusiasm by the people of Ontario in every walk of life.

Mr. Speaker, in the vital areas of health and education that I have touched on which are so important to the citizen of this province, very few of these things will we be able to afford if we do not do everything in our power to keep this province on the forward march.

During the past year there have been indications that our economic rate of growth might not be high enough to enable us to supply the many jobs and services the people of this province should have. To offset this and to keep the economy rolling, there has been no member of this government who has worked harder than the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) in organizing Ontario's Trade Crusade. There has been nothing but commendation for these efforts from businessmen, no matter what their political philosophy.

Success story after success story has come in from sales missions on their return from foreign markets.

The first manufacturing opportunities show and conference held early this month in Toronto has resulted in \$50 million of new business for Ontario industry.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Which industry?

Mr. Harris: Industries, plural!

Businessmen in other parts of the province are looking forward to the three other manufacturing opportunity conferences that will be held—in London in February, in Cornwall in March and in northern Ontario in April. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development for the forward-looking policies that are helping the province to forge ahead at an ever-increasing pace.

During the budget debate last March I was pleased to have the opportunity of reviewing some of the outstanding contributions

that have been made to amateur sports by such organizations as the Ted Reeve Arena, the Balmy Beach Canoe Club in my riding and, a few years earlier, the great Balmy Beach football team. I also referred at that time to a young student who attended Malvern Collegiate in my riding. Last week this young man, Bruce Kidd, again brought honour to us when he won the six-mile race at the British Commonwealth Games in Australia.

In this connection, in the Speech from the Throne, I was pleased to note the government's awareness of the value of a vigorous fit population to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing society and that they will recommend measures to expand the services of all citizens and organizations with interest in physical fitness and amateur sports.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the crisis in Cuba made us all pause and reflect on the uncertainty of just what the future holds for us. But it also made me feel proud to be part of a government whose concern is only for the welfare of the people and the best means of making this province one in which there will be an ever-increasing opportunity for all our citizens. I believe this is evident by the comprehensive and far-reaching programme now before us for our consideration. Despite what the hon. leaders of the Opposition parties have said, this new programme is not frosting any cake but rather a complete legislative programme to deal with the problems of our time. I can see great social and economic advances resulting from its implementation.

Mr. Speaker, Beaches riding is honoured that its representative has been privileged to make this address.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honour for me to be permitted to second the motion of the hon. member for Toronto Beaches (Mr. Harris) for the adoption of the Speech from the Throne graciously presented by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. It is an honour to me personally and to all the people of Welland whom I have the privilege of representing in this House.

We have been called to this fourth session of this 26th Legislature to enact important legislation and to meet with all our resources the many problems that confront us. This is a continuing challenge, for the world does not stand still and we must always be prepared to give our best for the good of all the people of Ontario. The programme that has been outlined to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne is in my view

the most dynamic and far-reaching ever proposed by a government in this province. I am confident its implementation will have beneficial results at both the economic and social levels of our society.

In my own riding of Welland, Mr. Speaker, we are already receiving consideration for many important projects and I am sure that we shall continue to share in the prosperity of this province. Since I have been a member of this Legislature I have brought to the attention of this House the need for an overpass or underpass for the Welland Canal at Welland. It is gratifying to see that negotiations on a \$10 million tunnel project under the canal will proceed.

Also, I was pleased to learn that Highway 58, or Highway 406 as it is now called, will be extended from Welland to St. Catharines and a new development road will be constructed from Beckett's Bridge north to link with the Queen Elizabeth Way. This is just a part of the same story of progress that is happening all over Ontario.

Most people here, I believe, know how I earn my living. I am employed by one of Canada's major industries, Page-Hersey Tubes Limited. We manufacture a great variety of steel products, mainly in the form of tubes and piping, and through this activity we are in touch with the commercial life of Canada and, indeed, of the world. I work shoulder to shoulder with men who fill the many kinds of occupations which a large plant provides.

The circumstances of my fellow workers are well known to me. I am familiar with their families and their community life, and also with the ups and downs in their employment.

It is no secret to anyone here that satisfactory employment is not only essential for a livelihood, but also for a happy home life and the activities of a good citizen.

Interest in industry, and the jobs which it provides, is something that is always of concern to me and the people of my riding. My home town of Welland is one of the most industrialized areas of Canada. All types of skilled tradesmen and mechanics make their home there, in addition to a very fine group of professional and business men.

The county of Welland has progressed beyond all expectations in the last few years. This, of course, is a welcome prosperity, although the city of Welland, for example, has been hard pressed to supply the services required by this growth. But we are building new schools, and streets and roads, and all that is called for in the expansion of a modern community. We need continued prosperity

and employment to maintain the level already reached, and to consolidate our gains on that level. That is why every alert person in my riding is aware that the economic life of this country and this province is part and parcel of his own personal life.

Having the honour to represent these people, I feel the same interests and the same concerns.

I must say here that I have nothing but praise for the manner in which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and his government are moving to help our productive system. This government has gone out to face world competition in the markets, besides taking many steps inside the province to create new industries and new jobs.

We have, in the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), a man who has dedicated himself to an all-out effort to strengthen and enlarge our economy. He is giving encouragement to business in a practical, down-to-earth, feet-on-the-ground way, and his success to date has been most exceptional.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the management of my own plant is encouraged. They are most eager to co-operate in this programme to promote the sale of Ontario-produced goods.

The other industries of Welland are taking an equal part in this forward driving, forward looking, trade crusade.

In any event, the efforts of the people and the government of Ontario have shown good results. For not more than 2.8 per cent of the labour force is unemployed in this province. This compares to 6.9 per cent in the Atlantic region, 5.9 per cent in Quebec, and 5.8 per cent in British Columbia.

These figures show us that Ontario is neither falling back nor standing still. For, in spite of seasonal declines, more people were employed here in October than in September. We would, of course, like to see every person with a job, and that is the goal. Our comparative position, nonetheless, is good, both in Canada and in the wider North American scene. In the United States something over 5 per cent of the work force lacks employment.

We can be thankful that this fair province enjoys many of the blessings of nature. We have used these to advantage for industry in developing low-cost hydro-electric power, in creating, years ago, excellent railways and, just recently, unsurpassed roads, and in opening up the St. Lawrence Seaway for ready access to world markets. As a result, our commercial life has grown.

Yet, there are certain features of the economy that disturb me. Many branches of industry have grown, other branches seem stunted or broken off. To take one instance, why has this country no distinctive Canadian-made car? Of all the automobiles on our roads, or on the roads of Europe and other continents, you cannot point to one and say that is Canada's own car. Yet Sweden, a country with only seven and a half million people, has two national manufacturers who produce and export Swedish cars.

But much Canadian industry is controlled by United States companies and American capital. As a result, we have "copy cars" only. Even at that we are required to import many of the parts that go into the cars and trucks assembled here. The export markets we used to have in automobiles—such as they were—have faded to marginal operations. U.S. cars go overseas along the routes ours used to follow. It is a case, I suppose, of why buy the copy when you can get the original?

To take another instance, let us consider the most notable book that is in print—the Bible. The Bible leads all other books in volumes of sales in Canada, year after year. Yet the Bibles sold here are entirely imported from the United States and Great Britain.

Is there any member of this House who has ever seen a Bible that was produced in Canada? I recommend that hon. members look into the Bible. It will do them good. And, at the same time, look to see where it was printed. It will not be in Canada, I'll warrant, even though the paper it is printed on probably came from here. Yet this is a country of 18 million people—a large enough market, I would think, for such a popular publication.

Possibly the hon. Minister of Economics and Development would like to consult some Canadian printers on the reasons why this most important of books should come only from outside this country.

Another source of wonderment to me is the fact that the imports of manufactured articles made of iron and steel rise from year to year. As I explained, I know something about steel pipes and tubes. At Page-Hersey we make big pipes and little pipes, straight ones and bent ones. It is a piping business, but apparently there is a wide Canadian market that it does not cover. I note that in 1961 over \$46 million worth of tubes, pipes and fittings came in, mainly from the United States.

It borders on the ridiculous that we should

rely on foreign industries when an expansion of our own plants could easily supply the greater part of our needs.

Such serious gaps in the range of Canadian-made goods are certainly worth further study. It is common knowledge, I believe, that many items that might be manufactured in Ontario are not produced here. The United States, or some other nation, has grasped the market to itself.

I am sure that every hon. member in this House will note with approval, first, that this government has recognized the possibilities of home production, and secondly, has opened an energetic campaign for that purpose.

I am confident that the trade crusade will be a great success if it opens the eyes of our industries to the opportunities for increased production that exist in Ontario today. The establishment of the Ontario Development Agency will add yet another weapon to the government's arsenal in its attempt to stimulate production and employment in this province.

These steps bring us to a milestone of progress in the life of Ontario, and they will add wealth to the country as a whole.

This people's government, of which I am a part, is reviewing the economic side of our Ontario society. No one needs to be told how important that is. Earning a living is for us the biggest part of living. So let us move to another point in commercial-industrial questions.

This is the matter of a minimum wage for men, fixed by law. My personal opinion is that the time is ripe for such a consideration. I am pleased to see that the government is taking positive steps in this direction in requiring fair wages to be paid on government contracts. It is my hope that The Department of Labour will be able to develop policies to protect the workers of Ontario with dispatch.

A minimum wage would contribute to the stability of the economic structure of this province. And while I am talking about stability I want to mention a feature that too often disturbs a stable system. That is the movement of industrial plants from one town to another. Closing down of a factory in one place and opening it in another is an activity I deplore, unless it is justified by sound social and economic reasons. Such a movement disrupts a community from end to end; it deprives all its institutions, churches, stores, offices and schools of the required support, tears families from their

roots, scattering relatives and neighbours who must seek work elsewhere.

I think that we can all agree that this is a problem that can be solved only by the co-operation of business and labour. The joint conferences sponsored by The Department of Labour should consider this vexing social problem. In my view, the answer lies in the creation of a co-operative spirit between labour and management.

All sudden large-scale unemployment has these bad effects. The movement of plants is one cause, automation is another and, without a doubt, a more serious and widespread factor. We are all concerned with automation—the replacement of men with machines in the manufacturing process. We all know that this can be a great blessing; the almost effortless production of goods for our enjoyment is the fulfillment of man's dream. But this can be a curse, too, if it is not carefully managed.

I know that studies are under way in Ottawa. But I feel this is such an important subject that I suggest that a select committee of this House devote time and energy to considering automation. Such a committee would consider ways and means to avoid any ill effects that might arise when workers are displaced by technical changes. I think some help is in line for the man who has, perhaps, spent years of good service in an exacting job, and then finds himself ousted by some automatic device. I would like to congratulate the government for its recognition of the importance of automation and for calling a conference in April on automation and social change under the joint sponsorship of The Departments of Economics and Development, Labour and Education.

Retraining is certainly in order, so that the person can get back to some useful and satisfactory employment. Much has been done in the way of retraining. Much more has to be accomplished. The present committee on the use of manpower is one of the best on which I have served since I have been a member of this House. I am pleased with the study and progress it has carried out in its own area of concern. Beyond this, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest a committee on the social effects of automation. There would be much of value following from the appointment of such a body with good results.

This move would be in line with the wide responsibility which government has for the well-being of all citizens, and while I am on this theme, I want to refer to another

topic that comes under the heading of social well-being.

From a copy of *Hansard* I note the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Diefenbaker) has asked that the prime ministers of the provinces give their views on a contributory social security scheme. The hon. Prime Minister of Ontario replied in February, 1962, as follows:

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER:

I learn with much pleasure of your proposals to develop a contributory social security scheme for the aged which will also include and extend to the disabled and survivors (including children) of contributors who have died.

It is our considered opinion that the only proper way to add strength to our social security planning for the future lies in the establishment of a contributory scheme enabling contributors to establish their right to receive benefits on a prescribed basis in keeping with their previous contributions.

May I say, therefore, that the government of Ontario would concur in and facilitate proper and reasonable plans by your government resulting in a contributory social insurance programme becoming a reality.

Yours very truly,
JOHN P. ROBERTS.

Mr. Speaker, that is the end of the letter. It is a good letter from our hon. Prime Minister and a good reply. It is another indication of how this government is concerned about the needs of all the people.

I am personally satisfied that the people of Ontario want an improvement in pension coverage. An extension of pension plans in Ontario would secure for everyone who contributes, at least the basic necessities. Income would be assured where a person was retired or disabled, or for a family in the case of the death of the breadwinner. I live near the international border and I know how much the people in the United States are "sold" on compulsory pension contributions.

I am very happy that this government is going to go ahead with the recommendations of the Ontario Committee on Portable Pensions. The passage of The Pension Benefits Act will permit thousands of Ontario employees to carry their pension benefits with them when they move from job to job.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Does the hon. member want compulsory medical insurance too?

Mr. Morningstar: Yes, we are in favour of that also.

It will also mean the establishment of pension plans in firms with 15 or more employees where no plan now exists. Good government, great government!

I have touched on the subject of pensions on every occasion that I have spoken in this House. Now, when I have the honour of

rising in acknowledgment to the Speech from the Throne, I am most happy to see action by our government.

It is in recognition that the basic security for society lies in economic strength, that I have mentioned automation, a minimum wage, as well as import and export gaps. In the legislative programme we have had outlined for this session, there are many opportunities to add to the fine quality of the life enjoyed by Ontario's citizens.

I am proud to be able to express the thanks of this House for the Speech from the Throne. In my selection for this duty, the people of the riding of Welland, whom I represent, are also gratefully honoured.

Mr. Speaker, I second the motion of the hon. member for Toronto Beaches (Mr. Harris) for the adoption of the address graciously

presented to us by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (leader of the Opposition) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow we will proceed with the introduction of bills. There is really nothing else on the order paper. It will be a day or so before the House is fully organized and the complete order of business available.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Friday, November 30, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Friday, November 30, 1962

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, first reading	43
Conditional Sales Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	43
Investigation of Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	43
Custody of Documents Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	43
Partnership Registrations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	44
Crown Attorneys Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	44
Rehabilitation and development of agricultural lands in rural areas in Ontario, bill to provide for, Mr. Stewart, first reading	44
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	46

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1962

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Holland School Area, Holland Centre, and in the west gallery, Quinte Secondary School, Belleville.

We are also particularly honoured this morning to have as our guest His Excellency Sultan Mohammed Khan, High Commissioner for Pakistan.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would say in explanation that this is the bill customarily introduced each year to amend The Highway Traffic Act, and it will be referred as usual to the committee on highway safety.

The bill deals with such matters as the registration of vehicles, exemption of rear view mirrors on commercial motor vehicles from the prescribed maximum width limits, safety conditions in special permits granted for the movement of oversized vehicles, maximum length of vehicles and combinations of vehicles and rules of the road having to do with driving on the right.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker? I would like to inquire if there is anything in the bill regarding safety belts, both as to requiring their use in motor vehicles and also as to setting standards of adequacy?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the hon. member, there is nothing in the bill having to do with making seat belts mandatory but yesterday the necessary regulations and order-in-council were passed describing the standards for seat belts sold and installed in Ontario.

THE CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, with respect to this bill and the three succeeding bills which I propose to introduce, I would say in explanation that they follow the same pattern. They are amendments to the present legislation; the removing from certain Acts providing for registration of documents in county registry offices, the provision as to fees. No change is contemplated in the fee structure at the present time but it is desired to have the fee system for registration of documents in the Registry Office all under The Registry Act. These bills provide for the transfer of the fee provisions from these several Acts into the regulations under The Registry Act.

THE INVESTIGATION OF TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Investigation of Titles Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, the only provision here is for the removal of fees from this Act amending The Registry Act, as I mentioned.

THE CUSTODY OF DOCUMENTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Custody of Documents Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this bill has the same provision as the previous one, but in addition to that it prescribes certain changes in the practices with respect to actions to be taken and books to be kept by registrars under this Act for the purpose of bringing the practice in this regard in line with other practices in the Registry Office.

THE PARTNERSHIP REGISTRATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Partnership Registrations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this bill does the same as the other bills; transfers the fees. It also provides for changes in procedures and in records by regulation in order to bring the practices with respect to registration of partnerships into line with other procedures in the county registry offices.

THE CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, I neglected to say at the beginning that these bills, of course, will go to the committee on legal bills.

This bill carries a little further, an amendment which was made last year by the House. At that time there was an amendment allowing the appointment of Crown Attorneys pro tem when the Crown Attorney was absent or ill or unable to perform his duties. This provides for similar rights with proportionate fees and salaries when the office of Crown Attorney is vacant.

At the present time if the office of Crown Attorney is vacant, someone must be sent from Toronto or some other large centre where there is someone available. This will allow the Deputy Attorney-General to appoint a Crown Attorney pro tem in the area affected while the formal appointment is being considered and dealt with.

DEVELOPMENT OF LANDS

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the rehabilitation and

development of agricultural lands in rural areas in Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this bill, it is intended to bring the legislation of the province of Ontario in accord with the legislation provided by the government of Canada in order that we in the province of Ontario may enter into agreements with the government of Canada for the rehabilitation and development of lands within the province.

It is intended that it will provide for the establishment of what may be known as a directorate in the province of Ontario, established under The Department of Agriculture. A director has now been appointed, Mr. Herb Crown. I am sure many of you will know him as an outstanding agricultural authority in the province with wide experience in the field of conservation and of rural development.

Mr. Crown comes to this office as director to co-ordinate the activities of The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act in the various departments concerned in the Ontario government. The directorate will be appointed from those various departments and will be co-ordinated under his directorship.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question, of which notice has been given, that I wanted to address to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton). Unfortunately the hon. Minister of Highways is not in his seat and you will recall, sir—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would point out that I mentioned to the hon. member that in my opinion this question obviously requires considerable study and a detailed answer. I did not think from the wording of it that it was a question of urgent public importance and I so advised the office of the Minister to this effect.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I was about to remark on the comments that we exchanged earlier today and I wonder if the hon. Minister's absence might not be the solution to this problem, enabling me to put the question on the record and the hon. Minister take it as notice.

Now, the hon. Minister is not here and he cannot reply but I think this is a matter that might well be of substantial public importance. Let us have it on the record and then

the hon. Minister in his own good time can decide either to answer it or not.

Mr. Speaker, the question is this: Would the hon. Minister advise the House of the names and ranks of officials and workers in the North Bay district who have been discharged or transferred in the last six months, and the reasons for their discharge or transfer?

Mr. Speaker: Since this is one of the first questions to come before the House this session, I would repeat that the question obviously requires considerable study and in my opinion it is not one of urgent public importance. After all, there are some 30,000 or more employees in the province and they are being transferred, and they are being discharged, all the time and I deem it a proper question for the order paper.

In the future when I rule a question proper for the order paper, and not as a question before the orders of the day, that will be the end of the matter. It will not be mentioned in the House as this has been this morning, but I thought it a good idea to bring it up in this way for the information and advisement of the members.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like your indulgence and the indulgence of this House in rising to pay tribute, this being St. Andrew's Day, as I have in the past. The people of my riding, which bears the name of the patron saint of the fine people of Scottish background, are always glad to pay tribute to the many Scots in our province.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that I was taken unawares. The St. Andrew's Society in Toronto having celebrated the occasion a week or so ago, I somehow felt that St. Andrew's Day came on a day on which this Legislature did not sit. However, I found this morning, a memo on my desk, reminding me of it. Otherwise, I assure the hon. members I would have brought my kilt as usual and worn it for the occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all hon. members of this House in paying tribute to all those fine citizens of Scottish ancestry, both in and out of this Legislature, who have done so much to help build this province and who are playing such a vital role in it today.

I am sure hon. members would not want me to miss this occasion, and I am sure they all join with me in paying this tribute.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, as one who has perhaps the

proper right by birth and heritage to speak on behalf of St. Andrew, I would like to point out to you, sir, that we are a modest and humble people. I think I can best illustrate this, with your permission, sir, by relating a story.

I know that this august House is not given to telling or listening to stories, but this refers to a business man from Aberdeen who had occasion to travel to London and on his return he was met by his cronies and asked a good deal about his experiences.

The one question put to him which I think he answered very aptly and very neatly was this: "And what did you think of those English people? Are they all that we read about?"

"Well", he said, "I really couldn't see, you know I went down on business and I only spoke to the heads of departments".

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would draw to the attention of the House another very important matter on this particular date.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the birthday of the hon. member to my right, the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume). He did not want me to draw this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, he advised me he is in much the same position as Jack Benny. But I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that you would want me, and I am certain all the House, to join in extending to the hon. member for Essex North our best wishes on the occasion of this birthday.

I would only say that he has been in public life for, I believe, 33 years. Now his exact age will remain unknown. I do not know it myself. But certainly the hon. member for Essex North is a very popular member of this Legislature, a very outstanding man in the province of Ontario. He has been a good friend of mine over a long period of time, and I certainly am very pleased to have the opportunity to draw the fact to your attention, that the hon. member for Essex North, together with Winston Churchill and St. Andrew, was born on the last day of November.

An hon. member: And Jimmy Band!

Mr. Wintermeyer: And Jimmy Band, yes.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would certainly be remiss if I did not add my congratulations to the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume). He has had a long and varied political career. He has had the opportunity that few of us have

had to support various political parties. But over the years in this House he has been a good friend of mine and we have enjoyed some extra-legislative activities together. I am delighted to join with the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) in offering my congratulations to the hon. member for Essex North on this, his birthday.

As I explained to the House yesterday, these are the early days and we are attempting to get the flow of business established. With the introduction of the bills that we have today, there is no further business on the order paper. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) suggests that I might indicate to hon. members that on Monday we will move second reading of Bill No. 2. This is printed and in the order book. So if any of the hon. members have any comments to make, it will be debated in principle on Monday.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might speak for a moment. I want to thank the hon. Prime Minister of the province (Mr. Robarts), and also the head of our party.

I admit it has been a long, varied career; some 33 years. I probably am one of the very few who had the opportunity of being a member at one time of two of the old parties in the country. And without adding a whole lot to it, I just want to say that how it occurred was: a long time ago, when I was a very young man, I had an uncle who was a member of the hon. Prime Minister's party, and he was a very fine man, too. As a matter of fact, he was a member of the Whitby group.

After I ran for the very first time my uncle, who was a very fine fellow, said: "Now I think that where you ought to be is a member of the Tory party." So he told

me all the fine things about the party. And I joined, but I did not stay long.

I want to add to all of that, without making a long speech, that I have never been so happy in my life as I am now. I want to say that I do not think that we over here have really ever had it so good. As I look back over the last 33 years, the one important thing that comes at once to my mind is the very bright future that is opening up for our party. And indeed, in the opening up of this very bright future for our party there is a bright future opening up too for the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I would point out to the members of the Legislature when the Speaker rises and calls for order all members resume their seats. We have been a little lax this morning inasmuch as we have had these various notices in the House. I do not want it to be taken as an example of what might happen in future sessions; it certainly will not.

It is perfectly all right for the hon. member to rise in his seat and reply to felicitations on the occasion of his birthday, but it certainly is not in order to make political speeches. I presume the hon. member has now replied to the felicitations.

I would like to point out to the hon. members that a striking committee meeting was called, a meeting for the members of the striking committee, for Monday morning at 10:30. It has now been deemed advisable to hold this meeting one hour later at 11:30.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:10 o'clock, a.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Monday, December 3, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

	Monday, December 3, 1962	
First report, select committee on standing committees, Mr. J. F. Edwards		49
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to		52

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1962

The House met at 3:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from St. Elizabeth's Separate School, Islington, in the west gallery.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petition has been received:

Of the corporation of the city of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass authorizing the variations and extensions of certain provisions of its agreement with the T. Eaton Realty Company.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. J. F. Edwards from the select committee appointed to prepare the list of members to compose the standing committees of the House presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the standing committees ordered by the House be composed as follows:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE — Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Auld, Boyer, Brown, Brunelle, Carruthers, Chapple, Connell, Davis, Davison, Downer, Edwards (Perth), Edwards (Wentworth), Evans, Fullerton, Gaunt, Gisborn, Gomme, Guindon, Hamilton, Hoffman, Innes, Janes, Johnston (Carleton), Lavergne, Letherby, MacDonald, Mackenzie, MacNaughton, Manley, Morningstar, Myers, McNeil, Nixon, Noden, Oliver, Parry, Phillips, Quilty, Rollins, Root, Sandercock, Simonett, Spence, Stewart, Sutton, Whicher, Whitney, Wintermeyer, Worton—50. The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION, LANDS AND FORESTS—Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Auld, Belisle, Boyer, Brunelle, Carruthers, Chapple, Davison, Edwards (Perth), Evans,

Fullerton, Gaunt, Gibson, Gisborn, Gomme, Guindon, Hamilton, Harris, Hoffman, Innes, Janes, Johnston (Carleton), Johnston (Parry Sound), Lavergne, Lawrence, Letherby, Lewis, MacDonald, Mackenzie, MacNaughton, Manley, Morningstar, Morrow, McNeil, Nixon, Noden, Oliver, Parry, Price, Quilty, Rollins, Root, Sandercock, Simonett, Sopha, Spence, Sutton, Troy, Wardrope, Whicher, White—51. The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION — Messrs. Auld, Beckett, Belanger, Belisle, Boyer, Brown, Brunelle, Bryden, Carruthers, Cowling, Davison, Downer, Edwards (Perth), Evans, Gaunt, Gibson, Gould, Guindon, Hamilton, Harris, Janes, Johnston (Carleton), Lawrence, Letherby, Lewis, MacDonald, MacNaughton, Morin, Morningstar, Morrow, Myers, McNeil, Newman, Nixon, Parry, Phillips, Price, Quilty, Reilly, Root, Sandercock, Simonett, Singer, Stewart, Sutton, Thompson, Trotter, Troy, Whicher, White, Wintermeyer—51. The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY—Messrs. Brunelle, Bryden, Bukator, Carruthers, Chapple, Davis, Gomme, Guindon, Hamilton, Haskett, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Carleton), Lawrence, Letherby, Lewis, MacDonald, MacNaughton, Myers, McNeil, Nixon, Oliver, Phillips, Reaume, Reilly, Rollins, Root, Simonett, Singer, Sopha, Stewart, Thomas, Whicher, Whitney, Wintermeyer—35. The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON GAME AND FISH—Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Beckett, Boyer, Brown, Brunelle, Chapple, Cowling, Davis, Davison, Evans, Fullerton, Gaunt, Gibson, Gisborn, Guindon, Hamilton, Hoffman, Innes, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Carleton), Lavergne, Lawrence, Letherby, Lewis, MacDonald, Mackenzie, MacNaughton, Manley, Morningstar, Morrow, Myers, McNeil, Newman, Nixon, Noden, Parry, Price, Quilty, Rollins, Root, Sandercock, Simonett, Sopha, Spence, Stewart, Sutton, Troy, Whicher, White, Whitney—51. The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONS—Messrs. Beckett, Belanger, Brunelle, Bryden, Davis, Downer, Edwards (Perth), Guindon, Janes, Johnston, (Parry Sound), Johnston (Carleton), Lawrence, Lewis, MacDonald, MacNaughton, Morningstar, Morrow, McNeil, Oliver, Parry, Price, Reaume, Reilly, Root, Sandercock, Singer, Sopha, Sutton, Thomas, Trotter, Troy, Whicher, White, Whitney, Wintermeyer—35. The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND WELFARE—Messrs. Auld, Belisle, Boyer, Brown, Brunelle, Bukator, Carruthers, Chapple, Cowling, Davis, Davison, Downer, Edwards (Perth), Edwards (Wentworth), Evans, Gaunt, Guindon, Harris, Hoffman, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Carleton), Lavergne, Lawrence, Letherby, Lewis, MacDonald, Mackenzie, MacNaughton, Morningstar, Morrow, McNeil, Newman, Noden, Oliver, Parry, Phillips, Price, Reilly, Rollins, Root, Sandercock, Simonett, Spence, Sutton, Thomas, Thompson, Trotter, Troy, Wintermeyer, Worton—51. The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAYS AND HIGHWAY SAFETY—Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Auld, Beckett, Belanger, Belisle, Boyer, Brown, Brunelle, Carruthers, Davis, Davison, Edwards (Perth), Edwards (Wentworth), Fullerton, Gibson, Gomme, Gordon, Grossman, Guindon, Hamilton, Innes, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Carleton), Lavergne, Letherby, Lewis, MacDonald, Mackenzie, MacNaughton, Manley, Morrow, McNeil, Newman, Noden, Parry, Phillips, Price, Quilty, Reaume, Reilly, Rollins, Root, Simonett, Singer, Sutton, Thomas, Thompson, White, Worton—50. The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON LABOUR—Messrs. Belanger, Belisle, Carruthers, Cass, Daley, Davis, Davison, Downer, Edwards (Wentworth), Gaunt, Gibson, Gisborn, Gomme, Grossman, Hamilton, Harris, Haskett, Lavergne, Lawrence, MacDonald, MacNaughton, Morningstar, Myers, Newman, Parry, Price, Reaume, Reilly, Simonett, Singer, Sopha, Trotter, Wardrope, Whicher, White—35. The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON LEGAL BILLS—Messrs. Beckett, Bryden, Cass, Davis, Downer, Edwards (Perth), Gaunt, Gould, Grossman, Harris, Haskett, Lawrence, Macanlay, MacDonald, Myers, Nickle, Noden, Parry, Price, Row-

tree, Singer, Sopha, Trotter, Wintermeyer, Yaremko—25. The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON MINING—Messrs. Belisle, Brunelle, Chapple, Davis, Evans, Fullerton, Gaunt, Gisborn, Gomme, Grossman, Harris, Hoffman, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Carleton), Lavergne, MacDonald, Mackenzie, Manley, Morin, Morrow, Newman, Noden, Price, Rollins, Root, Rowntree, Sandercock, Sopha, Thomas, Thompson, Troy, Wardrope, Wintermeyer, Worton—35. The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL LAW—Messrs. Auld, Beckett, Belanger, Belisle, Brunelle, Bryden, Carruthers, Cowling, Davis, Downer, Edwards (Perth), Edwards (Wentworth), Evans, Fullerton, Gibson, Gomme, Hamilton, Harris, Haskett, Janes, Johnston (Carleton), Lavergne, Lawrence, Lewis, MacDonald, Mackenzie, MacNaughton, Manley, Morin, Myers, McNeil, Newman, Nickle, Oliver, Parry, Price, Reaume, Reilly, Root, Rowntree, Sandercock, Singer, Sopha, Stewart, Sutton, Thomas, Whicher, Whitney, Worton, Yaremko—50. The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING—Messrs. Belanger, Belisle, Boyer, Brown, Brunelle, Carruthers, Cowling, Evans, Fullerton, Gisborn, Gomme, Gordon, Hamilton, Haskett, Janes, Johnston (Carleton), MacDonald, Mackenzie, Manley, Morin, Parry, Reilly, Whicher, Whitney, Worton—25. The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS—Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Auld, Beckett, Belanger, Belisle, Boyer, Brown, Brunelle, Bryden, Carruthers, Cowling, Davis, Edwards (Perth), Evans, Fullerton, Gaunt, Gisborn, Gomme, Gordon, Gould, Grossman, Guindon, Hamilton, Harris, Innes, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Carleton), Lavergne, Lawrence, Lewis, MacDonald, Mackenzie, MacNaughton, Manley, Morin, Morningstar, Morrow, Myers, McNeil, Newman, Nickle, Nixon, Oliver, Parry, Price, Reaume, Reilly, Rollins, Root, Sandercock, Simonett, Singer, Sopha, Sutton, Thomas, Trotter, Troy, Whicher, Whitney—60. The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS—Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Belisle, Boyer, Brunelle, Davis, Gomme, Grossman, Harris, Lawrence, Letherby, MacDonald, Morrow, Oliver, Trotter, Wintermeyer—15. The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS—Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Belisle, Edwards (Perth), Fullerton, Gaunt, Gordon, Harris, Hoffman, Janes, Lavergne, MacDonald, Mackenzie, MacNaughton, Manley, McNeil, Newman, Noden, Parry, Reilly, Sandercock, Sutton, Thomas, Troy, White, Wintermeyer—25. The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

COMMITTEE ON TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY—Messrs. Allen (Middlesex South), Auld, Beckett, Belanger, Belisle, Boyer, Brown, Brunelle, Bukator, Carruthers, Chapple, Cowling, Davison, Downer, Edwards (Perth), Fullerton, Gibson, Gisborn, Gordon, Grossman, Guindon, Hamilton, Harris, Hoffman, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Lavergne, Lawrence, Letherby, Lewis, MacDonald, Mackenzie, MacNaughton, Morin, Newman, Noden, Parry, Price, Quilty, Reaume, Reilly, Rollins, Root, Sandercock, Simonett, Trotter, Troy, Wardrope, Whicher, Whitney—50. The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

Your committee will meet again to prepare the list of the members of the standing committee on public accounts.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, excuse me. It is my understanding that at the meeting this morning there was some discussion about the composition of the public accounts committee and the suggestion was made that that composition would consist of nine members; six members from the government, two from our party and one from the New Democratic party. I believe that is the suggestion that was made, Mr. Speaker. And then it was suggested that this matter be deferred for a week for consideration.

Now, if it helps you, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to accept that particular composition of the new public accounts committee and thus avoid further discussion and precipitate a decision immediately.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, if I may add, we are also agreeable to this and our member on the committee will be the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden). So there is no need for a further delay as far as we are concerned.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not know that this discussion had taken place in the committee this morning, but we can reconvene the committee immediately. We will have to wait for the tabling of the public accounts in any event before this committee can carry out

the tasks which I think we are all agreed that it might do. I will arrange to have the committee reconvene and this committee appointed and there will be no delay.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to make reference to a matter that I am sure will be of interest to all hon. members.

I refer to the retirement of two senior members of The Department of Highways who have been well known to many throughout the province in the persons of Mr. W. A. Clarke, and Mr. Carman Tackaberry.

Mr. Clarke was, for many years, chief engineer and, for the last one and one-half years was Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of all engineering. Mr. Carman Tackaberry has, for many years, been chief maintenance engineer, and one to whom much credit is due for the excellent standard of maintenance, both summer and winter, on our King's highways system.

While we are sorry to see them leave the department they have served so long and so faithfully, I am sure hon. members will join me in wishing them a long and happy retirement.

I am also pleased to announce that Mr. Clarke will be succeeded as Assistant Deputy Minister, engineering, by Mr. H. W. Adcock, the present chief engineer; and Mr. Tackaberry's position as maintenance engineer, will be taken over by Mr. E. J. Orr who has for some time been acting as his assistant. I am confident that both of these men will carry on in the same high traditions as their predecessors. Again, I am sure the House will join me in congratulating them on their well-earned promotions.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would direct a question to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). In view of the several requests to the hon. Prime Minister for a public inquiry into the necessity and justification for a 20 per cent increase of Physicians' Services Incorporated subscription rates, would the hon. Prime Minister inform the House of his intentions in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this question I would point out first that neither Physicians' Services Incorporated nor the Ontario Medical Association is a

branch or agency of this government and therefore we have no control over their function and the rates charged. The Department of Insurance has an interest only to the extent of making sure what reserves they have; that they do maintain sufficient reserves to be able to provide to their subscribers the services for which those subscribers pay, because they pay for them in advance. It is an insurance principle, of course, that you must be in a position to provide the service for which some of us pay.

I had an investigation made just for my own information, concerning this increase in the rates of Physicians' Services Incorporated, and I am informed that they have paid out in benefits an average of 106 per cent of their income. This has made it necessary for them to draw from their reserves the sum of \$3 million in the year 1962.

Their position is, that the increase is made necessary so that they can set aside a sufficient amount to maintain the reserve which must be maintained if they are to guarantee the provision of services for which people have prepaid. They are increasing their benefits to their subscribers and they need additional funds to meet the Ontario Medical Association schedule of fees.

The point really is, that as a government we do not have control over rates that are charged for services by various professions including doctors, dentists, lawyers, business and association executives. We have no control, as a government, over the wage rates of any group of the population that are set as a result of collective bargaining between industrial firms and trade unions. There is no justification for us to make an inquiry as a government into the increase in rates when those rates are established by an association such as PSI. If we enter into setting rates for one group—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): We could always have a public plan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We could have a public inquiry. Certainly we could have a public inquiry into every rate set, by any group of people in the province—

Mr. MacDonald: That is what the government is doing in the drug—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I just point out that if we are going to investigate what dentists charge and what doctors charge we could get into, I suppose, the proposition of carry-

ing out an investigation of the wage rate established in every collective agreement.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): The hon. Prime Minister might even get into a minimum wage.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We might even get into a minimum wage, which we have already indicated in the Speech from the Throne that we will do!

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get sidetracked. Some of these things undoubtedly will be debated here later on during the session. I have gone into this rather exhaustive answer because I wanted the hon. members of the House to understand just what was involved. I still say that it is not the function of the government to check into the fees levied by associations of this type and therefore—well, I think I have answered the question quite clearly.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, the question did not ask the hon. Prime Minister to interfere in the establishment of certain rates or interfere into the business of PSI, but to bring about an inquiry as to the justification for the rates. I think there is a difference in the two things.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to go on with a debate on second reading of Bill No. 2. Unfortunately, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) is delayed from attending the House. This is the problem in these early days, to get a flow of business established so that we may move from one thing to another. I will move the adjournment of the House.

Tomorrow we will go on with the Throne Speech debate. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) will be speaking and we will go on with the introduction of further bills. In addition we will deal with anything that may be on the order paper.

Some of these bills that have been introduced so far are not yet printed, which means the hon. members do not have them on their desks. Some of them are printed, but I will not call any second readings until these bills have been on the hon. members' desks and they have had a chance to look them over and decide what they might like to say about them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.40 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, December 4, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 4, 1962

Reading and receiving petition	55
Statement re quarterly licensing for commercial vehicles and trailers, Mr. Auld	55
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Wintermeyer, Mr. Robarts	56
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to	72
Guarantee by the province of loans to promote the economic development of Ontario, bill to authorize, Mr. Macaulay, on second reading	72
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Thompson, agreed to	83
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	83

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1962

The House met at 3.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east gallery Holy Family School, Toronto; and in the west gallery Queen of Heaven School, Port Credit, and Bishop Strachan School, Toronto.

Petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petition has been received:

Of the corporation of the township of East York praying that an Act may pass ratifying by-laws respecting charges for services for apartment and other buildings.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I wish to make a statement which I am sure will be of interest to all the hon. members of this House. As was forecast in the Speech from the Throne last Tuesday, The Department of Transport is introducing quarterly licensing for commercial vehicles and trailers commencing on April 1, 1963. The purpose of this change in licensing procedure is to assist farmers and others engaged in seasonal occupations. As an example, let us take the fruit farmer who only requires his vehicle from say July 1, for 11 weeks. This man will now be able to purchase plates for just the July-September quarter instead of as previously the full year. Different coloured plates will be issued for each quarter and will show the date of expiry. However, a vehicle that is licensed for the full year will receive the regular black and white plates.

So that we can commence the first quarterly period on April 1, 1963, the expiry date of the 1962 commercial vehicle and trailer plates has been extended to March 31. This of course does not apply to all other

licences, including passenger cars and drivers' licences which will still expire on March 13 as previously announced.

Commencing in 1963 commercial vehicle and trailer plates will be valid from April 1 to the following March 31, with the previously-mentioned provisions for quarterly licensing. The 1963 commercial plates will go on sale next February 28. Prior to that date and after December 10 of this year the 1962 commercial plates will be issued for the period up to March 31, 1963 and they will be obtainable for one-quarter of the regular fee.

We feel that these changes will be beneficial to all seasonal users of commercial vehicles and trailers and that it will give them some equality in cost of operation with those who use their vehicles all year. In addition—and this is important to manufacturers and to all users—where a new vehicle is purchased and registered at any time after July 1 the quarterly reductions will apply.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question which is directed to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton).

My question is this: Would the hon. Minister indicate to this House if an investigation was conducted within the past six months into the administration of certain branches of District 13 of The Department of Highways? And (b), if the answer to (a) is in the affirmative, will he report to this House now the results of such investigation?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question. My answer could be a simple "yes" in each circumstance. I will qualify them briefly.

In answer to part (a) of the hon. member's question, the answer is yes, although it was not a specific investigation, it was part of a continuing investigation that is conducted by our regional audit staff. The answer to part (b) again is in the affirmative. I will report to the House as soon as the investigation is completed and I have received a report from the people who are conducting same.

Mr. Troy: Is that investigation not completed yet?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I said it was continuing.

Mr. Troy: It is continuing? Has the hon. Minister found out further things that require other investigations?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to reply to the Speech from the Throne. As His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, noted in his words of welcome, this is the fourth session of the Twenty-sixth Parliament. I am sure the significance of that remark was not lost upon hon. members when they heard it, nor when they listened to the address which followed. This will be the last session of the Legislature before the election, and in that regard I can only say it's about time.

We on this side of the House were not surprised to find that the Throne Speech this year was much longer than usual. Nor were we surprised to find that it was packed full of "goodies", as our newspaper friends like to call them. It seems to be a sad but inevitable fact of political life that governments are prone to come bearing gifts at election time. Once again the people of Ontario have had to wait until election time to be promised programmes that should have been brought in long ago.

I shall take a closer look at the government's gifts in a moment, Mr. Speaker, and I shall have quite a bit to say about what was not said in the Speech from the Throne. But before doing so, may I again pay my respects to you, sir, and to the office which you have the honour to hold. The office of Speaker has a long and noble tradition in parliamentary government. As guardian of the rights and privileges of all hon. members, you have the great responsibility to see that full and free debate is made possible within the rules and traditions of Parliament.

We on this side of the House have every confidence, Mr. Speaker, that you will preside over this session, as you have in the past, with impartiality and fairness. We know that you are anxious to see a greater attention paid to the rules and to proper parliamentary procedure, and thereby avoid some of the unfortunate occasions of the past. We in the Opposition are only too

conscious that the rules and the chair are our great protector, and we welcome your Honour's endeavors and extend our complete co-operation.

May I also at this point say a word or two about the retirement of the hon. member for Hamilton Centre. Bill Warrender served in this House for 11 years, most of them as a Minister of the government. He is a courteous gentleman and I wish him well in his new career on the bench.

His departure, of course, does pose a problem for those he leaves behind. There are now three ridings in the province, comprising some 130,000 voters, which are represented in this House by vacant chairs. Within the past year, the government has moved with commendable dispatch to have other vacancies filled when they have occurred. I trust that the judgment of the electorate in those cases will not cause the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) to have a change of heart in this matter. We will expect the present vacancies to be filled without undue delay.

While I am on the subject of by-elections, may I extend a warm welcome to the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). He is a man young in years but full of ability. I feel certain he will serve the people of his riding with energy and devotion.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to those voters who are not represented here, there are many hundreds of thousands who are not adequately represented. Their vote does not carry the weight it should because redistribution of representation is so grossly overdue.

The smallest riding in Ontario has fewer than 15,000 voters. The largest contains more than 120,000. Changes in population patterns have been so radical in recent years that a significant number of new seats in this House must be created. We all know they are needed. We all know the areas in which riding boundaries should be redrawn.

While the need for redistribution exists in many areas throughout the province, it is most critical in Metropolitan Toronto. Ideally, redistribution should be effected in all ridings which are either too small or too large. But perfection is unlikely: it is perhaps too much to hope that even a Royal commission will settle on a definition of riding size that will be applauded unanimously.

But the search for perfection, I suggest, should not be the occasion for any delay in redistributing the ridings in the Toronto metropolitan area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne was, as I have said, much longer than usual. It was a distinguished speech, if one considers only the number of words employed. But there its distinction ended. Like all its predecessors, it contained very little that was said clearly and precisely, and it left a great many things unsaid. This government's Throne speeches are rather like a suit of winter underwear—not very stylish, mind you, but big enough to cover the subject without being too revealing.

This Speech, however, does reveal a good deal about the government. It makes perfectly plain the fact that this government prefers a course of study to a course of action: that its thinking is done for it by committees and not by the Cabinet: and that it has no policy but expediency. This Throne Speech reveals that this government is not leading public opinion, it is being led by it. It is not breaking new ground, it is being broken by its own bureaucracy.

Let me cite some examples. The Throne Speech makes mention of five new advisory bodies, 13 study groups and 15 committees, Royal commissions and select committees.

And what are they doing? Let us look more closely at some of them.

There is a Department of Travel and Publicity which is presumably responsible for promotion of the tourist trade in Ontario. It has been reporting in glowing terms to this House for many years. Now there is a blare of trumpets about a tourist industry subcommittee of The Department of Economics to investigate "all aspects of tourism in Ontario." And we are told that one of its bold new programmes is to conduct "an inventory of manufacturers of souvenirs in the province."

In effect, Mr. Speaker, the government is telling us that its idea of a new way to promote Ontario's tourist industry is to create a subcommittee of The Department of Economics to investigate the responsibilities of The Department of Travel and Publicity and to work with that latter department in compiling a list of manufacturers who make souvenirs.

But the best indication of the way this government approaches a problem is contained in the Throne Speech references on law enforcement. The Speech said: "Proposals for implementing recommendations made in a survey of communication needs among police departments are under review."

For the benefit of those who might have missed this little gem, including the fright-

fully busy people in The Department of the Attorney-General, what this sentence means is simply this:

1. That a survey was made of communication needs among police departments.
2. That recommendations were made as a result of the survey.
3. Then proposals were made for implementing the recommendations.
4. And now the proposals for implementing the recommendations that arose out of the survey are being surveyed.

The Throne Speech talks about the new police commission, and about "consideration being given to the appointment of an advisor of police service". Note, that once again, there is no appointment of an advisor, only consideration of appointment.

But there is not one word about the Royal commission on crime or when it might be expected to report.

The Throne Speech contained references to some 15 committees and commissions—real, promised and imagined. But there was not one reference to the reality of the Royal commission on crime nor to the significance of its work for the people of Ontario.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in considering the Throne Speech, it is important to measure this government as much for what it omitted as for the things it said.

The Liberal Party believes that the vital issues affecting the people of this province are those of full employment and economic growth; of the adjustment of our economy to the challenge of the common market and the movement towards free trade by the United States; of the need for greater co-operation between management and labour; of the need for clear-cut, long-range government policies to help our agricultural industry; of the need for equality of educational opportunity for all the elementary and secondary school pupils of Ontario; of the need for a comprehensive service plan of medical care insurance.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the most important matters facing us as legislators. The Speech from the Throne is vague and half-hearted about the government's policies and programmes in these matters. The reason, I suspect, is that the government has no concrete policies.

This afternoon I intend to set out the position of the Liberal Party on these several matters.

We believe the provincial government has an inescapable responsibility for achieving

and maintaining full employment. The purpose of an economic system is to provide jobs. A Liberal government in Ontario will declare and pursue a policy of full employment to the fullest extent of its constitutional powers.

This will require new initiatives and new departures. We do not intend to stand on the sidelines of a changing social and economic order.

The greatest challenge to full employment, prosperity and job security in Ontario today is the growing and changing pattern in world trade. A great movement towards the integration and liberalization of trade is underway in the North Atlantic area. The creation of the European Common Market, Britain's application for membership in that organization, and the recent passage by the United States' Congress of President Kennedy's far-reaching programme for the negotiation of major tariff reductions, will profoundly affect the export markets for many of Ontario's products and commodities. How we react to these developments will in turn profoundly influence the level of employment and the number of job opportunities in Ontario.

Personally, I cannot escape the conviction that Canada's needs for foreign markets, in the light of the progress towards European economic integration, will propel us into some kind and some degree of free trade arrangement with the United States. I believe that is the way we are heading. Such an arrangement, carefully planned and negotiated step by step over a period of years, would make it possible for Ontario's secondary industry, which can and should be the great creator of jobs, to achieve the economies which come from long production runs and mass markets.

Free trade has long existed between Canada and the United States in the field of agricultural machinery, and has resulted in a flourishing farm machinery industry in Canada and Ontario. I am confident such results could be duplicated in other fields over a long period of time.

In any event, it is clear that we are entering a period in which job security and employment levels can only be maintained and expanded if unprecedented measures are taken by government, industry and labour to cushion the impact and exploit the opportunities which are being created as a result of trade developments abroad.

I know my hon. friends opposite, and particularly the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), believe they have a policy to deal with this situation. The hon. Minister has his economics council, and

his trade crusade, and now his bill to provide for provincial guarantee of private loans to enterprises contributing to Ontario's economic development.

I say to the hon. Minister with the greatest of respect that he is only nibbling at the problem. Salesmanship is important and my hon. friend knows and may very well understand the significance of the Madison Avenue approach. No doubt his sales missions and opportunity exhibitions and trade offices will have an effect, and we, from this side of the House, sincerely hope they do. But if the hon. Minister really believes his own statements and advertising that a domestic "Buy Canadian" campaign can create 60,000 more jobs in Ontario, then he is deluding himself and the people of Ontario.

I say to the hon. Minister that he is fighting the market place. Consumers in Ontario will buy Ontario products only to the extent that they are competitive in price and quality, and it is foolish to expect them to do otherwise. The essence of the problem, and the responsibility of government, is to assist industry to produce products which are competitive.

We in the Liberal Party believe this requires very direct action by government, not the dancing about on the fringes of the problem being practised by my hon. friends opposite.

A Liberal government in Ontario would therefore create a department of northern development to give direct assistance to primary industries. It will cut freight rates on the Ontario Northland Railway and restore the original purpose of the railway as a development road.

It is Liberal policy to assist the industry of the province to reduce costs by tax incentives, depreciation write-offs, and lower rates for hydro-electric power. Under a Liberal government in Ontario, there will be no cause for industry to move to Quebec in order to obtain cheaper power.

A Liberal government would establish an investment and development fund to expand existing industry and to help create new industries to process, as conditions may dictate, many of the raw materials we now export. Such an agency will be part of a policy to encourage the integration of industry where that is indicated by the need for longer production runs and lower per unit costs.

We will be prepared to form Crown corporations and to share with private investment in the establishment of enterprises that will broaden the base of the economy. In this

connection, some \$400 million worth of automobile parts are being imported this year for assembly in Ontario plants. A provincial Crown corporation to manufacture under the aegis of the automobile industry the stampings and other major items involved would, in our view, be amply justified by the number of jobs it would directly create.

If we in Ontario are going to prepare effectively for changes in world trading patterns, and effectively develop full employment and orderly economic growth, we must go far beyond the traditional limits of government action. There is in our province a vast reservoir of dedicated citizens who, I am certain, are willing and anxious to work with government toward these ends. I refer to organized agriculture, to Ontario's unions and to Ontario's management.

Government must have the long-term co-operation and the day-to-day advice of a council of economic advisors, composed of representatives of management, the unions and agriculture. Token representation will not do. Nor must there be limitations of political viewpoint. The council should include the best representatives of these groups, designated by these groups. Government must not only sit with these groups on such a council. Government must give it all the backing, all the facilities it needs and must be prepared to act on its advice, not use it for political window-dressing.

It should be the responsibility of such a council of economic advisors to study all current economic trends and project their findings into the controllable future. It must study the impact of the European Common Market and United States' trade decisions. It must survey Ontario's manpower, keep a constant inventory of the skills and abilities available or needed; it must foresee as far as possible the impact of automation and set down what is needed in job training, retraining and community readjustment. It must be in a position to recommend where investment should be encouraged, to recommend where wasteful duplication can be replaced by sensible integration, where community and transportation development is needed to assist economic progress.

In short it must not be a remote commission, assigned to study a limited area and expected only to provide attractive reports doomed to be filed away and forgotten. It must operate both on a long-term and on a day-by-day basis.

The council of economic advisors must be far more than a mere advisor to and liaison with government. It must be composed of

the kind of people and given the kind of backing which will enable its advice and aid to be welcomed by organized agriculture, welcomed by management and welcomed by the unions of Ontario. Agriculture needs to know the shape of the future, needs to be able to plan its future within that larger framework. Both Ontario management and Ontario's union members need to know where the best investment opportunities exist now and will exist, where employment will rise and fall and what skills we need and what skills must be replaced. Both need intelligent guidance in deciding what is the healthiest relationship between costs, wages, prices, earnings and profits.

It will be pointed out that the formation of a council of economic advisors for Ontario alone, or in any province alone, cannot begin to resolve all of our problems as long as similar action is not taken on a national scale by a federal government. But, as Canada's major industrial province, we cannot afford to wait. We must go ahead now, making it clear that, should Ottawa act, our council of economic advisors will gladly and enthusiastically co-operate with any national body.

Of equal importance—and this does not require any wait for federal action—is the depth to which we develop economic co-operation and liaison down into the grass-roots of Ontario. For that reason government should, in concert with the council, establish within each industrial and occupational area labour-management councils, each of which should enjoy the same government representation and backing as that enjoyed by the overall council of economic advisors.

Here, within each of our industries and occupation areas, can be seen our greatest failure to use intelligently the human resources at our disposal. We continue to assume, for example, that unions are simply a product of employee dissatisfaction. We assume that union-management relations must be a continual, unco-ordinated tug of war, that their dialogue must be restricted to wrangles over wages, hours of work and working conditions which, we hope, will not result in a strike.

Of course there are legitimate differences between unions and management. But there is a much wider area where there can be co-operation. If we are to effectively discourage the non-co-operation, the sensible way is to encourage the co-operation. There can be an honest difference of opinion over whether company earnings should go to an improved pension for employees or be invested in new equipment. But that difference

becomes academic if both sides are in possession of the same set of facts and those facts show that the company may be wiped out or will fail to grow because it is caught in the squeeze between the European Common Market or a growing U.S. trade area.

Too many people have missed the fact that when employees organize into a union, they are actually declaring a willingness to take part in the direction of their own economic and social present and future. We have somehow missed the fact that every collective agreement is visible proof that union members and management are prepared to compromise and co-operate for designated periods rather than conducting a continuous class war.

The role of management-union councils in each industry and occupational area can therefore be twofold. First, they must carry on within the industry and occupational area the detail of those tasks which I have described as the overall duty of the council of economic advisors. Secondly, they must consciously accept a greater responsibility in the development of management-union relations within their own industry and occupational area.

Our present labour relations board, the corps of dedicated full-time and part-time conciliators who serve in the field of mediation and the corps of inspectors who must enforce our industrial relations laws have performed a tremendous and frequently thankless role over the years. I suspect they would be the first to agree that the time has come, Mr. Speaker, after years of government responsibility alone, for Ontario management and Ontario unions to accept a greater responsibility for their own self-government.

May it not be possibly true that, at present, our laws are actually keeping management and unions at arm's length, freezing them in the posture of class mistrust which might have been valid years ago but must now become outdated? Are we not wasting needed abilities and valuable time in wasteful duplication of negotiations, conciliation and arbitration which could be streamlined and replaced by common-sense standardization and by a sense of mutual control over the development of each industry and the total economic life of the province which contains that industry?

There is no doubt that such self-government by experienced management and experienced unions will result in a wider use of the collective bargaining method by more employers and more employees. But this is

needed. We cannot have co-operation in the public interest between employers who are not prepared to work co-operatively with other employers, or between employees who are not capable of working co-operatively with other employees. Where collective bargaining is practised now, there are far, far more agreements than disagreements. If we are to progress in the years ahead, we must encourage those agreements not only over a wider area of mutual responsibility but over the widest possible area of employers and employees.

Management, unions, agriculturalists—all of us must co-operate in the public interest in this province and in this nation if it is to grow and prosper in the years ahead, if indeed we are to survive in a world of giant trading pacts where such co-operation is the growing characteristic. It is the task of government to bring those who influence our economy together and to charge them with the task of self-government and self-development in the larger public interest, reminding them that the only alternative must be the wider extension of government power.

I am convinced that management, labour, and agriculture in Ontario are ready to accept that challenge if it is made in good faith and if government demonstrates it will back it up. There have been in recent months a number of indications that the stage is set for action. I refer hon. members to the unanimous report of the labour-management mission of the National Productivity Council, which reported favourably on the procedures for industrial co-operation which have been successfully employed in many of the nations of western Europe.

The government of Nova Scotia, acting on a similar investigation and report by Judge A. A. McKinnon, recently convened a labour-management conference which produced a very significant agreement on the principles governing future industrial relations in that province. Such prominent Ontario industrialists as Mr. R. V. Yohe, president of B. F. Goodrich of Canada Limited, have urged management to respond positively to offers of co-operation from organized labour.

In this connection, I would like to make a suggestion. Unions are essentially associations of employees, and they are organized locally, provincially and nationally on an occupational and industry-wide basis. There is no comparable organization of employers. Management groups tend to be organizations for public relations, designed to deal with government and the public at large rather

than with employees and their unions. There is, as a result, no person or group of persons authorized to speak for management as a whole in its function of employer.

I suggest, therefore, that the owners and operators of industry consider the formation of an association of employers authorized to speak for management as a whole, and empowered to consult with government and labour to negotiate master agreements governing the economic ground rules of our society.

Mr. Speaker, thus far I have been discussing what may be called the long-range aspects of labour-management relations. There are a number of more immediate problems which require attention if the proper climate is to be established for the growth of industrial co-operation on the grand scale.

The Speech from the Throne announced that the portable pensions bill will at long last be submitted to the House for approval. We, on this side, have long supported such legislation and we expect to be able to vote for the bill after we get a look at it.

Once again, however, it was a great disappointment to hear that the government is still assessing the need for minimum wage legislation for male workers. The need, of course, is obvious enough and has been obvious for years. The only conclusion possible is that the Conservative Party is opposed to minimum wages but is not prepared to say so. Accordingly, I am again introducing a private bill to establish a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour for men in the metropolitan areas of Ontario, and I again express the hope—no doubt, a vain one—that my hon. friends opposite will permit it to come to a vote.

The Speech from the Throne contained a vague reference, Mr. Speaker, to amendments to The Labor Relations Act. We do not, of course, know what the government has in mind but I can assure the hon. Prime Minister that we, on this side of the House, will support any and all measures designed to strengthen collective bargaining, and speed up certification and conciliation procedures. In this regard, we welcome the announcement that legislation will be forthcoming to establish a joint council and an arbitration board to permit collective bargaining for the civil service.

The Liberal Party also believes that new legislation is needed to protect the right of workers to return to their jobs after they have legally gone on strike and the strike has been settled. Employers, of course, must have the

right to hire other workers when their employees go on strike. But we must also recognize that employees have a vested interest in their jobs which they are defending—not surrendering—when they go on strike. The idea that employees are out to destroy their employer really does not make much sense.

There is a growing appreciation, Mr. Speaker, that strikes are an antiquated and ineffective method for settling labour disputes, and usually result from a breakdown in the collective bargaining process. The great majority of employers accept and welcome collective bargaining as being good for business. Unfortunately, however, there are still some employers, especially in the service trades and in the field of unskilled labour, who remain unreconciled to it. In such cases, the process of collective bargaining means little. The employer is inclined simply to go through the motions of collective bargaining, knowing that if a strike occurs, he can break the union by hiring a new work force to replace the strikers.

We in the Liberal Party believe this to be destructive of the principle of collective bargaining and antagonistic to the spirit if not the letter of The Labour Relations Act. We believe that the law should be amended to require that in the settlement of a legal strike, the strikers must be rehired on the basis of priority over workers hired while the strike was in process.

We believe that such an amendment would greatly strengthen the collective bargaining process and thereby encourage the evolution of labour-management co-operation wherein strikes will be considered unnecessary and almost a thing of the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I refer to the agricultural industry. Let me say at once that I agree with the government's decision to ensure the inspection of all meat and poultry produced and sold in Ontario. It is a measure which is long overdue as was shown by ugly disclosures last year about the disposal of dead animals.

I am looking forward, as well, to the legislation which the Throne Speech promises, for the establishment of a producers, processors and consumers food council. There is too little amplification of the structure and purpose of this council in the Speech to warrant comment now.

It is also encouraging to hear that farm incomes in Ontario are rising. Over the past few years farm income in Ontario has been declining steadily and the gap widening between farmers and other groups in the

economy. The basic plight of Ontario farmers, however, remains the same. Mechanization and new techniques are producing an abundance of goods. The cost of machines and equipment continues to rise while the surpluses of goods produced continues to depress prices.

In order to finance higher costs farmers find it necessary either to increase the size of their holdings or to specialize in one or two products. It costs money to buy land and to reorganize a mixed farming operation on specialized lines. Therefore, one of the biggest needs of Ontario farmers is greater access to credit on easier terms. They need credit to expand their holdings, to buy machinery and to operate their farms.

The government has taken a step in the direction of making credit available by reinstating the junior farmer establishment loan. But why did they limit it to junior farmers? Why does the government set an age limit on the extension of credit? Farmers of all ages need assistance and the age limit should be removed.

One of the most serious handicaps facing Ontario farmers these days is inadequate leadership from The Department of Agriculture. Ten years ago marketing boards were established in Ontario to regulate production and marketing. The government unfortunately has not backed up the marketing boards in times of stress.

Let us take the current plight of the milk industry. One year ago the hon. Minister of Agriculture told the milk industry to get together or there would be chaos. Well, the industry was unable to get together and there is chaos. The government appointed a committee a year ago and neglected to include the distributors on it. The hon. Minister then said to the committee: You come up with a plan and we will back you up. Surely a Minister has a responsibility to do more than stand on the sidelines and lead the cheering section. He should have been actively participating in the devising of a plan that would work.

What is lacking for the success of producer marketing boards in Ontario are clear-cut, long-range government policies for agriculture. We had a perfect example of government bungling in the milk marketing scheme in Ontario only a few weeks ago. I am referring to the price increase for fluid milk approved by the milk marketing board to take effect November 1. The milk marketing board is appointed by this government. The formula it uses in establishing prices for fluid milk is this government's formula. Using this

formula it approved a price increase. Then on October 31, the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Agriculture declared a moratorium on the increase. Why did the government wait until the last minute to intervene?

J. M. Hartwick, president of the National Dairy Council, speaking to the annual convention of the Ontario Milk Distributors' Association on November 14 had this to say about the government's action:

The other example of political expediency in the administration of dairy policy which I had in mind was the recent "last minute" intervention by the Ontario government in declaring a so-called "moratorium" on increases in fluid milk prices directly resulting from the application of its own price formula legislation. I am not qualified, nor do I intend, to argue whether there should or should not be an increase in milk prices to producers or consumers. I am merely suggesting that failure to determine government policy well in advance of the announced increases represents the type of costly confusion which, in my opinion, is absolutely intolerable for an industry of this stature.

I continue to quote Mr. Hartwick:

I cannot help but observe that if the recognition which the stature of the processing industry deserves had been accorded, and consultations, other than of a unilateral nature, had been held, many unfair and embarrassing situations would have been avoided. I find it almost impossible to comprehend the reasoning which has all too often resulted in decisions and actions being taken without consultations with processors. It should now be apparent that mere lip service is not adequate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is chaos in the milk industry and the government is only paying lip service to the problem. It is not showing leadership.

There is also chaos in the tobacco industry. Sales have stopped. The farmers are worried. The government's answer is to appoint a committee of inquiry. The tough decisions in the tobacco industry are control of acreage and growing practices and the government is not prepared to face either one.

Is it any wonder that the marketing schemes which seemed to hold such promise a few years ago are now losing the confidence of Ontario farmers? Within the past year marketing plans for corn and for onions have been turned down. The farmers are losing

faith in a procedure that can be to their benefit because this government is not facing up to the need for leadership.

Vertical integration is another challenge to the farmers of Ontario that this government refuses to face. The processors are renting land for primary production and buying up competing canneries and closing them down. In this way they are reducing competition and exerting ever-increasing power over the price of basic commodities. Farmers who once had markets are being shut out. As a result they are being driven into new lines of production. Shifting from one line of production to another is costly and risky because increasing production of any product starts the cycle of surpluses and depressed prices and aggravates marketing.

For example, five years ago, in the counties of Brant, Wentworth, Norfolk and Oxford there were hundreds of farmers growing peas for the canning industry. Today not one of them is in the business of growing peas. Dozens of them went into the dairy business and because of the surplus of fluid milk some of them are shifting into beef.

Mr. Speaker, if the family farm is to survive the government is going to have to do something about saving it. One of the things it should do is to sit down with the vertical integrators and get them to agree to get out of primary production. If necessary, vertical integration should be stopped on rented land. If vertical integrators want to buy land and tie up capital in primary production as the farmers must do, then I say good luck to them. But this business of coming and going on rented land should stop or else the family farm is going to be a thing of the past in Ontario.

Let us look now, Mr. Speaker, at the question of medical care insurance. What is the government's position on this vital subject? It is hard to know because the government has not been very clear in stating its position.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What is the position of the hon. leader of the Opposition? That is the more important thing.

Mr. Wintermeyer: That is the quiet man to my left.

Last October—and now, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the government's position for a moment. In deference to the hon. member, I assure him that in due course I will take up our position, so let him just relax and wait.

Last October, in a 200-page brief to the Royal Commission on Health Insurance, the hon. Prime Minister said his government had

made no decision for or against a medical care insurance plan, and I quote:

We do not agree that it is the responsibility of the government to provide for the people all necessary services even though these services are the right of all. While the individual has the right, it should be recognized that he also has the responsibility to provide for himself and for his own.

Now what that means, Mr. Speaker, is so ambiguous that one Toronto newspaper said the government opposed medical care insurance, a friendly newspaper said the government was keeping the door open on the subject and Canadian Press said the government was on the fence in this matter.

On November 17, 1962, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* carried an article stating that:

Premier Robarts and Health Minister Matthew Dymond confirmed that the government has been consulting the Ontario Medical Association, insurance firms, economists and consumer organizations on medical care insurance. But Dr. Dymond noted that these meetings began 3.5 years ago at the direction of former Premier Leslie Frost.

"It has been an examination of all sides of the problem," said Mr. Robarts. "What we are trying to do is to get opinions from people who have opinions on this matter. These have been information-seeking consultations."

The report went on to say:

Right now, the government still has no medical care insurance policy.

This was confirmed last night by Dr. Dymond.

Now the Speech from the Throne states that the government endorses the principles of medical health insurance. And what does the government intend to do about implementing the principle it says it supports? It says it is going to appoint a committee "to examine the legislation and to receive representations from all interested parties before the provisions of the bill are brought into effect." It is also going to examine any recommendations which might be contained in the report of the Royal Commission on Health Services before giving any consideration to the benefits to be contained in an Ontario plan.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health is on record as saying that consultations and conferences and information-seeking has been going on in a serious way for 3.5 years.

What the government proposes is not a plan of medical care insurance but another round of talks, consultations, committees, reports, proposals, recommendations, to be followed inevitably by committees to study proposals to implement the recommendations arising out of studies. This is simply not good enough. The government says it supports the principle of medical care insurance. Then let them tell us clearly and precisely just what it is they support.

Mr. Speaker, there are many kinds of plans in existence but essentially there are only two plans—a service plan and an indemnity plan. An indemnity plan is a contract involving two parties—the individual paying the premium and the insurance company. The doctors are not part of such a plan. The doctor may bill any amount and the patient is responsible to the doctor for the amount in excess of the insurance coverage.

A service plan is a contract involving three parties—the person paying the premium, the insurance agency and the doctors. Physicians' Services Incorporated, or PSI, is the leading example in Ontario of a service-type plan. In a service plan the doctors and the insurance agency agree on a schedule of fees that shall be paid to the doctor for his services. The doctor participating in the plan agrees to accept payment from the agency as full payment for services rendered. The patient is fully covered for doctors' services and there are no extra charges.

The Liberal Party of Ontario believes that a service plan is preferable to an indemnity plan. I am convinced that in five years any plan whatsoever introduced in this province by any party will ultimately become a service-type plan because it offers maximum coverage to the individual without extra charges and because it is the most efficient plan to administer.

Mr. Speaker, all parties in Ontario have now declared themselves in favour of a pre-paid medical care insurance programme. The questions that remain are what kind of a programme do the various parties support and how do they intend to implement them.

The Liberal Party in Ontario supports the establishment of a comprehensive service plan, as I said a moment ago, for all the people of Ontario. We believe that every resident of Ontario, regardless of ability to pay, is entitled to medical care as a right. We believe in a PSI-type of service plan in which the patient receives complete coverage without extra charges. Such health insurance in our view is a matter of right. We do not

believe in a means test, as the government apparently does.

We believe in the autonomy of the medical profession. We believe that doctors should have the right to choose their patients and patients the right to choose their doctors. The doctors must be free to practise in or out of the plan. We believe the doctors should determine the standards of medical practice. We believe that doctors should continue to set their fees and that they should be paid on a fee-for-service basis.

I think it most unfortunate that the implementation of a health care plan in Saskatchewan has given a bad odour to the word medicare. The actions of the government of Saskatchewan during the past two years have left the impression that a health care programme can only be achieved by ramming it down the doctors' throats. Perhaps that is the way a socialist government approaches problems of this nature. Doctors are a responsible, respected group in our society. Their lives are devoted to serving their fellow men. I am completely confident that an amicable and satisfactory agreement can be reached by a Liberal government with the doctors of Ontario.

I have said that I believe doctors should have wide latitude in setting their fees in any medical care insurance plan. Naturally, this cannot be an unlimited freedom. They have already reached agreement and exercised restraint regarding fees in the PSI plan. There is no reason to believe they will be less responsible in a broader plan.

The problem of fees, Mr. Speaker, basically is one of the nature and control of the fee-setting mechanism. I recognize, as I am sure everyone does, that in any scheme supported by public money there must be an element of public control. And in the matter of fees there must be an element of public control. In the event of a dispute about fees, a Liberal government would be quite prepared to submit such a dispute to an impartial board of arbitration.

The people of Ontario are paying for the cost of medical services in one way or another now. A public plan covering everyone is the cheapest way to pay this cost. A province-wide plan would pool individual risks and banish financial catastrophe of serious illness for individuals and for families.

A Liberal government would introduce a service-type medical care insurance plan with the following features:

1. All residents of Ontario, regardless of age, state of health, or ability to pay will be eligible for benefits.

2. Comprehensive coverage will include the services of all general practitioners and specialists for service rendered in the patient's home, in the doctor's office or in hospital.

3. Patients will be free to choose their doctor and doctors will be free to choose their patients.

4. Doctors will be free to practise in or out of the plan.

5. The plan will be administered by a medical care insurance commission that will include representatives of government and the medical profession.

6. The plan will be financed by a combination of personal premiums and a special medical care insurance tax.

7. The scheme will be self-supporting financially.

8. Prescription drugs will be supplied without charge to old age pensioners and to all persons in receipt of welfare and disability allowances.

Mr. Speaker, we would implement such a plan following consultation and negotiation with the medical profession. We believe that the plan which we have outlined should be available to all Canadians. But, in the absence of a national plan a Liberal government in Ontario would implement the plan which I have outlined. I am confident that no private plan with a comparable coverage can be provided for anything like the cost of our plan. Our plan will provide medical insurance in an orderly, efficient and economic way.

I challenge the government to state its case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the matter of education. This is the most important responsibility of provincial government. Of all our resources, none is more precious than our young people. Of all our responsibilities, none is more important to the future progress of this province than the education we provide and the opportunity for education that we make available for our young people.

I hope that you do not consider that I speak idle words. On many occasions in this House I have pleaded for the cause of education. I have asked, for example, for a long-term policy in respect to university education. I have criticized the day-to-day programme of this government in respect to university development. I have fought for more grants and scholarships. I have predicted that our physical plant would be outstripped by the young people ready and qualified to enter university.

I believe that the government has been lax and has shirked its responsibility to develop an overall programme for university education that will demonstrate where university expansion will take place; that will provide grants for construction and maintenance so that they, the universities, can plan ahead; and that will make financial assistance available to young people so that they can plan their careers during their high school years in the certain knowledge that if they graduate from Grade 13 they will be assured entrance to university.

That is not the case today. Many young people who have passed the required examinations in Grade 13 find themselves denied admission to university because facilities are insufficient. As a result of lack of facilities, university standards have been raised to admit only those youngsters who have graduated with high honours.

I have on other occasions contended in this House that we must develop a programme of teacher training and qualification that will assure an adequate supply of qualified teachers for all the publicly-supported school system. I have criticized this government for its failure to explore the potential of television. Furthermore, I have advocated the introduction of French into the elementary school curriculum.

These things are now under study. I regret to say that too many things are under study by this government. Political expediency has made a fetish out of referring controversial problems to study groups and to experts. The job of government is to provide leadership. The progress of the government and the people are dependent on the conviction, the courage, and the fortitude of men in responsibility. The people of Ontario have elected this government to lead the people of Ontario for the time being. They expect those in charge to lead. The people do not expect or intend that that responsibility be delegated unnecessarily to study groups.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to return to another aspect of the overall educational problem about which much has been said in this House in years gone by. And that problem, Mr. Speaker, is the financial structure of our educational system. Year by year, complaints have been made that the financial structure of education in Ontario is breaking down for many reasons. Among these reasons are, firstly, the fact that property and land and buildings which form the basis of municipal assessment for education are not an entirely adequate or equitable basis on which to found the cost of education. Accordingly,

municipal taxation and levies upon lands and buildings have soared.

Secondly, the rural areas of the province have complained repeatedly that educational costs at the local level are an unfair burden to the farmer who is charged with a levy for education on his agricultural lands as well as on his residence.

Thirdly, the municipalities have complained that increased costs of education cannot continue to be absorbed at the local level beyond their current appropriations.

Fourthly, complaints have been made that the tax-supported separate school system has been dangerously weakened by inadequate financing.

These complaints, Mr. Speaker, cannot be brushed aside. These complaints are being made to government genuinely and with conviction. It is not said that because these complaints are made that the solution to the problem of financing education is easy or obvious. Indeed, it is not. However, education is the responsibility of the provincial government. This responsibility is identified in our constitution, in our history and in our convictions, and, therefore, we in this Legislature must make our answer individually and collectively to the people of Ontario. I do not say that those who have preceded us in this Legislature have always accepted the responsibility that I have outlined today but I do say that we at this time in this Legislature cannot avoid the responsibility that is ours.

A high standard of education is desirable for all the elementary and secondary school pupils in Ontario. Every child is entitled to equality of opportunity in obtaining an education, in our tax-supported school system. We in the Liberal Party, have determined upon a programme to finance the publicly-supported educational system in Ontario in a particular way. Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline the Liberal programme in this respect.

We, in the Liberal Party, have determined that the cost of providing equality of opportunity for education should be borne equitably by the tax-payers and the ratepayers of the province. Accordingly the Liberal Party has committed itself to the proposition that a basic, uniform education levy should be charged on all land and property in the province and that that revenue should be payable to the local school boards. In order to assure each school board in the province that sufficient funds will be made available to provide a uniform, high standard of education, the province will be responsible for the difference between the local uniform levy

and the amount that is required to provide a reasonable, high, uniform quality of education.

This will assure that every child in the tax-supported school system in Ontario will have a basic high quality of education regardless of where the child lives or school the child attends; regardless of whether the child is in a rural area or in an urban or metropolitan area; regardless of whether the child attends a public school or a separate school.

This commitment will translate into action the ideal of equality of education. This commitment will acknowledge the responsibility of the provincial government to provide the funds that are necessary to every school board in the province to exercise its responsibility and to provide a predetermined high standard of education.

The programme that I have outlined has been tried in many other jurisdictions in North America. It was founded in New York State, and is now being used in the provinces of Alberta and Nova Scotia. The system I have outlined is commonly known as the foundation programme. It is so named because it assures to each pupil that amount of money that the government determines is necessary to provide the foundation or high high standard of education determined by the government.

The foundation programme was recommended last year by the Ontario Conference on Education. A similar plan was recommended by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture last July.

I do not intend today, Mr. Speaker, to examine the foundation programme in all its ramifications and detail but I wish to take the opportunity to highlight some of its significant factors. You will note at once that the programme provides equality of educational opportunity for all children. The programme provides for a uniform, equitable local levy on equalized assessment with the revenue so raised to be paid to the local school board. This will assure local autonomy, local interest, and local responsibility in the financing of our educational system.

Secondly, you will note the system assures that the inequalities and shortcomings and weaknesses of our present method of financing education, as outlined at the beginning of this discussion on education, are overcome. It will provide an adequate and equal number of dollars for every child everywhere in the province, having regard only to regional economic factors, so that the same high quality of teaching and the same high quality of schools and curriculum are available everywhere in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the hon. members of this House, that we acknowledge the historical and constitutional and legal responsibility of this Legislature to provide all students and pupils in Ontario with the financial resources that are necessary to translate our responsibility into action and to give substance to the principle of equality of educational opportunity.

The foundation programme to which the Liberal Party in Ontario is committed will provide equality of educational opportunity for all elementary and secondary school pupils in the presently constituted provincial system. If our party controls the next Legislature, Mr. Speaker, it will not extend the separate school system beyond its present level, nor will it establish a separate teachers' college.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the motion for an address in reply to the speech of The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, now before the House, be amended by adding thereto the following words:

But this House:

1. Regrets that the government has failed to enunciate a positive programme of tax adjustments and incentives for industry that will enable industry to meet the challenges being posed by the common market and The United States Trade Expansion Act.

2. Regrets that the government has failed to strengthen job security for Ontario's working people by: (a) establishing a minimum wage for men of \$1.25 per hour, (b) promoting the collective bargaining process, and (c) protecting, in legislation, the vested interests in their jobs of workers engaged in a legal strike.

3. Regrets that the government has neglected to strengthen the competitive position of Ontario industry by failing to encourage management-labour co-operation through management-labour councils.

4. Regrets the chaos inflicted on Ontario farmers in the marketing of their products as a consequence of the government's lack of clear-cut, long-range farm policies and the failure of the government to check vertical integration and the threat it poses to the continued existence of the family farm.

5. Regrets the failure of the government to introduce a comprehensive pre-paid, service plan of medical care insurance, without a means test, for all the people of Ontario.

6. Regrets the failure of the government to make available, through fair and equitable financing, equality of educational opportunity for all pupils in Ontario's tax-supported school system.

Mr. Speaker: The members have heard the amendment, and the amendment is now open for discussion.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) commences his remarks, I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) indicated he was willing to entertain a question at the conclusion of his remarks. I wonder if I might be permitted to ask that question.

I would like to ask with regard to his reference to a medical care insurance tax, which I believe is the term he used, if he has in mind an addition to the provincial sales tax and, if so, what rate of sales tax he proposes.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, I discussed this in a very serious way. I assure the hon. member that this matter is under discussion and in due course, and at the proper time, I will enunciate exactly the matter.

Mr. Bryden: There is an evasive answer!

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I am delighted to hear that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) believes in a little consideration of something once in a while. After his address I really did not think he believed that anybody should consider anything, and that any arrangements made for—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Where does the hon. Prime Minister stand on teachers' colleges? Where does he stand on high schools?

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Where does he stand, period?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I stand, Mr. Speaker, where I propose to stand for some years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to pay the traditional compliments to you in entering this debate and say to you how delighted I am to be back in the House and to be discussing the issues of the day, and how I have the utmost confidence that you will discharge your duties, sir, as you have in the past, with fairness to all in the House.

I would like to extend my compliments too

to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney) on his appointment as Deputy Speaker. I can assure him that, at least from this side of the House, he will receive every consideration when we enter discussions and the House is in committee of the whole.

May I also extend to the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris) my congratulations on the very fine address that he delivered in opening this debate, and to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) on his contribution as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before going into some other parts of my address I would like to take this opportunity of offering my congratulations to the hon. leader of the Opposition. I understand that today is his birthday. Last Friday we made a few remarks about the birthday of the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume), and I am delighted to wish the hon. leader of the Opposition many, many happy returns of today.

There is an old saying, Mr. Speaker, that one should never mention a rope in the house of a man who has hanged, but somehow I gather that the hon. leader of the Opposition does not feel that these words have any relevance for him or his hon. colleagues on the other side of the House, because we have this amazing spectacle of a constant quest on his part for an election.

I have here a quotation from one of his supporters that I think puts the matter very well. This was the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), not speaking perhaps as a member here but as president of the Ontario Liberal Association. He said, and I am quoting from the *Toronto Telegram*:

Liberals are obsessed with unseating the government, Robert Nixon, president of the Ontario Liberal Association, admitted today.

I would point out to my hon. friends that this obsession in my opinion clouds their eyes to history and also clouds their judgment in no uncertain fashion. I would point out that after the election in 1943, just to point history out to them, the Opposition had less than 20 or so members in this House and today, about 20 years later, there are not many more. During that time there have been six general elections and they have been pretty decisively rejected by the people of this province in every one of those elections.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members of the Opposition could restrain

themselves to the point where one would speak at a time, I might have some opportunity to hear what they have said. Perhaps they really do not care whether I hear what they have to say, but when they all speak at once I do not hear any of them. Probably that is not a bad position to be in!

In addition to these general elections, Mr. Speaker, there have been 30 by-elections in this period, and the party opposite lost 26 of them.

Now, in all modesty, Mr. Speaker, we have done a little better than that on this side of the House. After the 1943 election we had 38 seats in the House; today, just about 20 years later, we have just short of twice that number. We won 6 general elections and we have won 18, of course, out of the 20 by-elections since 1943.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): When is the hon. Prime Minister going to try for 7?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, in due course, in due course. But I am very interested in the great anxiety of the official Opposition for this election.

We look at the New Democratic Party and after 1943 they had 34 members in the House, and then that was reduced to eight. Then they came up a bit and then dropped back to two. I believe they had two or three when I came in this House in 1951. Now they have five, or they have 29 fewer seats than they had 20 years ago. Of course, they have had no success in any of the by-elections since then.

I wonder, in the light of this record and in the light of some other comments I will make, why the hon. leader of the Opposition is really so very anxious to go to the country. I wonder whether he stops to consider why he has been rejected, and his party has been rejected, in the fashion it has over these years and in these elections.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Why does the hon. Prime Minister think we are asking for it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will tell the hon. leader of the Opposition why I think so. I think that if he looks at the period from 1934 to 1943 in the history of Ontario, that was a period of decline and it is so recognized.

But if one looks at 1943 to 1962 we will find that in this period—and nobody can deny this, hon. members merely have to walk out their doors, go into their own communities, they all know it—from 1943 to 1962 we have

a period, while this party has been in power, of unparalleled economic development. We have had massive industrial expansion, we have social advancement and cultural growth as we have never had in any other period in the history of this province. There are many men, Mr. Speaker, who have taken part in all these cultural, economic and industrial advancements who are sitting in this House today.

So therefore, it is the difference between one decade of economic and social stagnation and two decades of great growth in our province.

Mr. Speaker, we are debating the Speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. I am sure that Speech makes clear that the government which I have the great privilege of heading today is not prepared in any way to trade upon those massive, glorious and magnificent achievements of the past. Our concern here today is not with the achievements of the past. We are concerned primarily with the problems of today and the attainments of the goals that lie ahead of us. I think this is made abundantly clear by the legislative programme that was placed before the House, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne. In order to point out to hon. members that this is not necessarily only my opinion, I can quote from the St. Catharines paper of November 28:

Orderly but dynamic change to meet the changing times was the keynote of the Speech from the Throne in the Ontario Legislature.

The Windsor *Star* says:

The Speech from the Throne at Queen's Park yesterday certainly was a pre-election one.

Well, that is their opinion.

It proves the Robarts government is going all out to win.

That is also my opinion.

It is vague in many of its proposals as such speeches usually are. It is, however, a forward-looking document with many constructive ideas. If or when they are all implemented this will be a better province.

Just one more paragraph.

Premier Robarts has demonstrated he is not heading a caretaker government, he does not believe in standing back, he and his colleagues have ideas about Ontario and its progress. He intends to keep Ontario in the vanguard of Canadian affairs.

Now I just wanted to read this to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that these ideas I

am expressing are not merely my own, these are quotations from very reputable papers.

Here is another one, the Kitchener-Waterloo paper.

In its proposals for an economic development agency, for a portable pension bill, for a draft medical care insurance bill, the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the Ontario Legislature yesterday served notice that the government is aiming at solid legislative achievements in the current session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having heard what some other people think about this programme—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would suggest to the hon. leader of the Opposition that in view of this programme we have put forth and these comments I have read, that he might sort of give up this obsession, as one of his hon. colleagues refers to it—it is a craving from where I sit and what I hear him say—his craving for the election trail.

I suggest to him that he tie up his horse outside and let us roll up our sleeves and get down to business in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, let us get down to business here for the people of the province. Let us get off this blind political partisanship, where all we want to do is play politics, and let us be statesmen and play a little government for a while.

I would remind hon. members that there was an election in 1959. We have almost two years of incomplete work ahead of us. There is a great deal of legislation ready to be introduced. Some of it has been brought into this House and a good deal more is forecast in the Speech from the Throne and by the time the present legislation that is before hon. members has been digested, there will be much more in front of this House.

I could review the Speech from the Throne; I could mention a few of the things we have to be debated—medical health insurance, Ontario development agency, junior farmer establishment loans Act, minimum wages, fair wages, government contracts, portable pensions, assistance for retarded children, amendments to assist the civil service in the duty there performed, Ontario council for the arts, a shoreline of parks acquisition programme, survey of all the marine resources of our province, agriculture rehabilitation and development Act, meat inspection, food council, physical fitness, assistance to municipal roads, commuter service studies.

I just point out a few of the things that are mentioned in this Speech in order that hon. members opposite can realize just what they are doing when they ask for an immediate adjournment to have an election.

I was quite surprised, I must admit, that the hon. leader of the Opposition took the attitude he did on the opening day when he had an opportunity to hear this Speech. I arranged for him to have a copy of it long before the Speech was delivered in this House, of course. But as I read the press all he could say was that this very comprehensive programme which is for the benefit of the people of this province, is the final proof that this government should be turned out of office.

Perhaps he is right, perhaps all these gentlemen I have quoted are wrong. But it does seem to me that the people of this province are entitled to have this government run its course, that they are entitled to see these far-reaching proposals debated in this House and not to have a document such as this, which is of such importance to everyone in the province, treated in such a cavalier fashion, as if it contained nothing and as if it was nothing for the people of this province.

I can only assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is our intent on this side of the House to introduce all the legislation which is forecast in the Speech from the Throne. We would hope that my hon. friend will cease politicking. He has had a wonderful afternoon this afternoon, and he has told us we are really not too able to do anything. Perhaps after this we can get down to business and start enacting some legislation which will be of benefit to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I was quite interested in some of the things in his speech. I do not intend to review it in its particulars, but there were some parts that I found very interesting indeed. I like this section here particularly, in which the hon. leader of the Opposition said:

The Liberal Party believes that the vital issues affecting the people of this province are those of full employment and economic growth.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, if I can just find the particular piece of paper I want out of the pile I have here, I would point out that in 1962, since this government has been in power, we have brought in certain policies which were laughed at by all the hon. members across the House. A year ago, when we brought them in, they said: "Oh, here you go," and they tried to tease my hon.

friend on the right and I notice they are still at it. It will not succeed. In any event, I can only point out to hon. members opposite that 1962 has been one of the best years Ontario has ever had.

Our shipments of manufactured goods in 1962 stood at \$9.5 billion, which is 10 per cent higher than the first nine months of 1961. Production of motor vehicles is up 30 per cent in the first ten months of 1962. Our agricultural income is well above the 10-year average.

I am just hitting the highlights, but I want to point out that retail sales are two per cent higher than in 1961. On unemployment: in October seasonally adjusted unemployment in Ontario stood at 3.7 per cent compared to an average in Canada of 6.1 per cent.

Now the overriding role of this government, of course, is economic—the achievement of a satisfactory rate of economic growth—that is what all these plans we have are designed to do. Our rate of economic growth is something over 6 per cent.

I am not going to go into the programme in detail of The Department of Economics and Development, but I am just pointing out to hon. members opposite that when they speak of the Liberal Party believing that the vital issues affecting the people of this province are those of full employment and economic growth; we have achieved as close to full employment as we have come for many years and we certainly are achieving economic growth.

The next thing the hon. leader of the Opposition has to say is in regard to the adjustment of our economy to the common market and the movement towards free trade by the United States.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This government has a programme! Our economic council, which the hon. leader of the Opposition is still deriding today I notice, is part of it. It is working, it is functioning, it is producing results and the results are all around us.

We have a trade crusade, we have manufacturing co-operative agencies, we have extended trade offices abroad, we have established manufacturing opportunities shows—just laugh at it, but we will get the results.

Just to give an idea: in the marketing division, for instance, on manufacturing arrangements, there have been 22 manufacturing arrangements finalized in this department

since the first of April which will involve over \$15 million in new business.

Branch plants, let's take a look at that, if hon. members opposite are interested in full employment and economic growth. We are achieving full employment and economic growth!

This one branch of the department is in touch with over 800 foreign companies. Since the first of April, 1962, 51 foreign companies and 43 Canadian firms have established in Ontario and will be utilizing over one million square feet of plant capacity which will result in some \$7 million worth of business to the construction industry.

These things, I point out, Mr. Speaker, are the achievements, they are not promises. These are "have done's," not "will do's".

Of course, we are very interested in the adjustment of our economy to the challenge of the common market and the movement towards free trade by the United States. We realize the implications of the European Common Market and the possibility of Britain entering. We also realize the implications of the trade policies which President Kennedy has recently enunciated. We realize, also, Mr. Speaker, that it is impossible for us to control many of the events that are occurring internationally and which are bound to have a very great effect upon our economy, upon our business, upon our trade and upon our commerce.

But we do know this: we do know that it is going to take some time for these arrangements to reach their final form and shape and it will take some time before we know just how they are going to affect our economy in this province. We propose in the time we have, and we may be grateful that we have this time, to ensure that the industry, the commerce, the business in this province is in the best possible shape it can be in to meet the undoubted challenges that lie ahead of us.

We know they are there, but we do not know exactly what form they will take and, as I say, to a large extent, we have no control over them. But we do have control over the atmosphere, the industrial-commercial atmosphere, in our own province and we intend to ensure that when the times of difficulty do come, our industry in this province will be in a competitive position to take its place, as far as it lies within the jurisdiction of the government to make it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned some of our policies here in the legislation before us as far as agriculture is concerned. The hon.

leader of the Opposition has mentioned medicare. This subject will be debated here later on during the session and I do not intend to say anything about it other than to correct one statement he made in his remarks in regard to what is contained in the Speech from the Throne. On page 36 of his speech he says, referring to our proposals:

He is also going to examine any recommendations which might be contained in the report of the Royal Commission on Health Services before giving any consideration to the benefits to be contained in our Ontario plan.

That is not correct, factually that is not correct. If hon. members will look at the Speech from the Throne they will see where it is not correct.

The other thing, of course, is that I do not understand how the hon. leader of the Opposition can have a premium and not have a means test of some kind. These are things which will be debated in due course, but these are things which I do not understand, and I do not intend to go into the particulars of that today.

Mr. Whicher: What about the hospital insurance plan?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course, we do it in the hospital scheme, but we pay it on the basis of a means test. If you cannot pay yourself, the government pays it, and this implies a means test. As far as I am concerned, it must.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think I know what the hon. leader of the Opposition is driving at.

Mr. Speaker, I was of course interested in his comments about union industry councils. We have already done this on this side of the House. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) completed a meeting between labour and management in the fall and they are going to resume in the early spring and we intend to have more because we see the need. And of course, once again, we are doing something about it.

Equality of education! We are always criticized on education, regardless of what we do.

I was interested in the comments about our universities, because in that field we have really come a long way. I can point out to hon. members that we did give aid last year, for instance, to some 9,000 young people in

our universities. Our grants to universities have increased at the rate of about 25 per cent per year in the last three or four years. We have created a new university in Peterborough. In this present year, Laurentian University in Sudbury is functioning very nicely. While there are enormous problems facing us in this field, I cannot agree that we have done nothing.

While we are on the subject of education, I was very interested in a little booklet that came across my desk today—or was it yesterday? There is always the impression, Mr. Speaker, that we do not do anything. This little booklet is entitled: "What Every Parent Should Know About the New Robarts' Plan for Secondary Schools." The fact that this came to me gives me the opportunity to make two comments, the first of which is that I am not particularly happy about having my name attached to this plan and I would take this opportunity of pointing out that this is the product of a great many men's thinking over a long period of time. A great deal of effort was expended upon it by a great many men.

However, this is the way they have chosen to publish it and this is being distributed very broadly by one of the major newspapers in this area. In the covering letter they say the objective of this special education report was to build public understanding, acceptance and support for this revitalized secondary educational programme. It has been said that education in a democracy does not mean the same education for all children, but the best education for each child. It is the right of every child to be prepared to meet the challenge of the technological age in which he lives. In our changing sphere of education, the Robarts' plan is a step to recognizing this need.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, there we are.

This government is always looking ahead, always looking at what lies ahead for our people. Mr. Speaker, I can only say in closing these remarks, I reiterate once again that we intend to implement everything in the Speech from the Throne that is humanly possible and I would ask for the co-operation of the Opposition in getting down to business and going to work for the people of the province.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, after listening to two such inviting speeches, it is only with the greatest of difficulty that I fight off the tendency to accept the invitation immediately. But having fought

it off, I shall leave my comments until tomorrow. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, if it is a matter of procedure I would be quite prepared to permit the hon. member—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, in view of a call I had from the hon. Prime Minister last week in which he asked that I should be prepared to go on tomorrow, I so arranged my schedule to do that. I think under the circumstances, that is as far as I will go today.

Mr. MacDonald moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF ONTARIO

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development) moves second reading of Bill No. 2, An Act to authorize the guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I think if I may I would like to make some explanation of this bill in somewhat more detail than I did on first reading. I think the first thing to do is to state what this bill accomplishes or hopes to accomplish and by what means.

This is a bill which will establish an agency which we are calling a development agency. The development agency will be a part—for the moment at least—of The Department of Economics and Development. The purpose of the agency will be, in cases which meet certain requirements, to offer to guarantee, and in fact to guarantee with the name of the province, a loan or other advance of funds which may be made by a conventional financial institution. In short, this agency will guarantee the advancement and repayment of funds advanced by others rather than actually advancing funds of its own.

Having said that, I would want to point out to the House that the basic concept of this agency is to provide financial assistance to companies and persons in this province who are unable to obtain financing from conventional institutions were it not for the guarantee of the government. These are companies which can demonstrate their ability to make a contribution to Ontario's economic development.

I thought, if I might, I would indicate to the House some of the purposes of this agency.

First, to provide financial assistance through guarantees to selected enterprises in Ontario which are unable to obtain financing through, as I have said, conventional channels.

Second, to provide management, technical and advisory services to these and other enterprises.

Third, to assist in the development of northern Ontario by giving special consideration to requests for financial and managerial assistance to enterprises located or to be located in that area, and to encourage new enterprise to in fact locate in northern Ontario.

Fourth, to provide similar assistance and services to other areas in the province where the level of economic activity is below the level of the rest of the province, such as Windsor and Cornwall.

Fifth, to enable the benefits of research and development programmes conducted at the government's expense to be made available to businesses in Ontario.

Sixth, to assist in every way possible the formation of community development corporations whose major objectives are to foster regional and local industrial development.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to give precedence first to companies and individuals who come forward who intend to establish new types of industry in Ontario; second, to companies and persons who come forward with programmes which will help to bring about the decentralization of industries through the province of Ontario; third, to companies which come forward with new ideas and new techniques; fourth, to companies which come forward with products or programmes which will help our presently active import replacement programme and replace imports; fifth, to those companies or persons manufacturing products which in our opinion will help in our export drive in this province. This latter is but a part of the whole Canadian complex of increasing our exports.

Generally, I think we could describe these activities as activities which these companies would propose to carry on in this province which would in any way broaden and diversify the basis of our economic and industrial activities.

Now I do not want generally, nor is this the occasion, to get into a debate on what our programme is in relation to the Kennedy proposals and E.E.C. and so forth. This we will discuss in this House either during the estimates of this department or on some

other occasion. What we are discussing today is the general principle of the establishment of a bill which creates a development agency in The Department of Economics and Development.

I thought that I might just suggest to the House roughly how we thought this programme would operate.

There will be—let me give, if I may, an example of how this programme would operate. If a company which now exists wants to broaden its programme to take on a new line of business or to extend its operations to compete more adequately in the export market, or to take on a new programme which will help to replace an import which has been coming into this country; then that company or group of persons we anticipate would do everything in their power to arrange their own financial development. That is to say, they could do so through a bond issue, or raising or selling of stock, or by negotiating a loan with a bank or the insurance or mortgage companies, trust companies and so forth. These groups would do everything in their power to arrange their own financing of their new programme.

However, if their programme was not supported by one of these institutions and they were unable to raise the money necessary to carry out this kind of development, then applications would be welcomed by The Department of Economics and Development, either directly from the institutions themselves or from the companies that are seeking financial accommodation. At that stage, the first thing that we contemplate doing is to screen these applications in the department to make sure that these applicants have exhausted the conventional and traditional financial arrangements in this province. Assuming that the company has done this and it is unable to raise the money itself through the conventional institutions or raise it by mortgaging or by financing with bonds and sale of shares; then the next thing we will do is to carefully go over this company's plans and programme to make sure that the problem that the company has is really one of finance and not just of not being able to maintain the kind of financial and technical advice and assistance that it may well need.

If we find that it is a company which needs assistance, managerially or technically, our purpose will be to help this company find this assistance. That is why we are establishing a small business section in the department to handle these things, although these guarantees are by no means limited to small businesses.

If the company's problem is basically one of finance, then it will be our plan to look over the programme of the company to see why it was unable to obtain this financing. If it was because of the inadequacy of the financial market to serve what we believe would be a good cause, which will bring about development in this province, which will give employment, which will help to diversify industry, which will help to bring about development in the north or in other areas where additional development is required, then it will be our intention to go to the institutions with which this company has had dealings and to guarantee the advance of whatever money is needed in order to carry out this development.

This generally, then, Mr. Speaker, is the programme which we have in mind for these companies through this agency. We anticipate in the first instance that the organization advancing the money will likely take whatever security or collateral is available. It will be our job to see that the government and the tax-payers of the province are secured to the extent that is possible.

We are, however, intent upon this fact: that this agency do not develop into an arm of banking, but become an agency of development in the province of Ontario.

The kind of guarantees that it will issue will depend very much upon the circumstances. This is why I said to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) the other day that at this stage I was anxious not to hedge the applicants with a lot of artificial barriers which might make it difficult to obtain assistance at this stage, until we see just the nature of the problems which these companies are having. It may well be that the government should guarantee a part of the loan or a part of a bond or a mortgage repayment, or the whole thing. This, I think, will have to depend on the circumstances at the time, as well as the purpose for which this company wishes to bring about development.

Now I would like to just make two other points if I may. I have discussed this over a period of months with the financial institutions in this province, namely, the banks, the trust companies, the mortgage companies, and whatever other institutions there are, persons who are involved in the brokerage and financial institutions, in raising money in any way to assist companies to expand and develop. I have secured, I believe—in fact I am sure—the co-operation of the financial institutions of this province to this kind of a programme. This is the first programme of this nature that has been tried in Canada,

and as far as I know in the United States, although I am not positive of the latter. But it certainly is in Canada. I am very confident that this is going to do something useful in the field of economic development in this province.

The second and final point that I wanted to make was this: to accompany this bill—I have the intent at the moment—we are now preparing a bill to introduce into the House which will allow regional and local or municipal organizations to incorporate and to raise money by gift or loan or bank accommodation, or whatever other accommodation there may be, in order to bring about regional or local or municipal development in their own area. This has been tried in some instances in the United States and has been quite successful, and I would like to try it here.

We would call these community industrial corporations. These corporations, if they were not satisfied with the financial capacity they had at their own local level, would be able to come forward to the agency which, if their programme fitted the general requisites of the agency's assistance, would then be prepared, where it was the proper thing to do, to guarantee the repayment of whatever accommodation was needed to put the project over the hump. I think in this way we will be pioneering something that will be very important in this province, and in this country for that matter.

I would want to state this matter clearly so that it is understood in the House. This agency will not be borrowing money of its own and lending money directly. This agency will be guaranteeing the repayment of money lent by others to companies or persons who will be organizing or extending their operations in order to bring about development in this province.

This is the first, in fact I would think the only possible problem that can arise, and this is why I was very careful to deal with the financial community itself. First, I think it would be a great mistake for this province, with as much money as it needs to borrow to finance education and the kind of problems that we have to face, to borrow money directly and then lend it ourselves. First of all, I think this is competing generally with the financial institutions. I think it is an unnecessary intrusion of government into the normal free play of the financial market place in this country.

Here are the two protections I offer to the House. First, the care with which this bill was prepared and the long discussions

which were held, not with any club in anybody's hand but openly and I think with much care, to have all of our financial institutions in the province realize that this House is dedicated to bringing about development in this province. I do not limit to this government or to me, I think that this is a general aspiration of everybody in this House. Talking with the heads of all of these companies, and their general managers and so on, took a long time because I think the best of our intentions, the best programme on paper, could have been partially, if not completely, destroyed if we do not have the co-operation of the people who are involved in these things and who are experienced in them.

The protections, my hon. friends, are: one, the care with which we have discussed these things and the assurances we have had from the people who are in these businesses and in these institutions that the funds will be available. The second fact is that if in setting this thing up—I am hoping we can get into business by January 1 or soon after—we find that the assurances we have been given, or the market place does not permit it, then this will be the time for us to come, I think to the House and ask to finance it directly if that has to be done.

I hope it will not have to be done that way, because I frankly do not want to get into the business, with so much money to be borrowed every year for education and hospitalization and perhaps this medical programme. So many things have to be financed partially in this way. If we can use other people's money and other people's techniques and other people's experience and so forth, it seems to me we help to bring the whole community into this programme. I think it is on this basis that it will be most effective.

In any event, those are the two indications that I can give to the hon. gentleman in relation to the question that he asks. I believe after working at this very carefully over a period of time, having looked at programmes which are available in Canada and in the United States, the fact is that in almost every province where they have said they will go out and on a broad basis borrow money and then lend it, they have lent very little. This is partially because of the tremendous burden that this is upon the general tax-payer. If this burden can be spread evenly upon industry, where in the final analysis it seems to me with the prospect of the Kennedy proposal, the prospects of the European Economic Community and so forth, I think the most important thing we have to do is to help our

industries to get onto a footing where they can honestly compete without subsidization and in fields where they can sell the highest quality at the lowest price. It is going to be on that basis that we are going to compete in the world.

Now, this is an aegis through which I think we can help our industries extensively and as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) has said to the House before, if the amount of the guarantees which have been suggested is considered to be inadequate, then we will ask that this be increased.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the second reading of Bill No. 2, I want to say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Macaulay) that I personally certainly appreciate—all of us on this side of the House appreciate—what he has said in regard to the fact that all of us are interested in getting more industry into the province of Ontario. The obvious fact that we must get more is not just confined to the people who are sitting on the government benches; we who are on the Liberal side recognize this great problem.

I want to say at the outset that we agree with the principle of the bill and we certainly agree that something must be done in this great old province of ours and indeed in Canada as a whole. When we consider the fact that \$235 in goods per person is now imported each year in Canada, it is simply too much money.

Therefore, all of us in this House, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, agree that steps must be taken to manufacture more goods in Canada and particularly, as far as we are concerned, in the province of Ontario.

But then we come to another decision that we have to make, the question is how? Before I go into that and speak about the principle of this bill, I want to say that I as an individual have been most impressed by the efforts of the hon. Minister. Up to the present time he has certainly worked hard.

I had the opportunity of being, for example, at the Royal York Hotel when he had goods now imported into the province of Ontario, that he considered could be manufactured here, on display and when he had hundreds of prospective manufacturers go through that building, through the large room down there and look over these articles that he considered could be manufactured here. In other words I want him to know right off the bat that I appreciate the great deal of work that he has done but I have one or two questions that I wish to ask.

Firstly, I would want to know how effective has this plan been at the present time? I have reason to believe that in the past 3 months there have been more goods imported into the province of Ontario than ever before in the history of the province. In other words, when he says that \$235 per person was imported last year, I have read in certain financial papers that this figure has now increased, so in other words in spite of the fact that he may have worked hard, he has not been too effective up to the moment.

I have another question to ask too. How much overlapping is there between his department and The Department of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa? This morning, for example, in the financial section of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, a highly respected publication, we read that the hon. George Hees, Minister of Trade and Commerce, is spending half a million dollars to fly people in from the outside world to look at particularly large machinery that they possibly might buy so that we could export those goods.

Nowhere in his programme, in not one comment of that paper or in other papers, did I see the name of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development for the province of Ontario. In other words, it looked to me as if the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was going his way, and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development was going his way too.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I was astounded in reading the press reports of the large meeting held by the hon. Minister in the Royal York Hotel, no mention whatsoever was made of the fact that we have a Minister of Trade and Commerce in Canada; that he too is trying to the best of his ability to export goods of our own and to have less buying by our own people of foreign goods.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there has been considerable overlapping and I hope that the hon. Minister will get together with his colleague down in Ottawa and attempt to prevent this. I also most respectfully point out that there has been much overlapping of this department in the hon. Minister's own government. For example, we read some months ago when the hon. Minister came back from England, he said that we were not selling nearly as much Ontario food in England, or in Great Britain, as we should be, and in this—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: May I say to my hon. friend, with great respect, could we not deal with these things under my estimates? Or whenever else he likes—in the Speech from the Throne—

An hon. member: The hon. Minister raised this!

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I am perfectly prepared to answer whatever fair criticism is made, but I was trying to give a little bit of background as to why the bill was necessary. I could have simply said nothing about it.

An hon. member: The hon. Minister raised this on page 23 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I am trying to tell this honourable House why I believe this bill should be passed, with some adjustments, and also that there should be a few more things in this bill because I do not think this is enough. I point out that there has been overlapping among the hon. Minister and his federal colleagues, and also there is great overlapping between him and the hon. members of his own government.

Without going into great detail, because I agree with my hon. friend that perhaps we should bring some of these things up during his estimates, I suggest that it is common knowledge that there is great overlapping between his department and The Department of Travel and Publicity. That when we have a Minister of Travel and Publicity attempting to get tourists into this province of ours, and attempting to sell souvenirs and so forth—surely a man of his capabilities should be able to look after this problem himself without having the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and his department—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why does the hon. Minister have to?

Mr. Whicher:—moving in on these other various departments.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I agree that this bill is most important but is it entirely fair that we put the whole onus on the man who is doing the investing, in this instance, in the province of Ontario?

For example, presuming that he either borrows \$1 million under this bill or he raises it privately; if he goes into a new industry in the province of Ontario—and we will say just using a figure that it might be \$1 million—if that business is unsuccessful he has the chance of losing every dollar; in other words, \$1 million. But, on the other hand, if he goes ahead and is successful, under the laws of our province and our federal government today, the tax laws—if he wins and is very successful, 52 cents of

every dollar that he makes go to his government and to the government in Ottawa and only 48 cents go into his own pocket.

Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not right when you give a man who wishes to manufacture goods in this province the ultimatum that if he loses—

Mr. MacDonald: Do you want to raise the sales tax?

Mr. Whicher: —that if he loses, he loses everything, and if he wins, 52 cents out of the dollar go to our hon. friends on the other side of the House and to the government at Ottawa.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the way that it is in some other parts of the world. This afternoon I would like to compare another jurisdiction that is very similar to our own—because we are very close to the United States to the north, but on the other hand the British West Indies Federation is very close to the United States in the south and they have gone a great deal further in encouraging industry—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): There is no such thing any more.

Mr. MacDonald: It collapsed a year ago.

Mr. Whicher: Well, never mind, I am talking about Trinidad and Jamaica and other islands. This is what they have done to encourage industry that they need in their area, just as much as we do in this province of Ontario. There is a bill, which is in rough form at the present time, that is going to be presented there, and the situation is very similar in Trinidad, in Jamaica, in Barbadoes and the other islands in the British West Indies. For example, for anybody who will start a pioneer industry—and I presume that is what the hon. Minister is talking about in the province of Ontario—for anyone who will start a pioneer industry—in other words an industry where the goods are not being manufactured at the present time—it will offer and guarantee a seven-year holiday from all taxes. Seven years free of taxes.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member sounds like a Social Creditor.

Mr. Whicher: I am glad I do not sound like the hon. member.

And if that industry is an exporting industry, it will guarantee a ten-year tax-free holiday. Thereafter a tax of 12½ cents is paid on each dollar instead of 40 cents.

In Canada, of course, and in Ontario, the large corporations are paying 52 cents at the present time instead of the 40 cents that they are now paying in the Caribbean Islands.

The bill also offers notional depreciation on machinery and plant, in other words a very fast depreciation; exemption from income tax on interest paid on certain debentures; relief from interim trader's licence fees and from trade tax; relief from customs duty and package tax; refund of customs duty and package tax on certain imported articles; relief from company registration fees and from minor adjustments of special provision.

In other words, they have completely eliminated any red tape that a person or corporation must wade through in this province or in this country in order to start up a business.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, their bill does one thing more. It will allow duty-free into any of those islands, all materials for the starting of any new pioneer industry including materials for both plant and equipment; and in these particular islands this would include the tourist industry resorts and the furniture that they must import in order to go into the tourist business down there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, most respectfully I point out that there is a great deal of difference between what the hon. Minister of Economics, both in the bill that he presents to us now, and in other things that he has said and what the Speech from the Throne has suggested, between the way that he wishes to promote industry in this province, and what our friends in the Caribbean Islands have done.

But what our friends in the Caribbean Islands have done is very similar to what we ourselves suggest in this province. If we are going to have pioneer industries in this province, in other words industries that are not located here at all now, we must provide some tax incentive. It is not fair to put all the goodies in one hand and say that if you, as a manufacturer, are unsuccessful that you lose the whole thing—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That would go in the budget, that is not part of this bill.

Mr. Whicher: Yes, I know, but I feel that we should have something in this bill to this effect. It is not fair that a man should lose all of this money, and if he wins, why you are going to take the 52 per cent of the profits and leave him only 48 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, while we on this side of the House agree with this bill in principle, in my

opinion it is not specific enough. In no place in the bill does it say how much each applicant could borrow. Nowhere in the bill does it say how much the government is prepared to guarantee, although in the Speech from the Throne a figure of \$100 million is suggested, and it is further suggested that if \$100 million is not enough, the sky is the limit.

I believe that the idea behind this is good. I hope that it will be most successful. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it will be used for industries manufacturing goods which are not at present manufactured in the province of Ontario. The hon. Minister in his remarks just a few minutes ago mentioned the fact that new lines of businesses would be financed by this development fund. Nowhere in the bill does it suggest what kind. Are we going to get into, for example, the restaurant business such as the industrial bank has gotten into?

The name of the industrial bank is wrong in my opinion now because they have gotten into lines of business that I would not agree with and which I hope that the hon. Minister would not incorporate and finance out of this bill.

I feel too that this bill has given too much power for one man, and I point out to you in section 3 of the bill, as an example, the Minister may establish an advisory committee. And I would suggest that when he is loaning large sums of money—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I am not loaning them.

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister is guaranteeing it though and that is exactly the same thing.

If the business is not a success, Mr. Speaker, then the province of Ontario must put up the money. Therefore there is a risk involved and if you are going to have a risk I suggest that you must have an advisory board.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I do have one.

Mr. Whicher: Well, it does not say so in this bill; it says that you may have one. I suggest that when large sums of money are loaned by large financial institutions in this province, for example one of the banks, where sums of several million dollars are going to be involved, surely no one man in that lending institution sits down and says that this applicant may have 5 or 10 million dollars.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: What we are debating is the principle of whether the bill should be or not. If the hon. member wants to argue about whether the word "may" should be changed to the word "shall", please do that in committee and I certainly would be happy to consider it. Frankly, if you think that is a deficiency of the bill, I think it deserves merit—

Mr. Whicher: Well, I think that as the bill is laid out in general principle, it has given the hon. Minister of Economics and Development too much power for any one man in this government. I think that the advisory committee that he mentions and which he says he will have to advise him, should—inasmuch as there is so much money involved—be a group of people such as the Treasury board. I do not think that any one member of the government should have it in his power to say whether moneys up to the limit of \$100 million should be loaned to industrial enterprises of this province.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: If the hon. member looks at the bill he will see that the loan is actually made upon order-in-council. I am the liaison between the screening and the advisory committee and the Cabinet, and I take it from them to the Cabinet. I have no power to offer the guarantee, it is done by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Mr. Whicher: Will the hon. Minister suggest that every loan—supposing it was a \$10,000 loan—must go before the Cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Every loan, that is correct.

Mr. Whicher: That helps my suspicion, I might say.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: It is far better surely at first to have the kind of restraint the hon. member is wanting, then if we find this is hobbling it, I will come back. This is the way it must be controlled by the legislation. The House will still be in session and when we have some experience on this I will come back to the House and simply tell hon. members that we have done our best with it. If there are some improvements we could make we will ask hon. members to go along with it.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, to conclude I simply wish to say we certainly agree with the principle of this bill but we do hope that the hon. Minister will bring forth other ideas to attempt to get more industry into this province.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. member should wait until I show him my programme which I think—

Mr. Whicher: Well, we wish the hon. Minister had been here yesterday afternoon in order to bring some of that programme forth.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. member knows where I was.

Mr. Whicher: I was thinking of what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said this afternoon when he said the hon. Minister wished to bring his respected legislation programme to this House.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I was negotiating, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, it is a tragic affair when the whole business of this House has to be thrown aside and we only sit for 35 minutes because one hon. Minister—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. There are certain things which take place when this House opens, and I do not necessarily want to drag them out here, but I asked the hon. leader of the Opposition to go on yesterday, Monday, and I was ready to have him do this. I asked the hon. member—

Mr. Whicher: When did the hon. Prime Minister ask me that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Last week, and he asked if he might be permitted to go on on Tuesday. So to accommodate him I arranged this for today instead of yesterday. Ordinarily I would never mention this; it is the kind of arrangement made when running a government, but if the hon. member is going to take me to task for adjourning the House early yesterday, I am going to say to him, Mr. Speaker, I did it because the hon. leader of the Opposition was not here to enter the Throne debate after the Speech from the Throne was brought down last Tuesday.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the bill was called for yesterday and because the hon. Minister was not here we sat for 35 minutes, a complete waste of time.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I will assure the House at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that in

discussing Bill No. 2 I do not propose to compare Ontario with the very immature economies of the West Indies, or to discuss legislation that was considered by a federation that is no longer in existence.

Mr. E. Sopha (Sudbury): Is not Trinidad in existence? Is not Jamaica in existence?

Mr. Bryden: There is one point that I would like to refer to first in relation to this bill, Mr. Speaker, and that is the use of the word "agency" by the hon. Minister (Mr. Macaulay) in explaining the bill both on first reading and again today.

As I understand the hon. Minister's explanation, this bill deals with the Ontario Development Agency referred to in the Speech from the Throne. Now, as far as I can see from having read the bill several times, Mr. Speaker, the agency referred to is nothing but the hon. Minister himself. There is, in no true sense of the word, an agency, and I believe that in legislation of this kind there should be some sort of independent agency administering, not the funds, I suppose, but the guarantees that are available.

For one thing, Mr. Speaker, I think this House and the people of the province have a right to be absolutely assured, through the mechanics of the legislation itself, that support of the Conservative Party will not be a prime consideration in qualifying for a government guarantee under this bill. I think if we are to use public funds or the public credit, as in this case, we should follow the sort of procedure that has been followed in a great many instances at the federal level, or where genuinely independent agencies have been set up to consider applications for loans—to consider their validity—and to take action on the basis of the applications, naturally within a certain framework of legislative authority. That, however, is merely an observation in passing, Mr. Speaker.

Getting more to the substance of the matter, I would like to suggest to this House that the fact that the hon. Minister has, I think quite appropriately, considered it necessary to bring forward a bill of this kind, reveals a basic inadequacy in our present economic system in the very area where it is alleged to be highly efficient, and that is in the mobilization of capital for development and other purposes. Clearly this bill would not be necessary if our money market were adequate to deal with the needs of the country. It is a rather strange situation, that in a capitalist system the capital market is inadequate. But this is undoubtedly true, and as a result, it has been necessary for the hon.

Minister to bring forward a measure of this kind.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we should face up to the very serious problem existing in Canada and in Ontario that most of the savings of the community are now under the control of (a) very large monopolistic corporations, and (b) very large financial institutions. That is one of our severe difficulties in this country. It is one of the reasons for the inflexibility in our capital market.

Corporations which have large volumes of investment funds under their control—notwithstanding the heart-rending comments of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher)—will not, of course, make money available for development except for development that is under their control. That is not necessarily the kind of development we need at any given time.

I have suggested on a previous occasion in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I think the suggestion is worth repeating, even though I will not take time to elaborate on it, that this indicates a very urgent need for reform of our corporation tax structure. We should increase tax rates on undistributed profits and decrease them on distributed profits so that corporations will have an incentive to disgorge some at least of their profits, so they come back into the hands of the citizenry. They would then become available, through normal channels, for development and would not be tied down to the particular form of development which the corporation may have in mind and which in some cases may be very little more than merely building up the power of the corporation managers.

As far as the financial institutions are concerned, the hard fact is that financial institutions in this country are very, very conservative in their approach to everything, and this bill points up that fact. Apparently the government is satisfied that there are many applications for credit, many applications for loans which are quite worthy and do not involve undue risk. I do not think the government would involve itself in undue risk—which our financial institutions simply will not look at. As a matter of fact, the federal government has found that for many years it has had to guarantee loans for farmers even though the loss ratio under its policy in that regard has been negligible, it has nevertheless had to induce our conservative financial institutions by ironclad guarantees to undertake the job that they should have been undertaking in any case.

Mr. Sopha: Most of those farmers were in Saskatchewan; was that significant?

Mr. Bryden: Well, a great many of them may have been in Saskatchewan and, as I said, the loss ratio was very, very low. As I remember it, it was about one per cent.

Mr. Sopha: They needed credit and guarantees because they were in Saskatchewan, is that significant to the hon. member?

Mr. Bryden: Anyone who is in business on a large scale usually needs credit and unfortunately our financial institutions are only too often unwilling to accommodate them. In fact, there is an old saying that has a certain amount of truth in it, that the bank will not lend you money unless you can prove that you do not need it.

Mr. Sopha: Last refuge of socialism—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, adolescent prattle. Turn off the tap.

Mr. Bryden: Now, the hon. Minister has stated, both on first reading and today, that this bill is part of a larger development programme that he now has in progress and I have no doubt intends to pursue. One would judge from his comments that he regards it as a key part of that programme. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that though the measure is unquestionably useful and necessary, it can only be regarded as a very secondary part of any genuine development programme; that it is a key part of the hon. Minister's programme only because his programme is so inadequate.

What exactly is this development programme that he has in mind and that he has talked about, both today and when he first introduced this bill? Does it consist of trips by the hon. Minister to Japan and other foreign countries or of—

Mr. Sopha: It does.

Mr. Bryden: —or of exhortations to business to get out and sell?

Mr. Sopha: It does.

Mr. Bryden: Or of suggestions to the public that they should reduce their purchases of imports, particularly from the United States—by \$100, I think that was the figure he used? Or of encouragement to business to set up small uneconomic enterprises of which we already have too many in this country and in this province?

An hon. member: Billboards on vacant lots.

Mr. Bryden: I will quite concede that it is useful and desirable for our business community to get out and sell in every way they possibly can, and it is desirable for this government as well as the federal government to provide facilities to help them in selling their products particularly in foreign countries. I do not quarrel with that phase of the hon. Minister's programme, but he has perhaps overestimated its potential to some degree.

After all, in selling you have not only to put on a campaign, you have to have something to sell that you can sell competitively. You have to have a basis for selling and I fear, Mr. Speaker, from having studied the hon. Minister's statements outside this House as carefully as I could, as they were reported in the press, and having listened to him on a number of occasions in this House, that a great deal of the hon. Minister's programme with regard to the encouragement of secondary industry is merely repeating the mistakes of the 1930's.

For example, his suggestion that each of us should cut our purchase of imported goods by \$100. This is not really even feasible, Mr. Speaker, in most cases. I do not care how hard anybody wants to look, I doubt if he will find Canadian oranges on the market. We are buying imported goods because we are a fairly well developed country, with a fairly high standard of living. Imported goods are part of our standard of living and a reduction of these imports would merely mean a reduction of our standard of living.

What is an even more serious aspect of this suggestion of the hon. Minister is that it implies what was described in the London *Economist* six months ago as a sort of "beggar - your - neighbour" policy. Unfortunately in the past, in the thirties, when countries found themselves in difficulty, their immediate reaction was to try to export their difficulties to their neighbours, hoping that in that way they would get rid of them themselves. But all that happened was that though they indeed exported their difficulties, they then found that their own difficulties were compounded, and everybody was worse off.

The suggestion that we should be cutting down on imports, in my opinion, is inherently a "beggar-your-neighbour" policy, based on the idea that we can improve our own position by making somebody else's position worse. I do not think that works in the world of human affairs, whether it is in the relations of man to man or of country to country.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The automobile industry is working at a 30 per cent higher level today because the imported cars are down considerably; that is the basic reason for it. That programme is only one of 10 separate steps that I have outlined.

Mr. Bryden: Well, we may have an occasion to make reference to that particular phenomenon, too. It will not be changed by the hon. Minister's suggestion that we buy \$100 less imports.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I can show the hon. member it has been done already; I will show it to him.

Mr. Bryden: Well, the hon. Minister sometimes makes boasts, but does not seem to quite get—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, let us hear one of them. What is one of them?

Mr. MacDonald: Do not get petulant now, we will be on the hon. Minister's side.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister has embarked on quite a large-scale programme of exhorting business to manufacture items that are now imported into this country.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: You do not want that either, I suppose.

Mr. Bryden: This has been policy in Canada, I suppose, since Confederation. It was the basic rationale of the National Policy and the national tariff. It is a policy that, I think, is not going to work very successfully in the world of today—in the world of great trading blocs and in the world of developing freer trade.

There is a very serious danger that we will encourage more and more small units which cannot really compete economically even in our own country and continue in business only because of some form of government subsidization, either through tariffs or in other ways.

This is a move in the wrong direction inherently. I am not suggesting that there is not a single instance where it may be feasible to manufacture goods in Canada that are now imported, but I suggest that the number of instances is relatively small. The hon. Minister's policy essentially is in the direction of what the economists refer to as autarchy, a concept that was completely discredited in the depression of the thirties, the concept that you can pull yourself up by your own bootstraps.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, quite firmly, that we should be encouraging secondary industry in Canada and in Ontario, but that the way that we will best encourage it is by encouraging specialization. This country and this province are too small to manufacture a wide range of products and to be able to compete in the world markets. We simply do not have a large enough domestic market. We should do what other countries of similar size and similar domestic potentials have done, and that is specialize in some things that we can do well and then export the products of such industries to the world markets. This, I think, is the only direction of the future.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. member is against the small businessman this year, I see.

Mr. Bryden: And in reply to the hon. Minister's derisory question, I will be quite prepared to agree with him that this requires a very major transformation in our whole economy that will not be undertaken quickly or easily. But I think that a major part of the attention of government agencies at this time should be devoted to studying fields in which we can specialize and compete effectively, not only in our own country but in world markets. We should be adopting ways and means, including advancing money if necessary, to assist the transition of our productive capacity from some of the uneconomic uses to which it is now being put, into more economic uses which planned studies might indicate. Involved in this, no doubt, would be some modification of The Combines Act. Subject to reasonable safeguards, I think it is time we considered modifications in The Combines Act and perhaps relied more on reduction of tariffs.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, the hon. member did not think so last year. What has he been reading over the summer?

Mr. Bryden: The great problem with the hon. Minister is that he never reads anything but his own speeches. He cannot quote an instance where I ever expressed any opposition to desirable modifications in The Combines Act in this House or elsewhere in order to encourage specialization of industry; and I think that we should rely on the reduction of tariffs, which are becoming an outmoded instrument in any case, as a method of protecting the public against exploitation by monopolies.

The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, I would

like to say in conclusion, will no doubt serve a useful—even though a limited—purpose, but my objection is that the larger policy of which it is a part and which the hon. Minister has described in some detail in introducing the bill, is inadequate. This bill will not compensate for the inadequacies in the larger policy. I believe that the hon. Minister ought to concentrate on having less Madison Avenue froth in his economic policy and more real substance in a development programme for this province.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I would not have raised this consideration in connection with the principle of this bill, except that I notice it has been raised by the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden). And I notice also it has been raised by a colleague of the hon. Minister—a colleague whom he seems to want either to outmatch or outfollow—I am speaking of the hon. George Hees, the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

When I was looking at the federal debates on the exports credit insurance Act I noticed that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who had raised the question that hon. C. D. Howe has used some form of patronage. He did not name C. D. Howe; it said he was not referring to him. But Mr. Hees inferred that there was some sort of patronage with respect to the incentives that had been given to various industries by his department.

I think this could be a real danger in this bill if there are not some ground rules. I suggest that we do not want narrowing ground rules with respect to applicants; we want flexibility. It would seem to me that—as there are in the bills in the federal House—there should have been some mention of ground rules; for example there should be mention of Canadian content concerning these industries. I would like to know, sir, on what basis the hon. Minister would decide on the areas which he feels need a new upsurge of economic development. Would it be on the basis of the employment index?

The bill raises a further question—and this is a question that the hon. Minister himself raises—that is whether the department should be guaranteeing loans or giving loans directly. The hon. Minister has raised the argument that the latter course would be in competition with the lending institutions, and that it is far better for the institutions to play this lending role than for the provincial government to do it. I understand one of the principles of this bill is development. It seems to me that the proposed routine—the routine

which the hon. Minister outlined with respect to applicants—is that they must follow the procedure of going to each of the lending institutions—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Oh, not each one.

Mr. Thompson: All right, but they have to go to a number of them and be rejected. And then they may come to the hon. Minister, or the agency we hope he will set up, and then the hon. Minister says: "All right, it seems to us that this is for the good of the Ontario community, so we will go back to the lending institutions, perhaps not to the one that rejected you, but we will go back to one, and we will tell it, 'Look, instead of looking narrowly at this situation, you have to go ahead and help the applicant because we are guaranteeing the loans'."

Now, there are two questions. One is, I think, that the hon. Minister is inferring, by this approach, a lack of patriotism, of Ontario patriotism, of community responsibility, on the part of lending institutions. He infers that they may refuse to help the cause of Ontario; that they may not have the judgment to see a sure investment. He infers that he, the hon. Minister, maybe alone or maybe with advisors, can better decide what is a good investment.

If this is a development bill that we are passing, the Ontario government itself could decide that it is going to put money directly into helping new industry move into areas which are not traditional to the lending institutions, and be able to develop these areas.

I would suggest also that there could be the situation with the lending institutions, when the applicant goes back to them, now with a guarantee from the provincial government, the lending institutions could still tie him down with short-term loans and with high interest, whereas if the loans are made

through the provincial government itself—through The Department of Economics and Development—long-term loans can be provided with low interest. Surely with young developing industries this would be most necessary.

I further suggest, sir, that just because the provincial government says they will guarantee the loan, that this will not in every case justify a responsible lending institution in saying "Okay, we will go ahead with it." The lending institution is as fearful as the black next responsible institution in having a black mark against its name if its clients fail.

Many institutions, having rejected an applicant for a loan, may not be impressed that the provincial agency does possess greater wisdom and astuteness in assessing financial opportunities. I think that the effect of saying the government will guarantee the loan still does not justify to the lending institution that it should lend the money.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not wish to cut the member off, if he is just completing his argument. However, I will point out that it is after 6 o'clock and if the hon. member decides to adjourn the debate I presume that will be quite in order.

Mr. Thompson moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): **Mr. Speaker,** tomorrow we will go on with the Throne Speech debate and second readings that are on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, December 5, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 5, 1962

Reading and receiving petition	87
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. MacDonald	88
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Letherby, agreed to	111
Guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario, bill to authorize, debate continued on second reading	111
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Chapple, agreed to	118
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	118

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1962

The House met at 3:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petition has been received:

For the incorporation of the association of the chemical profession of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to announce to the House the assumption by The Department of Highways of some 35 miles of county and township roads in Dufferin, Grey and Wellington counties.

Result of the assumptions will be a new direct King's highway route between Shelburne, on Highway 10, and Palmerston, on Highway 23, via Mount Forest and Harriston. All of the mileage being added to the provincial highway system will be signed as Highway 89. The route represents a saving in mileage over any existing choice of King's highways between the same two points.

The roads assumed will provide an important new provincial highway link between a wide area of Western Ontario and the Lake Simcoe and Georgian Bay regions. In particular, the new King's highway mileage will knit more closely together the "blue water country" of Lake Huron and beyond—and parts of the province adjacent to and north of Lake Simcoe.

The longest continuous section being added is the 26 miles of county roads between Shelburne, on the east, and Mount Forest, the route passing through Jessopville and Conn, in that order. From Mount Forest, continuing due westerly, the route follows a county road in Wellington before turning south via county and township roads on a

direct line to Harriston. From Harriston on the route is directly south on a county road to the junction with Highway 23, just west of Palmerston.

Another link in the new route, namely, the 2.5 mile section of Minto township road from Harriston northerly, was recently reconstructed as a development road project, the work being completed in 1959. Thus, most of the mileage is already in a condition capable of carrying good traffic volumes.

Also assumed is the county road between Cookstown, on Highways 89 and 27, and Highway 400 which has a direct bearing on the new Palmerston-Harriston-Mount Forest-Shelburne route, since Highways 10 and 24 from Shelburne afford a direct bridge onto Highway 89 at Primrose. Highway 89 has become increasingly important as an east-west connecting link with north-south Highways 27 and 400, especially the latter. Thus the extension of Highway 89 easterly to Highway 400 is a logical move to further improve the highway network.

The other assumption is the county road between Acton and Ospringle on Highway 24 as an extension of Highway 25. In this way Highway 24 will be linked directly with Highway 401 and the Queen Elizabeth Way as well as Highways 7 and 5. The result will be a "tapping" of traffic on 401 and the QE Way which is bound for the resort areas to the north. Not only will traffic be relieved on these two freeways, but tourists, as well as others, will now have a wider choice of routes.

The effective date for all assumptions is April 1, 1963.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister if this is the same announcement which was made in our Guelph paper last night by the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root)? Do we have to have it twice?

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I insist that the hon. Minister answer this question. I had no idea that this was not the first formal announcement.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, subject to the insistence of the hon. leader of the Opposition, may I simply say that the release date is December 5 and I cannot account for the actions of newspapers that prefer to publish these announcements prior to the release date shown.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Why did the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin make any statement with respect to this matter prior to this announcement?

Mr. Speaker, I appeal directly to you.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): The release in the Guelph paper was no release of mine. I had nothing to do with the release that was published.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of a Throne debate it is traditional that one extends congratulations to a number of people and I want to do that.

First, of course, to the mover and the seconder of the speech. The hon. member (Mr. Harris) who moved it was one of the younger hon. members on the government side of the House who joined us not too long ago. I am delighted to see that the party has given him a chance to speak, because it is just possible that his tenure of office in the House is not going to be long enough that if he did not get a crack at it now he might not have it later. I think he is a very good fellow and he should have an opportunity to raise his voice in the Conservative ranks here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: One would almost think they had joined the Tory party by their objections.

As for the seconder of the motion, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar), I listened to his full-throated effort with a very great deal of interest. He is a man who has a great deal of weight behind his comments, in fact about 300 pounds of it. And that, I think, was very necessary in his particular instance, because when he strayed from local issues—and this is quite legitimate that he should deal with local issues—I was intrigued with the inconsistencies on which he got trapped.

For example, in living close to the American border he has apparently become quite impressed with the compulsory nature of the American social security system. This is something that a lot of Canadians have viewed almost with envy. So much so that even the Tories at Ottawa are doing a little bit of an investigation on it now. So he expressed his approval and commendation for the compulsory nature of the American social security system. But that he should be doing that at a time when his own government is making a fetish of the alleged voluntary nature of the hospital plan that they have put into effect, or the medical care plan that they are now contemplating, was just a little inconsistent.

It is the usual problem, I suppose, of injecting one's own personal views with the products of the script writers from the downtown office. One should not expect that all of these inconsistencies should be ironed out by any one hon. member.

Now as to the Cabinet changes, this has become almost an annual event. In fact, Parliament would be a little dull, or the Legislature would be a little dull, if on coming back we had not had another version of the game of musical chairs that is played. It was particularly interesting on this occasion to view the comings and the goings.

On the comings, those who entered the Cabinet for the first time, if I may speak personally, it is very pleasant to know Cabinet Ministers in the fashion that I have learned to know many of them from previous years on select committees. Some of them are younger men who came into the Legislature at approximately the same time that I did.

But it was the goings from the Cabinet that interested me even more. A month or so ago, for example, the hon. Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. hon. John Diefenbaker, appointed a gentleman to the Senate at Ottawa, a man by the name of Mr. Flynn. A lot of people were very puzzled as to why this particular gentleman should be appointed to the Senate. They had to wait no longer than about 24 hours, because the next day the papers carried the news story that he had also been appointed the organizer for the Conservative party in the province of Quebec. I do not know whether this is an accurate sort of a preview of the kind of thing that went on in this Cabinet shuffle.

For example, at this time when all good men should come to the aid of the party, and particularly the Tory party across the floor there, in its precarious position at the moment, I was a little puzzled as to the

departure from the Cabinet of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Goodfellow). A year or so ago I paid him a compliment, which I sincerely meant, that next to the then hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), I thought he was the cutest fox in the Tory den—and I still think he is, behind that back concession philosophy which he is so adept at conveying to the farmers, the rural folk. I was a little puzzled that he should be leaving the Cabinet and they should be missing the kind of guidance and experience that he should be giving at this time.

An hon. member: He knows when to leave.

Mr. MacDonald: No, he did not leave, this is the point. Do not beat the gun. Once again somebody tells me—I happened to miss this news story—the next day the story came out that he had been designated as the organizer for the party in eastern Ontario. Now that is one part of the province, only one, where they desperately need some guidance and some organization. So the Cabinet shuffle had meaning on that level.

An hon. member: How many seats does the hon. member for York South have in that area?

Mr. MacDonald: Never mind, the interesting question is how many the Tories will have after the next election, that should worry the hon. member more.

I was also interested, for example, in why the hon. gentleman from Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Simonett) got into the Cabinet. Not that I do not think he deserves to get into the Cabinet, but I have a healthy suspicion that there are at least 20 others in the back benches of the Conservative party who thought that their qualifications were at least equal to his. However, again I do not think there was any mystery to it. The hon. Minister from Northumberland (Mr. Goodfellow) needed an assistant in organizing eastern Ontario and the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Simonett) is a very swashbuckling young man who flies around and can reach a lot of territory in a short time. There was obvious point in bringing this man into the Cabinet to assist.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it did not even end there. I want to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). I have even other congratulations for him later, but I want to congratulate him on this particular score. One of the interesting things to watch when one analyzes in depth the operation of a Cabinet or a government, is the extent to which the normal business and operation of

departments are integrated with the party machine so that, while doing the business of the province, you are also making certain that no stone is left unturned in furthering the interest of the party. But I want to say to the hon. Prime Minister that if I had been given the chance myself to pick five people to head the five departments which offer the greatest potential for furthering the interests of the Tory machine while doing the business of the province, I would not have picked differently. He certainly did it very well.

I am thinking, for example, of The Department of Agriculture, of the Attorney-General, of Lands and Forests, of Highways, Municipal Affairs. The ground work was certainly laid for an election and the government recognizes that they have a terrific battle on their hands. The Cabinet shifts were one of the main moves in preparation for that election.

Now finally, Mr. Speaker, there are two words of unqualified congratulations and commendation that I want to make. If some of my earlier comments seem to have an edge on them along with the congratulations, I will confess to the truth of it. But there are two that I want to give in an unqualified fashion. The first one is to the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, for the kind of change that has taken place in arrangements for the business of the House. I am not talking about the argument that we have gotten into now as to whether or not we could have had more business on the order paper now and avoided the hours being skipped, I am referring to the kind of normal, behind-the-scenes co-operation between the parties or the leaders of the parties in the furthering of the business of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you quite frankly that one of the things that has puzzled me since I came into this Legislature was the kind of cat-and-mouse game that was played behind the scenes in days gone by. Sometimes it was petty, indeed it was petty to the point of being unworthy. The hon. Prime Minister has changed that and I think this is for the good.

The second point of congratulation, sir, is to yourself. I want to add my comments to those who have spoken enthusiastically of the job that you are doing and of the impartiality with which you are presiding over the affairs of this Legislature. I think, Mr. Speaker—and perhaps you are the one who would back this up most enthusiastically—that one of the most difficult tasks that we have in any Legislature is the task of the Speaker.

In our tradition in the province of Ontario,

indeed in Canada, I think we make that tradition even more difficult, because we pick people who have been active in the Legislature—maybe have had the normal amount of experience in chairing meetings and things of that nature—and we suddenly thrust them into a position which is very difficult. After he has had three or four years of learning the ropes, if I may use the vernacular, when he has shown that he has the capacity to do a good job, then out he goes and somebody else takes his place. It raises once again a question which I hope some time we can face up to—that is the obvious superiority of the practice of a permanent Speaker which is the practice in the mother of Parliaments at Westminster.

But in your instance, sir, I think that you have obviously given proof of the fact that today you are handling the position with even greater confidence and poise. This is not said in criticism of your earlier years, and I think it raises the question, if I may just pose it for the hon. Prime Minister's future consideration, of whether or not we in this Legislature should not at least explore the possibility of an arrangement in which we can move towards a permanent Speaker. I think the business of the House down through the years would be furthered by it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I turn to the question of the Throne Speech itself, I want to deal for a time with the issue of redistribution.

Just a week ago, today, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) and I put questions to the hon. Prime Minister with regard to the redistribution situation in the province of Ontario. The hon. Prime Minister at that time said that he would look into the situation and that he would report. I am a little puzzled as to why, on a matter which, in my view, is urgent, after a lapse of one week we have still had no reply or no comment.

I want, therefore, just to review this situation as I see it, because I think there are some factors in it that should be considered more fully by the public.

A week ago, when the hon. Prime Minister was questioned on the report of the commission on redistribution, at one point he declared that he was not going to be placed in the position of appearing to oppose redistribution at this time, for he was not opposed to it. Mr. Speaker, this was reassuring.

It was not only reassuring, but it was consistent with the very clear-cut statement which the hon. Prime Minister made at the

time he appointed this commission last April. When asked about the timing of the report, this was the hon. Prime Minister's reply—it is to be found in *Hansard* of April 18, 1962, on page 2529. He said this:

I would anticipate that there will be a bill before this House when we next resume. I do not think that this is a big enough job that it is going to take any protracted period of time and there is, in my view, ample time for a report to be prepared and submitted to the government. I would hope to have it in front of the Legislature when we next meet.

Therefore it can be said, Mr. Speaker, that last April this commission was not only given its terms of reference, but it was given a clear indication of when the Legislature expected its report—laid down by no less a person than the hon. Prime Minister. Under these circumstances, and particularly when the job to be done is an urgent one because of the coming provincial election, I submit that it is not good enough for the commission to report at this late date that it has been unable to complete its report.

It is an intolerable proposition, Mr. Speaker, that we should go into another provincial election with disparities in the size of riding electorates so great as to make a mockery of the basic principle of "representation by population". But having been given a clear time limit for its work, it is equally intolerable that the necessary steps should not have been taken so that that time-table could have been met.

I emphasize once again, Mr. Speaker, the very strange situation that was revealed by the hon. Prime Minister's statement last Wednesday. He stated that he had received no report from the chairman of the commission, verbal or otherwise. He added later that he had had conversation with the chairman on a number of occasions.

As I stated last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, both the hon. leader of the Opposition and I had been approached by the chairman of the commission. In stating it I was not revealing anything new; it has been published in the press from sources of which I can assure you I know nothing. While I do not feel that it would be appropriate for me to reveal the details of the discussion that I had with the chairman, in my view it is both appropriate, and now necessary, to state that the whole import of the discussion was to explain why the commission was not going to be able to report to this session of the Legislature.

Whether or not these discussions which the chairman of the commission had with the leaders of the Opposition parties could accurately be described as a "report" is a question of semantics. Certainly, the import of those discussions was tantamount to an "interim report" that the commission was not going to be able to live up to its time-table.

In the conversations which the hon. Prime Minister had with the chairman of the commission I find it impossible to believe that he would not have given essentially the same information that was conveyed to the hon. leader of the Opposition and myself, and I am not interested in quibbling with the hon. Prime Minister as to whether such information constituted a report.

If the hon. Prime Minister is not opposed to an immediate redistribution, as he reassured the House last Wednesday, then what did he say to the chairman of the commission when he was informed during those conversations that the commission was not going to be able to report on redistribution to the Legislature which is now assembled? I think the Legislature and the public are entitled to know.

Did the hon. Prime Minister accept the reasons for not being able to report? Or in view of his assertion that he is not opposed to immediate redistribution, did he in effect say that the obstacles in the way of preventing a final report would have to be met and removed, so that a final report could be submitted—if not before Christmas, certainly as soon as the Legislature convenes in the New Year?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this whole latter portion of what the hon. member is reading is based upon the assumption that I have had the same interim report from the commissioner as the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South—or as apparently they have had. I can only assure you that I have not, and he has not informed me at any time that he could not produce a report to be considered by the Legislature at this time. So the assumption upon which the hon. member is proceeding to accuse me of all sorts of dire things simply is not there.

It certainly is a debating trick to put words into my mouth and then take me apart for what I have not done. I would just make it clear to the House that the commissioner has not at any time informed me that he could or could not produce a report now or at any time. I do not know what his intentions are, and when I have a report as to

these intentions—as I said before, Mr. Speaker—I will make it clear to this House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I really do appreciate the hon. Prime Minister's intervention because I think it just underlines how extraordinary, perfectly extraordinary, is the situation. I was assuming—now I discover erroneously—that what the chairman of the commission conveyed to us was also being conveyed to the hon. Prime Minister. It leaves me even more puzzled as to the purpose of that visit because, I repeat, the purpose of the visit cannot be construed as anything other than to convey to us the difficulties, to the point of impossibility, of reporting. And why would the chairman of a Royal commission established to do this job come to the leaders of the Opposition parties and not to the government which actually appointed him? I leave the point right there because I think it speaks for itself in terms that are extremely eloquent.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that it is not good enough for the hon. Prime Minister to field Opposition questions by saying that he has had no official report, and that he is not going to be placed in a position of appearing to oppose redistribution. Under the circumstances he should be willing to back up his stand by taking this House into his confidence on the salient points of the conversations with the chairman of the commission. He has done so to a degree. I think perhaps under the circumstances there is even more necessity for him to complete the job.

But I want to pursue this question further because, Mr. Speaker, we are now getting into precisely the kind of trouble that I feared last April. At the time the commission was appointed, with general terms of reference, I made an urgent plea to the government that the Legislature should do what was done in Manitoba; that is, lay down in a frank and above-board fashion, certain basic rules so that this commission would not only be independent in personnel, but that the commission would also be able to be independent in its operations.

I urged, for example, that this Legislature should debate and decide on an appropriate ratio for the basic quota of voters in an urban and a rural constituency. In Manitoba the ratio adopted was seven to four. What would be an appropriate ratio for Ontar'o? This, it seems to me, was something we should have debated.

Well, to put it bluntly, I got nowhere on this. I then retreated to a final line of defence of the independence of the commission, and

asked that the House should consider, and decide upon an approximate number of seats for the new Legislature. I argued that if we did not do it openly and above board then somebody would be doing it behind the scenes. Once again I got nowhere with this plea.

The hon. Prime Minister argued that the commission was free to do the job as it saw fit, and then report. And if we in the Legislature disagreed then we would be under no obligation to accept their report.

With all the respect that I have for the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that argument was highly specious. Clearly the commission is not going to go to all the trouble of working out the details of redistribution—a job which is so big that they now contend they cannot complete it in time—without some assurance from someone in authority that their chosen number of seats for the new Legislature was an acceptable one. If they did not get that assurance publicly, after a debate in the Legislature such as I sought last spring, then they will get it privately from somebody behind the scenes who can speak for the government or the Tory Party.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, the government set up a commission independent of the Legislature in personnel, but it refused openly to lay down the rules of procedure so that the commission would be independent in its operations.

Against that background, let us consider a number of developments that have taken place since last April.

The first one was the most illuminating comment by the hon. member for York East (Mr. Beckett) as reported in the press of June 25 of this year. Speaking to the Young Progressive-Conservative Association, the hon. member is reported to have stated that re-shaping of electoral boundaries should not be left to any "ivory tower committee".

He quite frankly stated, and this is the direct quote: "If we're not careful how we redistribute these seats, we can lose them", and then he proceeded to outline a couple of examples:

We just took Beaches by a very narrow margin. If that boundary could be moved east into Scarborough where we have plenty of Conservatives, that riding would have been easy.

And the second case:

The North Scarborough area is traditionally Liberal. But lump it with Don Mills—call it York-Don if you want—and we can take it.

This blatant call for gerrymandering was concluded with this piece of advice by the hon. member for York East to the young Tories. I sometimes fear for the exposure that some of the young Tories on occasion get, because this is what he said:

If you have any influence, or you can talk to people on the redistribution committee, then we can win these seats.

Mr. Speaker, while there are some people in the Conservative Party who are genuinely in favour of handling redistribution through an independent commission—and I think one of them is the hon. Prime Minister—there are certainly others who think that this is so much mealy-mouthed nonsense. They will concur with the hon. member for York East that the political interests of the Tory Party should be given top consideration. Their only quarrel with him was his indiscretion in saying so quite frankly and publicly.

Undoubtedly this sizeable group in the Conservative Party has been seeking to express their views behind the scene each in his own way, in precisely the manner in which the hon. member for York East called upon the young Tories to do. That was the first development.

The second one is this, Mr. Speaker: The press has periodically reported in the past few months that groups of Tories have been meeting to arrive at their own proposals for redistribution and no doubt these meetings have subsequently sought to have their views communicated indirectly, if not directly, to members of the commission. Personally I do not have to rely wholly on newspapers for information regarding these behind-the-scenes meetings of Tories. I have learned of at least one of them myself from sources that I have every reason to believe were not without some authority.

Finally—and to my mind this is very significant—the press was reporting periodically, until a few weeks ago, that the commission was going to be in a position to report to this fall session of the Legislature. Such reports persisted until early October. Then suddenly the information on the grapevine changed. More and more the suggestion was being made that at this eleventh hour it has been found that the job was much too complicated, much too time-consuming, to permit of a report to the fall session. Finally the information reached the public through the press that a report from the commission was unlikely at this session.

The reason which was implied and—even more important, Mr. Speaker, which was privately stated sometimes behind the scenes

—for this sudden reversal, was that when the Tories discovered what redistribution was going to do in endangering their already precarious position, it was decided that redistribution would not be proceeded with before the next general election.

How much of these news reports, how much of this grapevine information, is exactly true I do not know. But of this I am certain: there has been too much smoke not to indicate some fire. And the information is not without some basis in truth.

Part of the problem rests squarely on this government's doorstep. In refusing to lay down publicly certain basic things such as the desirable number of seats for the new Legislature and an appropriate basic quota of rural and urban seats, the government made it inevitable that the commission would seek such information through conversations such as the hon. Prime Minister has admitted that he had every now and then with the chairman. And it would be very surprising if such conversations will not have been held periodically with all members of the commission at one time or another, in more or less casual meetings with people. Indeed it is inevitable that such conversations would take place and more than likely that they usually take place with hon. members of the government party.

In summary, therefore, Mr. Speaker, the government has created a most unfortunate situation which can be corrected only by immediate action.

By refusing last April to permit the Legislature to debate and decide upon certain basic decisions which are prerequisite for redistribution, independent redistribution, the government has made it impossible for the commission to operate independently, even though the highly commendable precedent has been established of appointing independent personnel.

This has placed the commission in an extremely difficult position. The position has been made all the more difficult by public statements such as that by the hon. member for York East and the repeated news stories of other behind-the-scenes efforts to influence their findings. It is inevitable under these circumstances that public suspicion will grow, indeed that the commission will become a political football.

This should be avoided at all costs. But it can only be if this government is willing to move quickly.

With the assurance that the hon. Prime Minister gave us last week that he is not

opposed to an immediate redistribution, indeed that he would not allow himself to be placed in the position of even appearing to be, I think that the hon. Prime Minister has only one course open to him. I submit to him, for his consideration, he should inform the commission that the original time-table clearly stated by himself last April must be adhered to; and that every step be taken to provide the commission with the necessary help to do the basic job so that the commission personnel themselves can make the final decision during the holiday recess and be in a position to report as soon as the Legislature resumes in the new year, if it is not possible to do sooner.

I felt I was right, Mr. Speaker, until I learned that the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) is going to go along with me. I will have to re-examine my position.

Let me turn to the Throne Speech itself, Mr. Speaker. The first comment I want to make—admittedly of a rather frivolous nature—is that clearly this government has a new scriptwriter. Can one imagine—and I address these remarks to those of us who have been in the House for a few years—can one imagine a Throne Speech being brought down by this government that did not contain that familiar platitude about human betterment? And yet it was not there. The words were not there.

The ironical thing, Mr. Speaker, is that there were some elements in this Throne Speech which I would admit, quite frankly, did involve human betterment, indeed there is one of them to which I want to draw attention, and on which I want to commend the government. It concerns the grants that the government has now indicated it is going to make available, of \$2,500 per bed for the building of retarded children's institutions within the local community. This is in keeping with the modern approach of having retarded children closer to the community instead of being taken away and institutionalized—at least insofar as it is possible for some of them.

Mr. Speaker, it is in keeping with the modern approach which the government is also indicating in their development of psychiatric wings in our general hospitals, so that those afflicted with mental illness can be treated closer to home and to try to decentralize the monstrosities of buildings and institutions we have built in the past and, now we conclude, have built on the wrong pattern.

But what puzzles me, Mr. Speaker—and I put this forward to the government in all

seriousness—is what is delaying the government in coming to grips with another proposal, concerning retarded children's classes, which has been advanced from a number of authoritative sources in recent years. That is the integration of retarded children's classes into the public school system. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Davis)—who, come to think of it, Mr. Speaker, is now the hon. Minister of Education and, I assume, one from whom we might expect a little action on this—was himself advocating this on behalf of the Retarded Children's Association a year or so ago.

The situation we have, Mr. Speaker, is this:

We started out about 10 years ago as a society finally coming to grips with this very difficult and tragic, human problem of young people coming from all ranges of life, all kinds of families, afflicted with retardation. We finally came to grips with it in retarded children's classes.

It was treated in the first instance as a pilot project by the former Liberal government at Ottawa. When they had proven to their satisfaction in pilot projects, one of which was in my own riding two or three years prior to 1953, that this was an obviously wise step forward, they, as federal governments so often do, cleared out of the picture altogether and dropped it on the doorstep of the provincial government.

The provincial government stepped in with grants. But I think that any rational, civilized assessment of this situation cannot escape coming to the conclusion that any family that is faced with the burden of coping with a retarded child has enough of a burden without having added to it the expense that is involved. And also that the sensible thing to do is to integrate our retarded children's classes with the public school system, not physically but at least on the financial level.

I would hope that the government could move in this fashion, so that those who are least capable of treatment would receive it. Those least capable are now going to go into our larger institutions. The ones who are most capable of treatment, or rather the intermediate group, will go into the local institutions that are going to be built. Those who have the greatest potential for training will conceivably still be living at home and attending the retarded children's classes. If those classes become part of our public school system, then I think we will have the correct kind of approach towards this problem. I would urge the government to

give immediate rather than delayed consideration to this.

The other thing about the Throne Speech which fascinated me was the number of death-bed repentances involved in it. For example, last year we listened for literally hours, at varying times during the session, to the reasons that were advanced from the government's side of the House as to why this government, at the provincial level, could not and should not enter the field of meat inspection.

Now an awful lot of people just did not accept the nonsense that was handed to the public on this issue, and even the government apparently could not continue to accept it, particularly with an election coming up, so we have had a complete about-face and the government is going to enter the field of meat inspection. Fine!

We have pleaded in this House—from the Opposition parties—for a number of years, for us to come to grips with the commuter problem, particularly in the Metro area. Two or three years ago there were even private conversations with some of the heads of our national railways to see if we could not face up to the problem of the commuter and the traffic congestion.

There were other occasions when we urged upon The Department of Transport, which had a research division, that surely here was one of the problems which, if any department of Transport was going to do research work, they should have tackled when the department was set up 4 or 5 years ago. Now, at this late date, at this eleventh hour, there is another death-bed repentance. The government finally says it is going to study the commuter issue and do something about it. Well, this is the sort of pace at which progress is made under a Conservative government.

I have a third item—the issue of fair wage clauses in contracts which are let by this government. I read into the record of this House last year, and the year before, letters from top Cabinet Ministers, particularly the hon. Cabinet Minister who has now become the Attorney-General (Mr. Cass)—in the days when he was the Minister of Highways—where he wrote, and in blunt, callous Tory fashion, explaining to trade unionists, who were pleading for a fair wage clause in contracts, that the fair wage was a wage at which the contractor could get the people in that particular area.

This was a point, incidentally, that Carl Goldenberg in his hearings, when he was looking into the construction situation locally, knocked

squarely on top of the head. He said this is certainly not a fair basis because it gives the contractor an opportunity to exploit those who happen to be unfortunate enough to be in the pool of unemployed. This is precisely what was happening.

Now we have the government—and I congratulate them but wonder why they had to be so late switching their policy—repudiating the statements that were asserted so dogmatically by their top Cabinet Minister and now claiming that they are going to put a fair wage clause in the contracts. If we could only have an election every year, we might get some of these things cleaned up in our administration a little more quickly.

We have listened, for example, to the government explaining, each time we raise the question of the need for greater parks and recreational areas in southern Ontario, that Ontario has a greater per capita area of public parks than any other jurisdiction in the North American continent. And I am certain that, at some time or another that expansive spread of the arms came, they would say "in the whole world." Ignoring, of course—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: True.

Mr. MacDonald: True—ignoring of course though, that most of these parks are in northern Ontario away from the overwhelming majority of the people of Ontario in the south—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They want them up there.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not objecting to having them up there but we want some down here. Even the validity of this claim was never accepted by the then Minister of Lands and Forests, who came before the committee on government organization of which I happen to be a member.

However, once again we have a reversal. The government is instituting a programme—and oh, how this has got election window-dressing in it—a programme that is going to have \$200 million involved in capital and is going to extend over a 20-year period to build parks in southern Ontario. And they are making a start up in the Killarney area. Once again, so far so good, but it is a minimum of immediate achievement and the maximum of election propaganda.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, there is too little and too late. The Throne Speech underlined once again why the people of the province of Ontario should turn this govern-

ment out at the next election. And if there were any remaining doubt, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister himself gave it yesterday when he rose in this House in replying to the hon. leader of the Opposition and reviewed the election results of the last 20 years as an irrelevant comment on what they might be in the next election. People have lost their confidence in this government—

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. MacDonald:—this becomes increasingly evident. Indeed the attitude of the government when they got up with an air of "we rule by divine right and nothing can ever happen to us"—do you know what that reminded me of, Mr. Speaker?

An hon. member: Who said that? We will change that.

Mr. MacDonald: It reminded me of the federal Liberals with their profound arrogance in the year 1957, when C. D. Howe got up and said: "Who is to stop us?"

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I will tell the hon. members who is going to stop them—the people of the province of Ontario are going to stop them. Don't ask for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

An hon. member: For you.

Mr. MacDonald: For thee! Thee on that side of the House, the wrong side of the House, if I may paraphrase the familiar comment of the previous Prime Minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party faces the next election in the province of Ontario with confidence—

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald:—not only because this government is on the skids but because of the growing evidence that the Liberals offer no alternative but a confusion of policy which adds up to collective incompetence.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, seldom has a party ever presented such a picture of internal conflict and contradiction of policy. Obviously the Liberal Party has no coherent philosophy. Individuals in it have—yes, of course; I would not deny for one moment,

for example, that the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson) has a coherent philosophy, and I also have no doubt in the wide world that the hon. member, the newest front bencher of the Liberal Party, from Fort William (Mr. Chapple) has a coherent philosophy.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): He likes you. You should not say that.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not dislike him.

But if anybody can, by the wildest stretch of his imagination, conceive of the philosophy of the hon. member for Dovercourt being in the same party with the philosophy of the hon. member for Fort William, then I invite him to contemplate it further.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party now is willing to fasten on anything—

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): And everything.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, and everything—no matter how contradictory it is with previous statements if they think it will catch votes.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Oh, the hon. member is all upset.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not upset.

Mr. Reaume: He is worried about something.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, as the people of Ontario contemplate the growing confusion in the Liberal Party it is impossible for them to place confidence in such blatant political opportunism offered under the guise of policy. And just in case anybody may have forgotten some of the detail in relation to what I am talking about, I just want to document a few cases.

For example, I remember 5 or 6 years ago when the hon. leader of the Liberal Party, the present leader, was aspiring to that position, he was talking constantly about voluntary farm markets. He said he did not like this business of compulsion, it was a bad business. Of course, none of us likes compulsion. We all would like income tax to be on a voluntary basis, too. For a time even after he became leader, before those in the farm wing of the party—and I suspect the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) got after him—he was persisting in his intellectual—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): And fair, and honest.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Ill-informed.

Mr. MacDonald: I agree it is honest. This is the thing about the hon. leader of the Opposition, he is honest in his convictions even when they are wrong. However, those who come from the rural parts of the province finally got to him and said, "Look, John, for heaven's sake, lay off this business of voluntary farm markets". So now he has rationalized that 19th century philosophy of his to an acceptance of compulsory farm markets. That is one example.

Now, let us recall the question of sales tax. Of course, the hon. gentleman promoted it for years. He not only promoted it for years but there was that magnificent week about a year or so ago when on the Monday he was still arguing for a sales tax, then on the Tuesday they must have had a caucus meeting, or maybe Wednesday morning, and they pulled the rug out from under him, and on the Wednesday they had the hon. member for Grey South get up and deliver the party's policy that they were opposed to sales tax, and that night on TV the hon. leader of the Opposition went to the whole province saying he was opposed to sales tax.

Now, that is rather remarkable. In 72 hours he did a complete—

Mr. Reaume: He is a remarkable man.

Mr. MacDonald: In this capacity, in this way, I acknowledge he is remarkable, beyond comparison.

Let us take the Medicare issue. Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party, through their hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) introduced a resolution in the House calling for a province-wide prepaid Medicare programme—that was the gist of it anyway. I listened very carefully and tried to discover what kind of a programme it was going to be. Was it a government-sponsored programme, or was it going to be a programme worked out in true Liberal-Conservative fashion in conjunction with the medical association and the insurance companies?

We could not find out, so we decided that we would throw the cat in among the pigeons. We moved an amendment, just two words, calling upon the government to establish a "government-sponsored" prepaid Medicare programme. And what happened? The whole tenor of the debate changed. The Liberals climbed into bed with the Tories, where they usually should be, and argued for an hour and a half against our amendment for a government-sponsored programme.

At the end of the hour and a half when the government resorted to its usual technique of moving adjournment of the debate so that

the resolution would die, they were as confused on tactics as they were on policy and they voted with government to kill their own motion.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): The hon. leader of the Opposition told me they did not know what they were doing, I remember that.

Mr. MacDonald: Two years have elapsed and now they discover that a government-sponsored health insurance programme is acceptable. For how long?

Mr. Reaume: What is the matter with that?

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder when it will be changed again. How can the people of the province of Ontario place any confidence in this kind of vacillation, a policy which has no relation to anything excepting expediency?

Mr. Wintermeyer: The people of Ontario have more common sense than the hon. member thinks.

Mr. MacDonald: I agree that they have and he will find that out at the next election.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to make two observations at this time. The first is this, that I do not think the member speaking requires any assistance. The second is that I try at all times to see that every speaker has order and as few interruptions and side talk as possible. I certainly want to keep it that way, and I would ask the member to bear this in mind.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that brief interlude. I appreciate catching my breath.

The next point that I want to draw to the attention of the House is the question of educational finance. For years the hon. leader of the Opposition has been going around the province saying that the answer to the question on educational finance and coping with this burden is that the provincial government should pay 100 per cent of the cost of education.

Mr. Thomas: That is what the man said.

An hon. member: You are right. That's what he said.

Mr. MacDonald: He says that is right. This is an interesting interjection. The Liberals are just confirming my statement of history up until now.

Well, in September of this year he went even further and this was, to my mind, proof of the fact that maybe there was a little thinking going on in the Liberal Party. They had added to their policy.

Not only was government to pay 100 per cent of educational tax but they finally got around to facing up to where they were going to get the \$300 million involved to do this, and he suggested one way in which they could do it, namely, the provincial government in exchange would take over the commercial and the industrial assessment for education from the local municipality and transfer it to Queen's Park. Now, this was the policy up until—oh, I do not know, I suppose about 10.30 in the evening of October 14. By October 15 it changed.

Mr. Wintermeyer: It was the 13th.

Mr. MacDonald: All right, the 13th, the hon. leader of the Opposition ought to know when the change took place.

Now, it is a foundation programme, by strange coincidence—I do not know what the Liberals would do if they could not pick up their ideas from our programme—but by strange coincidence, the foundation programme had been publicly discussed as part of our programme for some weeks and months; it had gone before our convention the week before and had been adopted and presented to the people of the province of Ontario.

We know now where the Liberal Party stands on this issue. At the moment the question is where will it be standing six months from now?

However, Mr. Speaker, they do not seem to have taken your advice, sir. The really classic case of a statement of policy which lasted something like 72 hours was the proposed law to outlaw strikebreakers. I happened to be down at Niagara Falls and saw this enunciation of policy. It was characteristic of the enunciation of Liberal policy.

The fact of the matter is that the hon. leader of the Opposition was backed into a corner with an embarrassing question and the words came out—I do not know whether he really knew what came out—but I can assure hon. members that when many of the Liberals took a look at what came out, they were shocked beyond words. If hon. members ever saw a display of internal confusion and conflict in the party, it was what took place in the Liberal Party the following week.

And then what happened? Well, let us quote that authoritative morning journal, the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, in a story by Wilf List. This is what he said, for example:

To escape this dilemma—

which the hon. leader of the Opposition has confirmed now in his statement of yesterday

—To escape this dilemma the Liberal approach is for legislation under which the only agreement that would be considered valid after a strike would be one negotiated by a certified union that called the strike. Thus a company would not be able to sign an agreement recognized under the law with any other union or employees' association.

This, of course, was different from the original statement of policy which was banning strikebreakers.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Oh, be honest!

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, come on now; "be honest," he says. He pleads with me. He should get up off his knees. Mr. Speaker, obviously this was a reversal of policy. On Sunday we were going to have a law to ban strikebreakers, on Wednesday you cannot have a law to ban strikebreakers. That is what they said.

Now, let me go on.

The Liberals also backed the proposition that in any strike settlements, strikers would have priority in employment over workers hired while the strike was in progress.

Mr. Reaume: What is wrong with that?

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member should just listen. Let us take the next paragraph.

This would not affect the situation when a strike petered out and the union had to give up.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am quoting from the *Toronto Globe and Mail*.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I can assure you that what the hon. member is quoting from is unknown to me and I never authorized any—

Mr. Bryden: The hon. leader of the Opposition said the same thing yesterday.

Mr. Wintermeyer: That may be, but I am not responsible for what the paper said. What

I said in the House yesterday is entirely different.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

The member who originally had the floor made a statement and a reference and the member concerned made a reply on a point of privilege. Now I would ask all members of the House to give attention to the speaker. I am having difficulty hearing myself and I can assure all the members that I do not want any one member of this Legislature to have to strain and maybe impair his voice any more than any other member in order to be heard. Now I would ask the members for their co-operation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, with respect, my problem is not that I am not getting attention, it is that I am getting too much.

I want to come back to this statement, because this is very significant and I would like to have some denial from some source if this is not accurate, because the rest of the story is accurate.

This would not affect the situation when a strike petered out because the union had given up.

So what have we got, Mr. Speaker? You have a situation in which the Liberal Party will not now pass a law to outlaw strikebreakers—they reversed that part of it—but if perchance the strike peters out because the union gives up, then of course you cannot implement all of the other so-called assistance or protection for workers into effect, because the union has gone.

In other words, this is an open invitation—in the usual ill thought through fashion of the Liberal Party—this is an open invitation—

An hon. member: The hon. member should ask some of his labour leaders on that.

Mr. MacDonald: I have. This is an open invitation, Mr. Speaker, for that small minority of ruthless, anti-union management—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reaume: Aw, what is the hon. member talking about?

Mr. MacDonald: —to fight against a union until the union's resources are depleted and it peters out. Then the union has gone and, with it, all the workers' rights.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege and I will state my point of

privilege. The hon. member for York South is attributing statements to me that I never did make.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, the hon. gentleman has no point at all—I have never attributed any statement to him, I am commenting on a story in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* with regard to the switch in Liberal policy—

Mr. Wintermeyer: I tell the hon. member the story is unfounded in fact.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe, Mr. Speaker, the appropriate comment is to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that he should have enough courage to acknowledge that he has reversed about six policies in the last three years.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think the best comment on this was a comment carried in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* editorial when they said: "The Liberal members of the Legislature realized the weaknesses in the plan when they approved it"—this is the reversal plan—"but their aim was not so much to make sense as to wriggle out of the awkward corner into which Mr. Wintermeyer had led them."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to spend too much more time on this, but I want to conclude with what I would call the text for my comments. One of my operatives drew to my attention in a book called "The Dramatic Event", which is a compilation of reviews by one of the best known American reviewers of plays, Eric Bentley. In it he has a comment on liberalism, which is uncannily accurate and apt with the situation at the moment. It is this, I quote from page 207:

There is a kind of liberalism which is safely reactionary. It offers you all the soft and self-congratulatory emotion of reformism without demanding that you should run the risks. The chief trick of the pseudo-liberal is to fare boldly forward towards the heroic goal, then to slink quietly off at the last moment and hope that no one is looking.

That, I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is the most magnificent description of the latest reversal of policy by the Liberals on their so-called strike-breaking law. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this morning when I read my favourite morning newspaper I noticed that they had "Your Morning Smile" which said: What is a politician, Daddy? and the reply was: A politician is a man who shakes your

hand before the election and shakes your confidence afterwards.

An hon. member: NDP, the hon. member means.

Mr. MacDonald: I think it was highly appropriate that the *Toronto Globe and Mail* should have carried that on the front page of the paper in which they carried the speech of the hon. Liberal leader yesterday.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, it is sad and disillusioning, I know, for traditional supporters of the Liberal Party. On the one hand they see the decline of the Tories and the opportunity, at long last, for the Liberal Opposition to get out of the political wilderness. On the other hand, they are appalled at the weakness and the confusion in the party's leadership. By election time, Mr. Speaker, I venture the prediction that these intelligent people—I agree they are intelligent, as the hon. leader of the Opposition described them a few moments ago—will recognize that the New Democratic Party offers the only constructive—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: —the only constructive alternative to the Tories. To the extent that the Liberals have any constructive alternative, they took it from our policy.

But, Mr. Speaker, as these traditional Liberals contemplate changing their vote at the polls, they have this consolation: They are not forsaking the Liberal Party for the Liberal Party has already forsaken them.

An hon. member: Hear! Hear!

Mr. MacDonald: This is the important point because any relationship between the policy and the procedures of the Liberal Party today and the basic principles, those great historic basic principles of Liberalism, is purely coincidental. The genuine Liberals are now heading into the New Democratic Party.

An hon. member: Let's get on with the election.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

I would point out to all members that it is quite early in this Throne Speech debate and that all members will have a full opportunity to answer any questions which may

be raised and so forth. But, please, for the order of the House, let us have one speaker at one time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, in contrast to this confusion and uncertainty of Liberal policy, the New Democratic policy is frankly and clearly stated. This past fall we held a convention in October attended by some 800-900 delegates from across this province—

An hon. member: The hon. member had them all there.

Mr. MacDonald: At this convention, we had the product of a year of research and discussion in the preparation of a programme. Now, I acknowledged, Mr. Speaker, that many of the hon. members in this House, outside of this group, will not at least publicly admit that there is any part of this programme that they agree with, but they will have to admit this, that it has a coherent underlying philosophy, that is presented as a unified whole. It is not simply a grab bag of election gimmicks. It has been presented far enough in advance of the election that the people will have an opportunity to study it and not spend their time wondering what the policy was last week, next week and the week afterwards.

An hon. member: They have made up their minds already. We are all ready to go.

Mr. MacDonald: But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, when listening to some of the hon. members who criticize what is in the New Democratic Party policy, I wonder how much they really disagree. What is very interesting to us in the New Democratic Party now is to notice the extent to which the things which are so violently criticized today are chosen tomorrow for presentation by the older parties.

An hon. member: The only good thing—does the hon. member want to join us?

Mr. MacDonald: For example, I have listened for years to the old parties decrying the role of public ownership in our economy; this was the inefficient way to do things. One even wondered on occasion whether or not the Liberal Party, for example, would not like to put our great Hydro system back under private ownership, if hon. members listen to them on occasion.

An hon. member: This is an historic—

Mr. MacDonald: And now it is discovered that the Liberal Party, after taking this doctrinaire free-enterprise approach, has

finally come out in favour of Crown corporations to build secondary industry. They now recognize the historic role of the ONR as a publicly owned system to develop north-eastern Ontario.

An hon. member: Who started Trans-Canada Air Lines?

Mr. MacDonald: We listen, for example, to the Conservative Party advancing their particular version of economic planning, of coming forward with funds that are going to make available \$100 million—and when that is gone there will be another \$100 million—to guarantee loans from the normal financial institutions. In other words, when private enterprise will not undertake the risks involved, then the government is going to take the risk. In other words, a final recognition of the need for planning and direction, even if somewhat fleeting and inaccurate and with no real grasp of the necessity of economic planning—playing around on the periphery of the problem, as my hon. friend from Woodbine quite effectively pointed out yesterday when we were discussing that bill.

We have listened, Mr. Speaker, to the old parties decrying the alleged lack of concern for the rights of the individual by socialist parties. And yet the fact of the matter is, if hon. members will look at history—if the hon. member for Sudbury wants to take a look at history—they will find that it is the socialist parties across the world which are coping with the problem of protecting the rights of the individual in the kind of complicated society we live in today. It is the socialist parties which are taking the lead in bringing such things as, for example, the public defender to defend a person who has no access to defence before the courts. Bringing in Ombudsmen.

An hon. member: What channel is that on?

Mr. MacDonald: Ombudsmen, as in the Scandinavian countries, and now in New Zealand, to assist the individual in coping with the great bureaucracy of modern government. It is interesting to note another point. After you have listened to people complaining about the injustice involved in a situation where a citizen cannot sue the government here in the province of Ontario without first getting permission—the government is in a position beyond the law, above the law, in this respect. It is interesting to recall in the province of Saskatchewan, years ago this anomaly was removed so that a

citizen can sue the government just as he can sue anybody else. These are things, for example, which are part of history in the programme of the kind of party with which the New Democratic Party is proud to be associated.

We have heard of the constant decrying of our mad dash towards the welfare state. We even heard it, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. leader of the Opposition two or three years ago. Yet we now find that they are all joining in this mad dash towards the welfare state, adopting Medicare and other vague suggestions of the social security measures that are required. They were opposed to them then, they were opposed to them until they found that it is necessary to adopt them to be able to go out and get votes and win the support of the people in the next election. So their adoption of them, Mr. Speaker, contains elements of hypocrisy and expediency.

I think once again, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the province of Ontario, with their great fund of common sense, are going to recognize that the people who are likely to put these things into effect are the people who pioneered them.

An hon. member: The Liberal Party.

Mr. MacDonald: The people who had the conviction, the people who are willing to fight through against the kind of opposition that we face when we go to put some of them into effect.

However, there are some things, Mr. Speaker, in our programme that the old parties are not even willing to consider yet. For example, the whole programme for the protection of the consumer, which is the dominant theme in the New Democratic Party programme adopted this fall.

As far as the old parties are concerned, once again they pick bits and pieces of legislation; they may protect the consumer in some particular aspect of his defenceless position. But, I repeat, this is the underlying theme of our programme. It is something in which we are convinced the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada are years behind the leadership of many other countries.

The fact of the matter is there is no more defenceless and vulnerable group in our society than consumers. And this is not any one group, this is all of us; we are all consumers.

Whatever our age, whatever our income, whatever our status in life, we are consumers

and we face the relentless pressure of the market-place, of slick advertising, of high-pressure salesmanship, of all of the gimmicks that are dreamed up to relieve us of our hard-earned dollars.

It is part and parcel of our philosophy, Mr. Speaker, in the New Democratic Party, that when the individual—and I am now back to the individual—finds that he cannot cope with problems that he has to face in his day-to-day life, and cannot get an effective solution, it is legitimate for him to turn to his government and to seek a collective solution to what experience has proven that he, as an individual, cannot work out on his own. This is what in essence we propose to do in our consumer programme.

Mr. Speaker, there is one area in which the government will take action—in the establishment of a consumer bureau, such as my hon. friend here from Oshawa has been introducing by way of a resolution for consideration by this House for years. A bureau which is not going to regiment people, which is not going to police people, a bureau which is going to do essentially the same thing as the Consumers' Union in the United States. In other words it is going to do a basic research job, an informational job, to get the information to the people so that they can protect themselves when they go out into the marketplace to buy.

This is a very great necessity. This is something that the consumers' association is doing to a degree, but it is not something that cannot be done on a purely voluntary basis. In our view it can be done by the establishment of an independent agency by the government, with these research and informational tasks to be undertaken.

Secondly, we feel that the government has to move into a considerable range of protecting the consumer on the credit front against second mortgages with interest rates which are difficult to discover until you find that you are being fleeced and are going to be fleeced for a great length of time. Faced as we are with the prospect that the one bulwark that the government has had in protecting the consumer in this field—The Unconscionable Transactions Act—has now been challenged before the courts, I think it is even more necessary that this government should move towards the establishment of this protection for the consumer.

However, Mr. Speaker, in addition to what the government should be doing on behalf of people, because the government is our agency, there are things that we are convinced

the people can and should do for themselves. I turn, for example, to the great co-operative movement of the province of Ontario. One of the regrettable things in the Dominion of Canada, and in the province of Ontario, is that the consumer wing of the co-operative movement has never developed to the same extent that it has done in many other countries of the world.

Indeed, the whole co-operative movement in the province of Ontario, while it has developed and expanded, when you examine the figures you will discover that their expansion has only been sufficient to retain the same percentage of the overall economic activity that is going on in the province. They have not been expanding; and they have not been expanding, Mr. Speaker, because there are people with the kind of philosophy as the hon. member for Fort William who are constantly trying to get tax laws which would cripple them, who are not giving the kind of co-operation which is possible and, I think, should be given to the co-operative movement, to assist people to go out and help themselves. This is what a New Democratic government would do.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go into the rest of our programme today, because we will have many other opportunities to deal with it. But I repeat that the consumer theme is underlying, not just at the level of what we may buy in terms of food and clothing, but is underlying in terms of recognizing that a consumer is a fully rounded citizen and that there are other things that must be met.

For example, we have offered a bold new approach in municipal government to get away from the horse-and-buggy approach that we are left with by the government across the floor of the House. And this will meet many of the vital needs of our people, the citizens—the whole educational programme, the financing of education so that we can get a greater equity in the financing and at the same time can remove the shame of the lack of equality of educational opportunity which characterizes the province of Ontario as comparing rural with city, or separate schools with public schools.

We feel that there should be the provision, on an economic basis, of insurance in many ways that are not now available today. Not only Medicare, but a sickness and accident benefit programme, an auto insurance programme.

We recognize that all of this can be met only if we have an expanding, thriving

economy, so the third part of our programme deals with "Wealth for our people" and the kind of economic planning which is a genuine economic planning and not the toying with it in the fashion that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) is indulging in at the present time. We are convinced that this would provide us with enough wealth to meet all these needs of our people.

In other words, it is a clearly stated programme, it is a unified whole, it has an underlying philosophy, there is no mystery as to what it is, and there is no prospect that it is going to be changed tomorrow—because political winds appear which, with a change, may mean you get more votes by some sort of a shift.

I was interested, Mr. Speaker, in one aspect of the comments of the hon. leader of the Opposition which is pretty basic, namely the striving of the working people of this province on the industrial and the farm front to be able to get more effective collective bargaining rights. I was interested, for example when he was referring to the chaos that we have at the moment in the milk marketing industry. He reminded the House, for example, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) had said last spring that if the various groups in the milk industry did not get together we would have chaos. They did not get together effectively, so we have chaos.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think an analysis that is something more than superficial should end precisely there—and that the government get off quite so scot-free. We have chaos at the moment. We have chaos because this committee that was brought together came up with a marketing plan which obviously did not have the support of enough of the producers. It was going to be defeated, so they could not move to a vote. But Mr. Speaker, what should not be missed is that there is no doubt in the world that, in its inimitable way this government, behind the scenes, through its friends in the milk industry, shaped the plan which this committee came out with. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this government cannot just dismiss the plan, because the plan is very much their plan, and they are the creators of the chaos.

There will be many other opportunities to come to grips with this. For example—and quite rightly—there is the point made by the hon. leader of the Opposition about the strange situation of establishing a milk formula, and about going to the eleventh hour when suddenly the hon. Minister steps in and in effect cancels the implementation of

the price increase that was going to be brought there.

Here we live in a province where you have one group of people, for example, who have to live with a formula that is worked out scientifically to give them an increase because of their costs of production; and when they get to the point where they are entitled to this increase the hon. Minister steps in and cancels it. And yet in this same month we have another group, the doctors, who without any negotiation come up with an increase in their fee schedule, the PSI plan, and nothing can be done about it at all.

The hon. Prime Minister assured us yesterday that the government cannot intervene in this kind of thing, that this would be equivalent to intervening with an agreement that had been entered into by a union and management, surely a completely irrelevant comment because there was no collective bargaining process involved before the PSI rate came into effect.

However, Mr. Speaker, what really puzzled me, in listening to the hon. leader of the Opposition yesterday was his suggestion—if I take the implication of his comment accurately—that one reason why this committee had failed was because on the committee representing the four groups of milk producers the government had failed to include the milk distributors.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I find myself almost incapable of grasping the confusion in Liberal thinking. Why, in heaven's name, when a group of producers are asked to sit in a committee and come to a conclusion with regard to a marketing plan to market their product, would the milk distributors have any right sitting around the table at all?

Mr. Whicher: Because they pay the cheque.

Mr. MacDonald: Because they pay the cheque, the hon. member says. Here is a milk distributor who confirms exactly what I meant. This is the equivalent of saying, Mr. Speaker, that when a group of workers are going to sit down and decide on the union of their choice the person who should be sitting down with them is management. Of all the fatuous propositions I ever heard!

In fact, it is rather significant, Mr. Speaker—and at least in this respect it is a coherent philosophy, that the Liberal Party is advancing—that the Liberal Party at the present time is talking about labour-management councils. If I may borrow the phrase that the hon. leader of the Opposition is so fond of using now and then—"platitudinous"—may

I say that if there is anything platitudinous it is this reiterated plea that we must have co-operation between management and labour. Of course we must have co-operation between management and labour. But Humphrey Mitchell, 20 years ago, was going around peddling the proposition of labour-management councils being an effective agency to provide this kind of co-operation.

An hon. member: Who was Humphrey Mitchell?

Mr. MacDonald: Who was Humphrey Mitchell? There is a Liberal who is really on his toes. Mr. Speaker, the recent comment of Carl Goldenberg when he was speaking before the Empire Club, was:

Mediation or voluntary arbitration by third parties would be the more civilized methods, but since mutual confidence has not yet replaced mutual suspicion, I am afraid that the required degree of civilization has not yet been attained.

I would apply the same thing to this proposition of labour-management councils because, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to consider for a moment exactly what this means. Throughout the province of Ontario much fewer than one-half of the people who are entitled to be in unions are in unions. So if you are going to set up labour-management councils, Mr. Speaker, with management on one side and unions on the other side so that they can co-operate, how are you going to do it among the one-half who are not now organized, to say nothing of the futility of bringing in those who are organized but who are very weak?

In other words, a labour-management council that involves a strong established union with a strong established corporation is fine, but a labour-management council for the half of the people who are not organized at all is nonsense. How are you going to get them there? And here, Mr. Speaker, is the wonderful thing about it. Some time soon somebody in the Liberal Party is going to waken up to the fact in their confused thinking, what this in effect means is that they are advocating compulsory unionism, because how are you going to get them into the labour-management council unless you have compulsory unionism?

Mr. Speaker, I venture a prediction. When that idea dawns and emerges from their thinking, just watch the internal strife in the party, with the Royce Friths and the Norman Matthews and the Bill Hendersons, and even the editorial writers on the *Toronto Daily*

Star as they try to get the Liberal Party back on the track again, because this, in effect, is what they are advocating.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am rather impressed with the relative quiet with which the Liberals took this. It obviously contained an idea that had not yet occurred to them.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to move on, but before I move on, the hon. gentleman, the new front bencher for the Liberal Party, the hon. member for Fort William, interjected and said there was nothing new. The thing that intrigues me about this kind of proposal from the Liberals is—I listened to the hon. member for Fort William getting up and rant, no other term could describe it, about The Industrial Standards Act. Now the whole function of The Industrial Standards Act is to take an industry as a whole and to establish labour-management co-operation and come to a collective agreement which will apply to everybody, even the company that has not got a union.

An hon. member: When did he do that?

Mr. MacDonald: When did he do that? Read *Ilansard* for last year.

So some time soon perhaps we will expect the Liberal Party to sort their thinking out on that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to a final topic which is paramount in the needs of consumers in the province of Ontario, and is certainly the liveliest issue in Canadian politics today—and that is Medicare.

Everybody is promising it, but I want to suggest now, Mr. Speaker, that the public are entitled to something more than vague promises. Those who are not intent on perpetuating the traditional game of playing politics with this issue will present a detailed statement of what their plan involves and exactly how it is to be financed. On behalf of the New Democratic Party of Ontario I propose to present such a detailed statement today. But first it is necessary to provide some background.

The reason for the lively interest in Medicare is beyond dispute, Mr. Speaker. For years a great majority of the Canadian people have sought it; as far back as 1945, the Gallup poll reported almost 80 per cent in favour of it. But the old parties have blocked its implementation either through outright opposition or through promises that were never fulfilled.

But, Mr. Speaker, the triumph of the New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan has changed all this. Make no mistake about it:

if the New Democratic Party had not succeeded in Saskatchewan, the Medicare issue would be a dead issue; it would be as dead as a doornail. It would be dead notwithstanding the needs and desires of the Canadian people. But when the Saskatchewan government triumphed in spite of all the odds, the Canadian people took new heart. The public pressure has mounted until, here in Ontario, every party is now advocating its particular version of Medicare. We created the bandwagon, and they have now all climbed onto it.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party welcomes all these developments. It means that victory for one of the most important social security measures is now close at hand. For over 30 years, since the CCF was launched in 1932, we have been leading this fight. The prospect that this vital need of the Canadian people is finally going to be met is reason for great rejoicing.

But if there is one thing the experience of the past 40 years or more has proven, it is that an old party promise of health insurance is no guarantee that it is going to materialize. If circumstances permit, those promises will go by the boards once again—just as they have for nearly two generations. So the battle has to be fought until victory is secure, Mr. Speaker, and let me assure you that is what the New Democratic Party will do.

The reason why nothing can be taken for granted is emphasized by the eleventh-hour conversion of both old parties, and the vacillation in policy that led up to these conversions.

Two years ago, as I said earlier, the Liberal Party in this Legislature voted with the Tories in opposition to a government-sponsored provincial Medicare programme. They took essentially the same stand then as Ross Thatcher took throughout the whole battle in the province of Saskatchewan in 1962. As late as August this year, the hon. leader of the Liberal Party in Ontario, as reported in a press conference up in Port Arthur, was making snide comments about the Saskatchewan plan, with his usual references to "bureaucracy", "socialism", "state control"—indeed he repeated it yesterday. Then suddenly, Mr. Speaker, in mid-October, the Liberals profess to have changed their mind, and now they favour a government-sponsored plan.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberals have forsaken the various plans which they had been promoting for over 40 years. They have now another new plan which calls

for the federal and provincial governments to finance jointly doctors' bills for children of 16 years and under and for older folk, while employed adults would be expected to pay their own doctors' bills up to a stated figure, with some help from the public purse for big bills. In other words, Mr. Speaker, back to a version of catastrophic coverage so dear to the heart of many Liberals.

Where the Liberal Party stands amidst all this confusion is anybody's guess. And what is more important, even when their policy is clarified beyond the basic principles repeated by their hon. leader yesterday, their record indicates clearly that it cannot be accepted as a firm promise but merely an election gimmick subject to change without notice.

For example, in this connection there are a couple of editorial comments I found looking through my files that I thought were so apt that perhaps they should be brought out here. The *Toronto Globe and Mail* on October 17 commented editorially with regard to the Liberal reversal of policy on this. They said:

The Liberal Party has been wildly inconsistent in its approach to Medicare, has moved within months from promising little to promising all and is obviously concerned only with using Medicare as a tool to garner votes.

Very right. But, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most interesting comments, and a very serious analytical comment, was a comment that appeared in the Stratford *Beacon-Herald*.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Made by Wyatt Earp of Saskatchewan.

Mr. MacDonald: I said it was an intelligent comment.

On October 16, Mr. Speaker—Tuesday, October 16—the Stratford paper under the title of

VARIOUS KINDS OF LIBERAL

had this to say editorially:

This new plank in the Ontario Liberal platform should certainly illustrate one point, that is that the word "Liberal" has to be stretched a long way to cover all the varieties of political gospel which are preached under the auspices of the 11 "Liberal" parties in Canada. When a plan similar to the new Ontario Liberal plan was introduced in Saskatchewan the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan fought violently against it and Ross Thatcher, the Saskatchewan provincial leader dramatized his opposition by rounding up reporters and

photographers to see him kick the door of the provincial Legislative chamber. The palm of the Liberal hand is given in Ontario to an idea that got the toe of the Liberal boot in Saskatchewan.

While two provincial Liberal parties march in opposite directions, neither one of them seems to be in tune on the subject of health care plans with the national Liberal leadership. In the Dominion election campaign this year the Liberal Party had a different kind of medical care scheme in its programme. The essence of the national Liberal plan is that the Dominion and the provinces would jointly raise the money to pay doctors' bills for patients under 16 years of age, for the unemployed, and for some categories of elderly people. Employed adults would be expected, under this plan, to pay their own doctors' bills up to a stated annual total with some help from the taxpayers for very big bills.

Then later they say this:

This scheme will probably be allowed—talking of the national scheme

—to fade away and disappear. But at the moment it is the official policy of the Liberal leadership at Ottawa. It bears little resemblance to the 1962 Thatcher policy, summer vintage, or to the 1962 Wintermeyer policy, autumn vintage. Canadian voters fortunately have always displayed a nimble-minded ability to cope with this curious fragmentation of Canadian political policies. They have to reckon with 11 different Liberal platforms, 11 different Conservative platforms, and four varieties of Social Credit.

The only one of the four parties which seems to preach a reasonably uniform doctrine all across the country is the New Democratic Party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so that Liberal blood pressure can subside to normal, let us turn to the Conservative position. Yesterday, sir, the hon. leader of the Opposition accused the government of not being very clear in their Medicare policy. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt as to where the Tories stand on this issue. Their policy is very clear. It is wrong, but it is clear. In fact, it is clearly wrong.

They have accepted completely the demands of the private insurance companies and the medical association. Essentially these demands are that the government should provide coverage paid from the public purse for those who cannot otherwise meet their medical bills or pay the premiums. This will

involve a humiliating extension of the category of indigent to include those in the marginal income groups. As for the rest of the population, we are all to be left to the tender mercies of the private carriers.

Past experience has proven that this is not good enough. Indeed, the very fact that it is not good enough has created the irresistible demand for a full Medicare programme. It is not good enough because the rates are too high. I bring as a witness no other man than the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario.

When PSI announced their last increase in rates scheduled to go into effect January, the hon. Prime Minister was reported as being disappointed. In fact he is quoted directly as saying: "This will mean just an added burden on the people; I don't like to see it happen". And yet now, Mr. Speaker, the government proposes to accept these high rates; even more, to place their stamp of approval on them and to offer them to the people of Ontario as their medical insurance plan.

Now we in the New Democratic Party strongly feel that this is not good enough. Our programme calls for the establishment of a Medicare programme that will be based on the following six principles:

1. Everyone will be covered.
2. A comprehensive range of services of high quality will be provided.
3. Costs will be equitably distributed, with each person or family paying a premium which even the marginal income groups can afford, or having the premium paid on their behalf if they are in receipt of public assistance of any kind—with the remainder being met from public revenues raised on the progressive basis of ability to pay.
4. There will be a public responsibility and accountability in the administration of the plan, through a medical care commission on which the profession will be represented, which will be responsible to the Legislature through the Minister of Health.
5. Medical decisions will be made by the medical profession.
6. A doctor will be able to practise completely outside the plan if he so desires.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic plan will not interfere with the present practice of medicine—with the doctor-patient relationship. A patient will be free to choose his doctor, subject to the choice available in the community; and a doctor will be free to choose his patients. An effort will be made through the plan to maintain and increase the quality of services provided and,

through various incentives, to extend the availability of these services to presently under-doctored areas.

The main objective of the scheme will be to make the services of modern medical science available by a system of payment which will remove the spectre of crippling medical costs. The cost of the plan will be equitably shared in accordance with ability to pay, with each person making at least a minimum contribution through a premium which will be within the means of everyone who is working.

So much for the general principles, Mr. Speaker. I draw to your attention that this is all the Liberal Party presented to the House yesterday, despite the 40 years that they have been playing around with this subject. But general principles are not good enough. As I stated earlier, now that every party is advocating its own particular brand of which it calls Medicare, the electorate will quite rightly demand that each party provide the details of its plan and its financing and that is what I propose to do today.

But first, this word of explanation. For some time now the New Democratic Party of Ontario has had a Medicare committee studying this question. It is chaired by George Cadbury, an economist and businessman, son of a distinguished English family, a man who had spent years working with the Saskatchewan planning board immediately after the war, with the United Nations in many countries throughout the world, and in Jamaica when the People's National Party was in power.

Among those on the committee are three medical doctors, David Archer representing labour, Len Laventure representing agriculture, Dr. Ted Goldberg, a research assistant who has just completed a doctorate in this field, and the hon. member for Woodbine and myself from our caucus.

Our committee has met, and is planning to meet, with every group which has sought to present its views, or whose views we have sought—including the Ontario Medical Association, the Ontario Federation of Medical Co-ops, the College of Pharmacy, and so on. It is our intention to seek the co-operation and assistance of every and any person or group which has had experience in this field or which would be involved in or affected by a Medicare programme in Ontario.

To date, the greater proportion of the committee's work has been devoted to considering the basic problem of financing our Medicare plan. There is a wealth of material

to draw from countries across the world, that have had years of experience with health plans. Members of our committee, such as our chairman, George Cadbury, and two of the doctors meeting with us, bring first-hand knowledge of many of these countries.

We have had, of course, the benefit of the Saskatchewan experience, both as reported by the Thompson Commission and The Department of Health since the plan went into effect out there. Finally, there is available the full range of income tax statistics for doctors' income, and we have made a particular point of going behind the published figures to check and to correct any factors in those statistics which could lead to inaccurate or false calculations. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that countless hours have been spent by competent and experienced persons so that we are as certain as is humanly possible that our calculations are correct insofar as experience elsewhere and available Ontario statistics can provide a guide.

I am not going to burden the House, Mr. Speaker, with a great array of detailed figures. Suffice it to say that there are two ways to approach a calculation of financial costs for a Medicare programme. One is to work from the gross income received by doctors in Ontario—statistics which are available from the income tax tabulations. The other is to work from the cost now being incurred from the proportion of our population covered by some such plan as PSI, to what that cost would be if services were available to the whole population. One method provides a check against the other.

We have found that a range of costs emerges from these calculations. This is inevitable because there are a great number of factors which affect cost which we have taken into account. Some of these are the relative proportion of urban and rural population; sex and age distribution; the proportion of female population in the age group of 19-34; the proportion of single young men; and probable increased utilization.

We have deliberately picked the highest cost figure at which we have arrived. We are convinced that it is greater than experience is likely to confirm, but in order that the people of Ontario should be under no illusions as to the cost involved, we have felt that the top calculation should be used.

Our studies have revealed that this estimated cost in Ontario at the present time—which involves projections forward from the latest annual statistics available—is \$26.25

per capita for medical care, not including administration.

Our latest population figure for July, 1962, is 6,351,000. Assuming 96 per cent coverage—because approximately four per cent are otherwise covered as members of the RCMP and similar federal groups, or because they are in federal or provincial institutions of various kinds—that reduces the Ontario population figure for our purposes to 6,100,000.

At a per capita cost of \$26.25 for some 6,100,000 persons, the cost of the plan for medical service alone will be \$160,125,000.

To this must be added administration costs, and we are satisfied that \$5,000,000 a year will cover this. Machinery for collecting premiums has already been established under the hospital plan and the addition of medical care will result in very little increase in collection costs. Our figure of \$5,000,000, therefore, will be available entirely for processing the payment of medical bills. If anything, it should be more than sufficient for this. That brings the total cost to \$165,125,000.

So much for the cost. How can these revenues be raised?

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that these revenues will not represent a new expenditure for those who are presently paying the bills, but for the most part they will be a redirection of present expenditures. The government will merely serve as a collection agency.

We proposed that the necessary revenues be raised as follows:

First, there will be a premium payment of 30 cents per week for a single person and 60 cents per week for a family, with or without children and regardless of the number of children. In other words, we propose that premiums should be paid in respect of adults only; there will be no premiums for children. We have used the 1961 census figures on the number of families and adults in Ontario, projected them to the present and taken 96 per cent of the figure at which we arrived, for reasons already given. This indicates that our proposed premiums will yield \$57.38 million a year.

Second, there will be a 3 per cent corporation tax. A study of the federal and provincial figures on the corporation tax in Ontario indicates that it is now yielding \$16.6 million for each one per cent, so that 3 per cent will produce \$49.8 million. It is our belief that corporate income, which represents a growing proportion of our income, should meet approximately one-third of the

cost for something as important as the health of our people.

Third, there will be a 6 per cent increase in personal income tax collections. It should be emphasized that this is not a 6 per cent increase in the federal tax rate, but rather a 6 per cent levy on the present federal tax. Under such an arrangement the federal government will be prepared to collect the tax for us. Again we have studied both federal and provincial figures on the income tax in Ontario and this indicates that each one per cent of our tax will yield \$9.7 million for a total of \$58.2 million for 6 per cent.

The effect of this will be a 6 per cent increase in all income taxes paid. If a person pays no income tax, or a small one, then his further tax will be nil or very small. Thus the progressive feature of paying in accordance with ability is built into the revenues, over and above the minimum premium payment which is paid either by the person if he or she is earning, or by the government on behalf of indigents.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the revenue picture is as follows:

From premiums	\$ 57,380,000
From 3 per cent corporation tax	49,800,000
From 6 per cent of income tax	58,200,000
	<hr/>
	\$165,380,000

just a shade over the problem which we had—

An hon. member: Somehow I do not think that is going to sell.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I also want to interject that in our reference to income tax we excluded the federal social security tax.

All of this money will be paid into a medical care fund which will be administered by the commission for the provision of medical services. The operations of the hospital services commission will of course be inte-

grated with those of the medical care commission.

To sum up, everybody in Ontario will be covered for all medical bills and the financial barrier to medical care will be removed. The minimum direct cost will be 30 cents a week for a single person and 60 cents a week for families, with these amounts being paid out of the consolidated revenue into the medical care fund in the case of people on welfare. Further costs will be raised on the basis of ability to pay. Thus the financial barrier which at present interferes with the doctor-patient relationship will be completely removed.

To illustrate how this method of raising the necessary revenues will affect people at various income levels, I have worked out a table for what is usually considered to be a representative family group, namely, a father, a mother and two dependent children. I have assumed in calculating this, Mr. Speaker, only the basic exemptions of \$2,000 for a married couple plus the \$100 for charitable contributions, which may be claimed by all whether they make any contributions or not, plus \$300 for each child eligible for family allowance. This table, Mr. Speaker—and I give a copy of it to *Hansard*, whether or not you want me to rattle off all these figures or give you the gist of it and it all go into *Hansard*. [below]

An hon. member: We will read it.

Mr. MacDonald: For example, on an income of \$3,000, the present income tax for that family is \$33. Therefore the 6 per cent of tax for Medicare will be \$1.98, which along with the annual premium of \$31.20 would mean a total Medicare payment of \$33.18.

For a family with an income of \$4,000, their income tax is \$52, 6 per cent of that for Medicare would be \$9.12, which along with the annual premium adds up to \$40.32.

Income	Income Tax	6 per cent of tax for Medicare	Annual Premium	Total Medicare payment
3,000	\$ 33.00	\$ 1.98	\$31.20	\$33.18
4,000	152.00	9.12	31.20	40.32
5,000	301.00	18.06	31.20	49.26
6,000	477.00	28.62	31.20	59.82
7,000	676.00	40.56	31.20	71.76
8,000	896.00	53.76	31.20	84.96
9,000	1128.00	67.68	31.20	98.88
10,000	1388.00	83.28	31.20	114.48
11,000	1660.00	99.60	31.20	130.80
11,500	1810.00	108.60	31.20	139.80

If I may jump up, for example, to \$7,000. Income tax for a family with the exemptions I outlined is \$676, 6 per cent of that for Medicare would be \$40.56, which along with the annual premium of \$31.20 would be a total Medicare payment of \$71.76.

If I may go to the top of my scale, Mr. Speaker, at \$11,000, a family with these exemptions will be paying an income tax of \$1,660, so that their 6 per cent for Medicare purposes would be \$99.60, which along with the annual premium adds up to \$130.80.

And that figure, as I want to point out in a moment, Mr. Speaker, for the first time begins to break even with the amount of payment that now has to be made by a person who has PSI coverage at the rates that they will be when they are increased on January 1. Only when one gets beyond \$11,500 for a family of that nature does one get to a cost for Medicare that will be beyond what they now pay into the PSI programme.

Now there will be some, Mr. Speaker, who will argue that at least part of the corporation tax will be passed on to the individual taxpayers. But I want to stress that this is a highly theoretical and debatable point. The degree to which corporation tax is passed on, if at all, varies greatly according to the competitive situation and a great many other factors. Those who think that it may be passed on to some degree can add a small indeterminate figure to the amounts I have shown in the above table for various income groups. The most that any reasonable person could arrive at is \$3 or \$4 a year.

The only plan now available in Ontario that provides anything approaching the coverage proposed in the New Democratic plan, although it falls short, is the PSI blue plan. The family rate for a person in a group under this plan is \$129 a year, and for a person who pays direct it is \$141.60 a year.

It will be seen from the table that I have just given the House, Mr. Speaker, that a person has to reach an annual income of almost \$11,000 before the rate for our plan equals the PSI group rate and his income has to exceed \$11,500 before he reaches the PSI pay-direct rate. Moreover, the PSI imposes on a family with an income of more than \$10,000 a year the liability of additional billing by specialists.

Since PSI is by far the most economical plan presently available our plan will compare even more favourably with all others that are available on the market.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one final point

with reference to Medicare with which I want to deal, and that is the attitude of the medical profession. It is a common practice now for spokesmen of both old parties to refer to the alleged mishandling of the situation in Saskatchewan by the government and to conclude that any different handling would have secured the earlier co-operation of the medical profession. The facts simply do not substantiate this contention.

No profession was ever consulted more fully than the medical profession in Saskatchewan. They had been sitting for 10 years—from 1951—on a sickness survey committee in Saskatchewan. When the government announced its intention in 1959 to proceed to Medicare, their co-operation was sought. When the bill was first introduced in the Legislature earlier in 1960, prior to the election, they requested that the government withdraw it and set up a Royal commission on which they would be represented. The government did this—the Thompson commission.

When the government was re-elected with a mandate to proceed with Medicare, it did so—and passed the bill. The doctors' stand then was they would consult and negotiate no further until the bill was withdrawn. They maintained this stand until their strike began to collapse and they agreed to work with Lord Taylor as conciliator.

Involved in this situation, Mr. Speaker, was an issue broader than Medicare and even more important. And that is the obvious threat to the basic rule of law on which our free society is built if any group—whether it be management, labour, the medical association or anybody—abrogates unto itself the right to defy the law of the land as passed by the duly elected representatives of the people. That is, in effect, what the doctors in Saskatchewan did. At this point I would like to pay tribute to the papers in many parts of Canada, if not in Saskatchewan, for recognizing this basic point.

In effect, the doctors in Saskatchewan said to the government of the province: you withdraw your bill, and until you do we shall withdraw our services no matter what danger that represents to the well-being of the people of the province.

A comparable situation in Ontario would have been if the Hydro workers had defied the law of the province as passed by this Legislature last spring and had gone on strike in spite of the law that was passed here.

Now this basic question is very relevant for Ontario—in answer to the interjection of

a moment ago. When the Liberals reversed their policy in mid-October and came out in favour of a government-sponsored plan, spokesmen for the Ontario Medical Association immediately stated that they were opposed to the Liberal proposal and if necessary they would "back up their arguments"—a vague but ominous statement. It is idle for the hon. leader of the Liberal Party to talk with glib self-assurance as he did yesterday when he said that he is confident that he will get the co-operation of the Ontario Medical Association in a plan such as he has just enunciated. In dealing with the medical profession, in light of the past, there is no alternative but to be firm.

I am certain that it is the fondest hope of every member of this Legislature that when a Medicare plan is introduced, by whatever government it is introduced, that it will have the full co-operation of the medical profession and that there will be no further ominous threats about "backing up their arguments", and in effect defying the government.

Obviously, no Medicare programme can be implemented without the co-operation of the doctors. Certainly the New Democratic Party is seeking that co-operation, through the presence of individual doctors on our Medicare committee and through consultation with the Ontario Medical Association and other groups in the work of that committee. Every legitimate fear of the doctors, either with regard to their own position in a Medicare programme, or with regard to the accepted objective of maintaining medical standards, should be met.

But on some points, Mr. Speaker, the doctors' fears have become exaggerated to the point of being pathological. They cannot set themselves above society as a whole, or above the government that is chosen by the people in a free society.

Their co-operation can and should be sought. Compromise is the essence of democracy. Every possible compromise should be considered—consistent with a maintenance of the basic principles upon which any public Medicare programme must be based, principles which we have clearly enunciated. That is the basis upon which the New Democratic Party will proceed.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Thomas):

That the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne be amended by adding thereto the following:

Furthermore this House regrets that Her Majesty's Official Opposition:

1. Has offered no clear-cut alternative to the government's inadequate programme of economic development, contenting itself with proposing a patchwork of measures instead of a comprehensive programme of economic and social planning through which the government, in co-operation with industry, labour, agriculture, consumers, municipalities and other major groups, will take all steps necessary to establish and achieve carefully considered targets of economic growth, rational allocation of resources among public and private purposes and fair distribution of wealth among all our people, and which alone will provide the basis for genuine labour-management co-operation in place of the form of company unionism proposed by the official Opposition;

2. Has, in relation to the vital issue of medical care insurance, contented itself with repeating the vague generalities that the Liberal Party has been repeating for more than 40 years, instead of advancing as an alternative to government policy specific proposals for a universal, comprehensive, publicly administered Medicare plan and for the financing of such a plan.

And this House further regrets that:

1. The government has disclosed no intention of bringing forward legislation to establish a government-operated automobile insurance plan that will cover all owners and drivers and will automatically provide compensation for accident victims and their dependents, as well as public liability insurance;

2. The government's housing programme continues to be grossly inadequate in relation to the needs of the people, particularly of senior citizens and low-income families;

3. The government still has not brought forward legislation for the redistribution of provincial constituencies, notwithstanding the assurance given by the Prime Minister to this House on April 18, 1962.

Mr. Speaker: The members have heard the amendment to the amendment, and the amendment to the amendment is now open for discussion.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member who just finished speaking would permit a question.

When he was extolling the virtues of consistency, Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me that in 1959—

Some hon. members: Ask the question!

Mr. Singer: The question is: Have you changed your approach from 1959 till now in the two methods of raising finance? In 1959 the hon. member had quite a different programme, enunciated clearly by himself and his hon. colleague from Woodbine (Mr. Bryden)—liquor, natural resources and corporations. The NDP has abandoned these things.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked from the usual morass of Liberal confusion and ignorance. We have spelled out where we will raise the revenue for financing a Medicare programme alone. We will get around later in the House, at the appropriate time, to discuss the further general revenues needed to meet the province's programme.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF ONTARIO

Clerk of the House: Second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 2, An Act to authorize the guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, last night I was discussing the principle of this bill and I suggested the following points might be considered. I suggested that there should be more elaboration on the ground rules in connection with applicants, and yet I would hope, in respect to these ground rules, that they would have a great flexibility.

If I could just dwell on the essence of having flexibility; I think it is important that there is a great variety of interests, industrial interests, in connection with the development of our country and we do not want a conformity with respect to the ground rules. I think it is the same in political life. A political party thrives when there is a variety of opinions and not a conformity; and I notice that in the party to the left they somehow could not understand that there was a variety of opinions representing many sources within my own party, while they themselves

have hailed to a rigidity of thinking dictated by such eminent philosophers as Dave Lewis and such. They cannot understand when we have diversity. And yet they did talk about compromise being the essence of democracy. I am proud that I am in a democratic party.

However, sir, I was speaking with respect to the bill and the principle of flexibility in connection with the ground rules. The other point that I made was about the fear of patronage if you do not have ground rules. As I explained to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), I myself would not want to raise this; but there was this colleague in Ottawa who had raised this, and, therefore, I thought it was such a precedent that I could also perhaps mention it.

The third point we were discussing I think was the point the hon. Minister had raised himself for discussion—whether there should be the guaranteeing of loans, of whether the province itself should actively go into making the loans. And the hon. Minister has pointed out that he did not feel that the province should go into giving direct loans because this would mean withholding certain moneys in order to make the loans. Also he felt that it would be interfering with the legitimate business of lending institutions.

I pointed out that I felt that the hon. Minister either took one of two positions. He said that there was a nobility and a business sagacity on the part of the lending institutions, but he was not quite sure about the profundity of either the nobility or the business sagacity that he was going to himself or with an advisory council, and we hope an advisory council—have a second look at any applicant who was turned down. And then he, with greater wisdom and greater business sagacity, might turn around and face the lending institution: "Look, you people have not understood how important this would be to the development of the community. We'll guarantee the loan. We know that this will be a good investment."

I suggested that this might in a way be rather insulting to some of the lending institutions, with the hon. Minister taking this approach. I further suggested that providing a provincial guarantee might not mean that the lending institutions are going to go ahead and give loans to the applicant. And I say this because the lending institutions, that is the responsible ones, want to keep a record to show that the applicants they have approved have gone ahead and are becoming successful. They feel that, in their own terms and with their own capability, if

they have looked at some applicant and decided that this applicant is a poor risk, even if the province comes in and says: "Look, we'll guarantee this loan," they should say: "It doesn't matter; we have a reputation to uphold, and we are not going to risk the record of failure just because you are going to guarantee the loan."

I notice, sir, that the hon. Minister has said—and I have not seen his speech, this is just from listening to him yesterday—that one of the reasons that he did not want to go directly into providing loans, was that he did not want to interfere with the tide of business that is carried on by lending institutions, that it was better if the government stayed out of this.

But I would suggest that if there is, in the eyes of the lending institution, a poor risk, and if that poor risk is turned down by them and the hon. Minister in his own wisdom decides that this poor risk should get a guarantee, that the hon. Minister, in providing the guarantee of the provincial government, is really pushing the lending institution into new areas. He is pushing them into taking risks which otherwise they would not.

In other words, he is actually trying to change and to interfere with the established procedure and the established areas of the lending institutions. And I would suggest, sir, if he says that he is not doing this it would mean simply that the lending institutions are perfectly free to disregard the provincial guarantee and that really the provincial guarantee is not very effective.

Well, I talked from the point of view of the attitude of the nobility and business sagacity on the part of all lending institutions. The hon. Minister talked about the fact that he discussed this bill with many lending institutions and there was going to be a happy marriage and I remember him holding his hands out eloquently and saying: "We are all going to work together." And he then went into that magnificent clarion call which he displays now and again on the future of our province. I was carried away for a while by the ecstasy which he displayed.

But the question that I ask: if I was the owner of a lending institution and the hon. Minister came along to me and said: Look, there are people coming to apply to you. I admit they have been turned down by a lot of others, but you can have them apply to you. You can see they are a poor risk so you are going to suggest that these be short-term loans and at a very high interest rate. Do not worry about that, charge them the

high interest rate, because you will get a guarantee from us that this will be paid.

In other words, an unscrupulous financial house or lending institution could really embrace the hon. Minister with warmth and take every advantage of the people involved by suggesting they will take on poor risks. But it will be the people of Ontario who will be paying interest, for they actually are taking no risk, because the province has guaranteed it.

I would suggest, therefore, that we should study very carefully this principle that the hon. Minister is suggesting, that he is not going to go into direct loaning but he is going to let the investment, or the lending, houses themselves do the loaning and get the interest.

Now the hon. Minister said as well yesterday that this was a new development. As I understand it he started saying it was new for Canada, and then said it was new for North America. I find it hard to see the new part about it. I thought of the Industrial Development Bank; of farm loans, for example, which to me are similar in principle; or the small businessmen's loans, and so on. I am trying to decide, and I am sure the hon. Minister will elucidate and enlighten me upon this, why this is new.

But if I could go into some other points, sir, in respect of it. I feel that there is one area, one group that the provincial government would consider it should actually help with loans. I can see the point of helping young industries developing, but I would think that the group they would be interested in helping are their own creatures, the municipal councils, the municipal boards. I would think that as well as this they would be certainly emphasizing that they are going to help the creatures of the provincial government.

Yet we hear nothing of this. We hear nothing of a municipal loan fund.

I would think that as well as helping small industries get started by giving them loans, it would be vitally necessary to supplement the loan to a small industry by helping the municipality in which those industries are going to develop.

My colleague, the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Singer), immediately noticed this point: the discard of the children of this government, the creatures that are the responsibility of this government, not wanting to take care of them. It reminds me of leaving a baby on the steps of a church, the arrogance

with which the government is discarding these needy children, the municipalities, and moving into another area.

Now, sir, one thing I noticed was that the New Democratic Party spoke with respect to this bill. I was listening hard to see some important points that they would make in connection with the principle or otherwise. It was hard. I noticed that their main points seemed to be in connection with the term federation. My colleague, the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher), had referred to the example of the West Indian Federation. With great anger, as though insulted deeply, the New Democratic Party stood up and vainly argued that because the federation had gone—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): More in sorrow than in anger.

Mr. Thompson: More in sorrow, he said, than in anger. At first I thought he was referring to the commonwealth federation, the CCF federation, which was gone, because I do not see why he should be greatly annoyed in connection with the term. We were taking an example of other methods to get economic conditions to help develop industries.

I would like to say, sir, that on this bill I also feel like my hon. colleague from Bruce. I feel that there is a great deal of importance attached to the—and I am sorry I have not got the bill at the moment—but I am referring to the inclusion of “may”, with respect to the advisory council. Now the hon. Minister said that this was really just a word and it should go to the committee to be studied. But I feel, like my hon. colleague, that this is a principle. It is the difference between “may” and “shall”—“shall establish an advisory committee”. To me the principle is between a Napoleonic despotism and having democratic control.

I would not suggest this, sir; that the hon. Minister would be in any way inclined in this way. I am sure there could be a Minister, all the same, who might be impatient of stupidity, who might be impatient of democracy, who might have a lust for having great control over a large empire. There might be such a Minister, sir, and if such should be the case then I would think we would all, and the hon. Minister would agree with me, rather than a permissive “may” prefer that we should have “shall”.

May I also say, sir, that the advisory committee in my opinion should be made up, not only of financiers, but should be made up of hard-headed—and I repeat that—hard-

headed businessmen who can assess the efficiency and the growth development of the industry. I would hope that the hon. Minister in his advisory committee, which I hope he “shall” convene, would have hard-headed businessmen as well as financiers.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Could I just say to the hon. member that the financial advisory committee we contemplate at the moment are those senior members of the financial community, of labour, of small business, of industrialists, of the Treasury department and The Department of Economics and Development.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Why does the bill not say so?

An hon. member: Suppose he is no longer the Minister?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. Minister explaining that to me.

The last point that I would like to mention is in paragraph 5, or clause 5, or however it is termed, describing the conditions. This is part (a), describing the conditions that shall prevail before applications for guarantees shall be considered.

I know that this is going to be elaborated on more by another speaker, but I would feel that the principle of this bill is development. I would hope that prescribing the conditions that shall prevail would not refer to the broad economic conditions around the province, but would refer more to the narrow conditions in connection with an applicant. I raise that question, because I would like to say, sir, it would seem to me the essential thing about this one arm—and I would hope the many arms in encouraging industrial development in our province—would be that it is going to give leadership when there are depressed periods, that it is going to help pull us out of this by providing loans and also by stashing this up with many other resources, as the hon. member for Bruce has suggested. I would hope that we will not hold back, that the hon. Minister in no way will feel satisfied, with only providing loans when industries cannot develop, when the conditions are not available for development.

The other point which I made yesterday, sir, I would be very interested to have the hon. Minister elaborate on. He mentioned certain areas that he would consider giving priority in connection with applications. He suggested the north, he suggested those who

would disperse industry around Ontario, and he suggested I think that those areas which were depressed—I am not sure if he used that term, but to me in my rather limited way I felt that he was referring to those areas that need more economic upsurge. I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us how he defines those areas and, if there are such areas in Ontario now, whether he would be good enough to give us the substance of his definition of this and where we particularly need to get this upsurge of industry.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, I did indicate that yesterday but it may very well be that in preparation of my hon. friend's notes he did not hear me say so. But I indicated that the economic rate of development in this province at the moment is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 6.2 per cent in terms of real dollars. This means therefore, as I indicated yesterday, that there may be areas where this is not so; two areas which I mentioned yesterday were Cornwall and Windsor.

Secondly, the unemployment rate in this province is the lowest in Canada; much lower than the national average and lower than the average in the United States. It is running at about 3.7 per cent which is, I think, almost the lowest rate since very nearly the end of the war; and the drop in unemployment last year was the most in any single year since the war. But there are certain areas where this does not apply and, again, Windsor and Cornwall qualify.

It occurs to me that one of our problems, and many people have spoken on it eloquently in this House, concerns the necessity of the diversification of industry around this province. This does not conflict in any way with the necessity of bringing together large manufacturing units, in some aspects of which I quite agree with what was said by the hon. member for Woodbine yesterday. It does seem to me that we can encourage, by way of this agency, the establishment and the creation of new or extensions of existing industries in certain areas that do not come up to the growth rate or exceed, for example, the unemployment rate in certain areas. I think these are certain standards that one can use.

Then, again, it has been quite evident to us, from our first Manufacturers Opportunity Show, that with a certain amount of standardization of component parts and perhaps whole products, we may be able to assist a number of industries in this province to re-tool and to establish themselves. And they may be, and in many cases are, in industries where the transportation distances of a few

miles will not make any difference to the ultimate price of the product which they will manufacture. These kinds of industries are industries which you can very usefully place in areas that are in need of them, where the transportation costs are not such an important differential. These are just a few aspects of it.

I mentioned to the hon. members yesterday that we are interested in the establishment of new types of industries in Ontario, in the extension of existing industries, in the creation of industries which will replace imports which are now being brought into the province, in helping industries to arise in areas where the rate of growth or the unemployment rate is either less or more favourable; the kind of activities generally which will give rise to employment in this province and which will assist us in bringing about the type of development that we are anxious to have.

Mr. Thompson: I wondered, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the hon. Minister answering,—could I ask him if he would reply to the suggestions I have raised in connection with having direct loans rather than of guaranteeing loans? Perhaps just to start this with one suggestion: When does a lender, after he has had the guarantee, have to put up a quarter of the loan? Or does he have to put up any amount?

Mr. Speaker: I believe the question, or this part of the question would be better asked when the bill is in committee. It seems to be getting to a question-and-answer period which I think is much better taken care of in committee. If the members would stay with the real principle of the bill—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I won't depart from the detail then but could I ask the hon. Minister a question? I appreciate that he had made the statement that he did not want to go into direct loans because he felt the government was already having to have money for medical insurance, or proposed medical insurance and in a number of other areas. In view of the points that I had made that with guaranteed loans some difficulties might arise, would he answer to some of those points and suggest why he is firm in not going into direct loans?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I would answer this question, but I would also want to honour the admonition of Mr. Speaker. I would say that we indicated yesterday that we first of all believe that the money will be available, and this was one of the reasons why we carried on extensive conferences and negotiations and

discussions before any bill was introduced. I also pointed out yesterday that it seemed to me that the demands upon the Treasury of this province to carry out the developmental programmes that are necessary in the fields of education, health and highways and other aspects, are going to be heavy enough in this coming year—as they have been indeed in the past—that I think it is unwise for us to additionally strain our credit in the market and therefore affect the interest rate which our taxpayers have to pay for money which is borrowed, when there are others who may be available to lend money of their own.

I think until it is evident that this is not true, that this is the course which, in the long run, will leave the greatest flexibility to the industry itself—and I incidentally would like to draw to your attention that most development money does not come from banks; we are not talking about banks.

Mr. Thompson: Well, the hon. Minister said it did.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: No, I did not say it 'did'; but I would want to leave it perfectly clear that most long-term lenders are not the banks. The banks are not the lenders of that kind of money. That kind of money will come of course from the private investment field through the stock exchange and, I should think, from the insurance companies and large pension funds that have money to invest; companies of this nature. No, I have said I think as well as I am able that, in my feeling at this stage, we are wise to work on the premise of the bill which I have presented and for the reasons which I have tried to outline.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make one or two comments on the principle of this bill, perhaps you will permit me also, sir, together with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) to say how happy I am to be back taking part in the parliamentary procedure; but mark you, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Prime Minister said it I thought he said it with a certain sense of relief that he was still there—which would not be surprising bearing in mind the agility of some of his hon. colleagues behind him.

Now, sir, the hon. Minister who introduced this bill, as I understand him, said yesterday something to the effect that we are not making direct loans for the reason that we would not want to disturb the money market or the financial institutions or disarrange the means of credit that presently exist. I would say to you, sir, for him to

say that, if I paraphrase him correctly and I hope I do, seems to propose a number of inarticulated major premises which may or may not be valid. Neither the policy of our party, and indeed the policy of our party in Ottawa, nor the history of this country, if he understands it as I do, sir, is in any way in contradiction with this, one of the rules of government being the extension of money for the development of what might in another environment be an activity carried out in the economy by private enterprise. I hope I make myself clear when I refer you, sir, to as far back as the few years after confederation when governments of this country involved themselves in the construction of the first major railway, the Canadian Pacific, by direct loans of capital funds of the Crown. And subsequently after the turn of the century, in the first decade or two, when the government again got into the same role and established and helped build, or did in fact build, the Canadian National Railways. So it is with the establishment of the Trans-Canada Airlines, the Polymer Corporation, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; to name four or five that have had a very important place in the economic history of our country.

All I am saying really is this, that notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman said about his reluctance to interfere with the money market, we Canadians are indeed accustomed historically to the direct intervention of government in enterprises which advance the economic life of our country.

So I hope that by referring him to some of that history some of his reluctance to disturb the financial climate, the financial life, of our country, by way of explanation that he made for the form of the bill, will disappear. And indeed it will if he reflects upon the economic history of our country for a moment.

We in the Liberal Party have said—our hon. leader has said it on many occasions, he will say it on a great many more occasions—recent political events demonstrate that our hon. leader is listened to very intently, and what he says has great effect upon the temper of the electorate. We will not shy away from the provision of direct funds where it is indicated in order to better ameliorate the economic life of our people. I take that to be one of the fundamental policies of our country.

But this bill with which we are dealing, Mr. Speaker, in the words of the hon. member for Bruce—who always says things very incisively

—says “upon the recommendation of the Minister.” In other words, his recommendation, if I may use the lawyer’s phrase, is the *sine qua non* as I read it. If you do have the Minister’s recommendation then the Treasury board cannot consider it. It is the condition precedent.

Having the Minister benignly smile upon the applicant is first, sir. He must give him his benign smile in the first place. Then, having got the smile, he gets the recommendation. The Minister carries the recommendation to the Treasury board—and I am glad the draftsmen of the Act have seen fit to impose the Treasury board as watchdogs on the Minister.

Not that I do not trust him, but I want to help him evade the daily temptations to which all politicians are subject, including myself. I would not want it ever to be said that the recommendation of the Minister is in any way even remotely, or even in the fecund imagination of the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), connected with membership in the Conservative party or dedication to its aims, or contribution to its coffers, or any of the other things that might elicit the benign smile of the Minister and lead him to give his recommendation.

Now I take as my text, sir, the groundwork laid out by the hon. Minister himself when he discussed this bill in first reading, when he felt the necessity to give some explanation of it.

It will be possible, second, to encourage industries in this province to replace manufactured goods which heretofore have been brought as component parts or as a whole, into this country from other countries.

That is his quotation and that is the quotation with which I should like to deal.

Let us hope in the first place, Mr. Speaker, that unlike the hon. Prime Minister who sits to his left, that he is concerned about something more than the eyes on mounted police statues, that the hon. Prime Minister picked up some place downtown, and the mark of where they were made.

This statement by the hon. gentleman who introduced and seeks to put this bill through the House, is nothing more than a definition of the old mercantile policy known sometimes as mercapilism, which is as old as the Middle Ages. Every country at some time or other in its growth has had an obsession and a fixation with this policy. This policy is nothing more than a reliance upon, even an obsession upon, the need or of the desire to export more than you import.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Woodbine did not call it the mercantile policy, which it is, he called it the policy of beggar your neighbour. Every country! In Great Britain a revolution, sir, was caused. If one of the causes can be selected more than anything else, it was dedication to this policy by Great Britain in its relations with the American colonies that caused the American revolution.

Great Britain, in the years prior to 1775, wanted to export as much as it could to the American colonies and bring in all the raw materials to be fabricated, manufactured, made up in Great Britain and then shipped back in finished form to the American colonies. That was one of the greatest matters, the greatest irritants that bothered the residents of the 13 colonies and led them in the subsequent years to attempt to throw off, and eventually throw off, the British yoke, as they did. At least what they contended to be the British yoke. We in this House would not agree with them that it was.

Not only would it be no disservice to my constituents, it would be a positive service to them to remind the hon. Minister, if one may make so bold as to remind him of anything, of our great dependence upon exports, and specifically in my constituency, our great dependence that West Germany and Scandinavia and the Benelux countries and indeed Japan, and every other part of the free world, purchases our nickel from us. Our miners are fabricators of 70 per cent of the free world’s nickel.

To the north of us, if I may go outside my own constituency, we are the world’s leading exporter of newsprint. No country competes with us in that field. Forest products generally are our greatest dollar income earner.

We go abroad and seek to sell those things, and continue to sell them, in order to keep the economy prosperous in this country. In doing so, we meet constant complaints. Specifically we have had complaints from those purchasers of our basic commodities, West Germany, Japan, to name two, even the little Crown colony of Hong Kong, have complained to us that the imbalance of trade between our countries is a matter of great irritation to them. In other words, they are buying a great deal more from us than they are selling to us.

In saying that I am not totally decrying nor condemning nor seeking to amuse the hon. Minister, but I am only saying to him that as he goes across this province from one end to the other—and he is a very

ambulatory gentleman, he might be in Tokyo today, he might be in Cornwall tomorrow, he gets around fast—as he goes across this province he must approach his programme, the Macaulay programme—I assume those billboards that have that silly looking insignia, and the letters “M.O.” that that now means Macaulay’s Ontario—that he must approach this programme with some degree of caution because of our great dependence in this country on our exports and upon maintaining the goodwill of those who purchase our basic commodities from us. That is my only plea.

To put it another way, my plea is couched in terms to indicate that I am not completely sold on the approach made by the hon. gentleman to this problem of the diversification of our industry and the establishment of secondary industries.

I sometimes wonder what a strange coincidence it is that he sits for what is called Riverdale, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa sits for Broadview. They are one and the same constituency, sir, and I believe both of them go to the same church; they occupy adjoining pews in that church.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): They do not wear the same halo, though.

Mr. Sopha: I assume they speak to each other. I assume, I have no proof of it, but I assume they do. And I am wondering to what extent that has become so. I do not use these terms in any deprecatory sense; one has become our foreign secretary of this province. Why, I wonder, are they working at cross purposes?

On the one hand we hear the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce at Ottawa talking about increasing our exports. Our man—our man in Japan—is talking about cutting down our imports. And to the extent that cutting down our imports, sir, deprives those who purchase our exports from us, then to that extent, I say to you, sir, without fear of being accused of any lack of logic whatsoever, he is working at cross purposes with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce in Ottawa.

If, on the other hand, he took a few important industries, such as the automobile industry, and he concentrated on that, and did not worry about those scissors in his hand which say “made in Germany”; if he took an important industry like the automobile industry and he said: “We will make every effort, we will strive our mightiest, to produce as many component parts of the automobile as is possible in this country,”

then I would be foursquare 150 per cent behind him. Indeed, I would.

Would you permit me, sir? I am going to end in a couple of minutes and if I may have the indulgence.

Then there are other industries. There are other industries. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Woodbine who, on most occasions, speaks very good sense—on most occasions, though sometimes he falls into our error—yesterday spoke good sense when he said: “What is the sense, what is the sense of setting up a variety of small industries through the extension of guarantees that are in this Act?” Why not concentrate on a few of the larger ones that are the source of irritation to our economy? And no industry is a greater source of irritation to our economy, I put it to you, sir, than the automobile industry is.

I cannot, from that point of view, and as long as the hon. Minister talks about little piddling products made elsewhere that could be made in Ontario, feel in my heart the measure of enthusiasm for this measure that he has, when it is against that background. I hastily say, sir, because I have in my heart the desire to do what I can as a member of this House, to put forward the economic welfare of the people of this province, I vote for the measure. Of course I will. Of course I will. Of course I will. The same as you will vote for the measure. I will vote for it.

May I make one lawyer’s objection, if I may be permitted. This government has not much experience in drafting statutes where a suit against the Crown is permitted. This government, in the days of the predecessor to the hon. Prime Minister, back in 1952, passed an Act called The Proceedings Against the Crown Act, Chapter 78, Statutes of Ontario, 1952. They never had the guts to proclaim it. They never had the guts to proclaim the statute and it still lies in the statute books unproclaimed; an Act which would permit a citizen to bring an action against the Crown in tort or in contract.

The reason they did not proclaim it at that time was perfectly obvious. It was no sooner passed than they were in the middle of the highway scandal and they did not dare proclaim it so that actions would be brought against them. It has never been proclaimed to this day.

My complaint as a lawyer to this statute is—I am too much of a royalist to let go past such references as “the province of Ontario is liable”. So if they were as much

of a royalist as I am they would have the proper words in there—"The Crown is liable."

"Her Majesty the Queen, in the Right of Ontario, as represented by the Minister of Economics and Development is liable."

The Highway Improvement Act is the only other statute in the book, sir, which I know, where a proceeding against the Crown is permitted. I asked the legislative counsel if he knew any other, and he tells me that that is the only one. The Highway Improvement Act sets out in its terms—after imposing the liability in tort upon the Crown, in Section 8, I believe it is—the method by which an action is to be brought against the Crown in about 10 different subsections. If this statute means that the guarantee given by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, which is the Crown, is actionable in the courts and can be enforced in the courts, it should say so, in clear words.

Furthermore, we know—I raised it in this House last year—the devices that are used by those who defend an action. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that somebody sued The Department of Highways. They went right to the Supreme Court of Canada on that. This is my final comment, as everybody will be happy to hear, I put it against this background: This is the law of suretyship, the law of guarantee.

The law of suretyship as we understand it is a very complex part of the law, very complex indeed. Having made the guarantee, if the person to whom the guarantee is given does anything to in any way change the position or harm the position of the guarantor without giving him appropriate notice, then the guarantor, in this case the Crown, might very well say: "Well, I am no longer liable." It is only meet and just, Mr. Speaker, and I appeal to the hon. Minister, it is only meet and just that this statute should set out the terms of the liability of the Crown and how they may be enforced.

There should be an additional section, that an action upon the guarantee made by the

Crown may be enforced in the Supreme Court of Ontario without a fiat, without the fiat of the Lieutenant-Governor, and the style of cause in such case shall be such-and-such, Her Majesty the Queen, in the Right of the Province of Ontario, as represented by the Minister of Economics and Development—and I daresay he said when he introduced the bill, sir, you will recall, that he said something to the effect: "We have been looking at this for a year. This is a better bill." That is what he said: "This is a better bill than we could have brought in last year."

This bill, as it is framed, from the point of view of the lawyer's objection, which I unashamedly make—I make no apology for making a lawyer's objection—this bill as it is presently constituted from that point of view, sir, is sloppy draftsmanship, very sloppy, and it needs, in order to give some degree of confidence to the business community who will be interested in how you enforce that guarantee, it is necessary that the hon. Minister gets draftsmen post haste to draft an additional section to put in terms and words that are not open to any ambiguity whatsoever how the guarantee is enforced in the courts, because I presume it is to be enforced in the courts if necessary.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Prime Minister give us the order of business for tomorrow?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Introduction of bills, the order paper, and the Throne debate.

The House adjourned at 6.10 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Thursday, December 6, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962

CONTENTS

Thursday, December 6, 1962

Second report, select committee re standing committees, Mr. J. F. Edwards	121
First report, standing committee on standing orders, Mr. J. F. Edwards	121
Indian Welfare Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading	122
Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowances Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading	122
General Welfare Assistance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading	123
Children's Institutions Act, 1962-63, bill intituled, Mr. Cecile, first reading	123
Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63, bill intituled, Mr. Cecile, first reading	123
Homes for Retarded Children's Act, 1962-63, bill intituled, Mr. Cecile, first reading	123
An agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the province of Ontario respecting public harbours, bill to approve, Mr. Roberts, first reading	123
Parks Assistance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	124
Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	124
Game and Fish Act, 1962, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	124
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	124
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	124
Public Libraries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	124
Chatham Community Young Men's Christian Association, bill respecting, Mr. J. F. Edwards, first reading	125
City of Belleville, No. 1, bill respecting, Mr. Sandercock, first reading	125
City of Belleville, No. 2, bill respecting, Mr. Sandercock, first reading	125
Village of Bath, bill respecting, Mr. Whitney, first reading	125
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading	125
University of Windsor, bill to incorporate, Mr. Belanger, first reading	125
Esther Taylor Wood Trust and the John Taylor Evans Memorial Trust, bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, first reading	125
Presbyterian Church in Canada, bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, first reading	125
Guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario, bill to authorize, Mr. Macaulay, second reading	126
Dependants' Relief Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	128
Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Macaulay, second reading	128
Conditional Sales Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	128
Investigation of Titles Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	128
Custody of Documents Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	128
Partnerships Registration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	128
Crown Attorneys Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	129
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Letherby, Mr. Whicher	129
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to	144
Rehabilitation and development of agricultural lands in rural areas in Ontario, bill to provide for, Mr. Stewart, second reading	144
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Roberts, agreed to	148

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1962

The House met at 3.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery, students from Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. J. F. Edwards from the select committee appointed to prepare the list of members to compose the standing committees of the House presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the list of members to compose the standing committee on public accounts be composed as follows:

Committee on public accounts: Messrs. Brunelle, Bryden, Gomme, Janes, Lawrence, Oliver, Price, Sutton, Whicher—9. The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

Mr. J. F. Edwards from the standing committee on standing orders presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Of the corporation of the city of Oshawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing the payment of compensation to three companies for loss they will suffer by reason of the removal of railway tracks from King Street.

Of the corporation of the town of Fort Erie praying that an Act may pass validating an agreement with the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority respecting taxation of the Peace Bridge property.

By the trustees of the George Taylor Richardson estate praying that an Act may pass winding up the trust and transferring the remainder to certain charities.

Of the corporation of the village of Bath praying that an Act may pass authorizing

debentures for school renovation and equipment.

Of the corporation of the Sudbury Youth Centre praying that an Act may pass exempting it from provincial and local taxes.

Of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec praying that an Act may pass giving the convention, when incorporated by an Act of the Parliament of Canada, power to acquire real and personal property in Ontario; and related powers.

Of the trustee board of The Presbyterian Church in Canada and the executive of the administrative council of the Presbyterian Church in Canada praying that an Act may pass empowering the board to retain property given or devised to the church; and related purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Belleville praying that an Act may pass providing a two-year term for the mayor elected for the year 1964 and thereafter.

Of the corporation of the city of Belleville praying that an Act may pass permitting the corporation to order the removal or demolition of premises which have been closed as unfit for human habitation or as dangerous to health.

Of Herbert James Walker Taylor praying that an Act may pass winding up the John Taylor Evans trust and the Esther Taylor Wood trust.

Of The Boys' Home praying that an Act may pass enlarging its powers.

Of the corporation of the township of Innisfil praying that an Act may pass validating a by-law of the township respecting the construction of drains and issuance of debentures therefor.

Of the Chatham YMCA praying that an Act may pass exempting its lands from municipal taxes other than local improvement rates.

Of the corporation of the township of Bruce praying that an Act may pass vesting certain lands in the corporation.

Of the corporation of the city of Waterloo praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement with the Kitchener Public Utilities

Commission for bus and trolley bus service in Waterloo.

Of the Beechwood Cemetery Company of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass changing the company's name to "The Beechwood Cemetery Company"; and for other purposes.

Of Young Men's Christian Association and Young Women's Christian Association of Cobourg praying that an Act may pass authorizing exemption of its lands from taxation other than local improvement rates.

Of Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association of Guelph praying that an Act may pass authorizing exemption of its lands from taxation other than local improvement rates.

Of the corporation of the township of Scarborough praying that an Act may pass respecting the composition of the township council; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Toronto praying that an Act may pass enlarging the residence qualification for members of the parking authority; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of North Grimsby praying that an Act may pass validating the construction of its sewage plant.

Of the corporation of the city of Windsor praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws for licensing, regulating and governing the conduct of bankrupt stock sales and other sales of a like nature.

Of the Sudbury high school board and the high school board of the town of Coniston praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement for the accommodation of Coniston students in Sudbury secondary schools.

Of the corporation of the county of Dufferin praying that an Act may pass validating a debenture by-law for highway construction.

Of the corporation of the city of Sault Ste. Marie praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws to impose special charges to pay for all or part of the cost of additional sewer or water supply capacity, upon owners of high rise or other buildings, and for other purposes.

Of the high school board of the township of Gloucester and the collegiate institute board of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement under which high schools in Gloucester will be operated and staffed by the Ottawa board.

For the incorporation of the University of Windsor.

Of the University of Waterloo praying that an Act may pass granting it exclusive use of

the name "Waterloo University"; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of East York praying that an Act may pass ratifying by-laws respecting charges for services for apartment and other buildings.

For incorporation of the Association of the Chemical Profession of Ontario.

Of the corporation of the township of Toronto praying that an Act may pass establishing a board of education with secondary school jurisdiction in Toronto township, Streetsville and Port Credit and public school jurisdiction in Toronto township; and for related purposes.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves that tomorrow the House will resolve itself into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves that tomorrow this House will resolve itself into the committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE INDIAN WELFARE SERVICES ACT

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Welfare) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Indian Welfare Services Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, a short explanation on first reading. I would say that at the present time the Act permits the payment of mothers' allowances only to an Indian mother who is a widow or whose husband is dependent. The amendment extends all the benefits of The Mothers' Allowances Act to Indian mothers on the same basis as any other mother.

THE MOTHERS' AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowances Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, the bill removes from the application of the Act in cases where need arises because of a permanently unemployable father. This enables these cases to be dealt with under The

General Welfare Assistance Act and to be included in agreements with the government of Canada under that Act.

THE GENERAL WELFARE ASSISTANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, in short explanation, this bill is complementary to the bill to amend The Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowances Act, which removes from the application of that Act cases where need arises because of a permanently unemployable father. The amendments in the bill provide the provisions necessary for the province to pay assistance directly in these cases without municipal participation. The payment of the assistance under The General Welfare Assistance Act will enable the cost to be included in the agreements with the government of Canada.

THE CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS ACT 1962-63

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of bill intituled, The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-63.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, The Charitable Institutions Act is divided into The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-63, applying to children's institutions, and The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63, applying to other institutions. This bill in general is similar to The Charitable Institutions Act. Provincial contribution to children's institutions for the construction or acquisition of buildings is unchanged but the basis for the provincial subsidy for operating cost is changed from a flat rate of \$8 per month in respect of each child to 50 per cent of the net cost for the care of children, for whom the cost is otherwise unpaid, up to the maximum prescribed by the regulations.

I shall make a longer statement on second reading, Mr. Speaker.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-63

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of bill intituled, The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, this bill replaces The Charitable Institutions Act. The principles are unchanged except in the following respects:

1. Children's institutions are excepted and are to be dealt with in The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-63.

2. Grants are provided for correctional institutions and fixed at 50 per cent of the net operating cost.

3. Residence in Ontario is required for persons towards whose cost subsidy for operating and maintenance costs will be paid by the province.

THE HOMES FOR RETARDED CHILDREN'S ACT, 1962-63

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of bill intituled, The Homes for Retarded Children's Act, 1962-63.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for grants to local associations for retarded children for the construction and acquisition of homes for retarded children and for the payment of a provincial subsidy of the operating and maintenance costs of such homes.

PUBLIC HARBOURS

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to approve an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the province of Ontario respecting public harbours.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I think a short statement of the contents of the bill is desirable at this stage, and I would say that section 108 of The British North America Act reads: "Vested in the Crown in the right of Canada ownership of the bed and foreshore of all public harbours in Canada that were actually used as such at the time of Confederation."

However, because the Act did not list and describe those harbours, confusion has arisen as to which harbours became the property of Canada and what were the precise limits of those harbours. An agreement has been negotiated between the two governments and is scheduled to the bill—about 33 or 34 pages—which clarifies and establishes beyond any question what the boundaries are for

the future and also provides that mineral rights under these harbours are acknowledged to be the property of the province.

THE PARKS ASSISTANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Parks Assistance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, again by way of explanation, the proposed amendment will bring Indian bands within the scope of the Act so that they can obtain grants from the province for the development of suitable park areas on Indian reserves. It in effect acknowledges the organization within an Indian band of a council similar to a municipal council and gives those councils similar rights to apply for grants as now applies in the case of municipalities.

THE LAKES AND RIVERS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, again giving a short explanation. Application for approval of the location of a dam will be required and, following such approval, the application for approval of the plans and specifications of the construction of the dam will be required as to the future. The revised section permits refusal of an application where the public interest appears to warrant such action. Examples may be given and can be given on second reading of situations which would come within this provision.

THE GAME AND FISH ACT, 1961-62

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-62.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, again by way of short explanation, the proposed amendments are mainly complementary to the new Act which was passed at the last session of the Legislature and was to become effective on proclamation. It has not up to the present time been proclaimed. The main item is found in section 4 of the bill relating to guides. It is the intention that this bill

should go to the game and fisheries committee for their consideration and the benefit of their views.

The amendment relates particularly to guides, and adopts the principle of restoring requirements as to guides but on a local option basis, so to speak, and providing for, where areas designated so desire and determine that there would be, prohibitions against persons who are non-residents of the province of Ontario hunting or fishing without being accompanied by a licensed guide. That would be placed, on the basis of local option in areas concerned, where that requirement is considered advisable.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, just a short explanation. The first amendment will permit the school attendance officer to look after non-resident, secondary school students who are now not covered, and the second revision will allow local boards to provide group accident insurance to indemnify members who are travelling on official business for the board.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments to The Public Schools Act and this whole bill will be referred to the education committee. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the one provision that may be of particular interest. This amendment will permit a school board to provide a beginners' class in the spring term for children who were under the official age of admission for the preceding fall term.

THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this bill will also be referred to the education committee, but I might point out to the House that one revision of this bill will permit the establishment of regional libraries in areas of population of at least 100,000 people. These libraries are to be primarily reference libraries and will be established upon receipt of petitions of three or more library boards of cities or towns over 15,000 in population by the Minister. This whole matter will be discussed at the education committee.

CHATHAM Y.M.C.A.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Chatham Community Young Men's Christian Association.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE, No. 1

Mr. E. Sandercock (Hastings West) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Belleville, No. 1.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE, No. 2

Mr. Sandercock moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Belleville, No. 2.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

VILLAGE OF BATH

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the village of Bath.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BAPTIST CONVENTION

In the absence of Mr. J. Root, Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate the University of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

WOOD AND EVANS MEMORIAL TRUST

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Esther Taylor Wood Trust and the John Taylor Evans Memorial Trust.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA

Mr. Mackenzie moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting The Presbyterian Church in Canada.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question which is directed to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart). The question is: if the hon. Minister met with representatives of the fluid milk industry on Monday, December 3, as reported, then will the hon. Minister inform the House whether the government plans any action with respect to the representations made by them in reference to concentrated liquid milk?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member, advance notice of which he was kind enough to send me, I do not know what report he is referring to and I did not meet with the representative of the fluid milk industry on Monday, December 3.

Mr. Troy: May I have a second question then, sir?

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture, with respect to the dairy industry of northeastern Ontario, as far as the milk producers already designated are concerned, will he bring to the attention of the government, and particularly the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), that if the expansion of this particular type of milk is increased, the industry will be obliterated?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I would ask the members: if they have a supplementary question which actually asks for more information than the original question, that they put the supplementary question before the Minister rather than bring it up immediately in the House.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a statement for the convenience of the hon. members of the House,

to tell them of some plans I have for Monday's session.

As everyone in the House is aware, Monday, December 10, is the 14th anniversary of the signing of the universal declaration of human rights upon which our Ontario Human Rights Code is based. In years past it has been the custom in the House to take special note of this date, particularly when the House is in session at this time. This year, we would like to add some new features to this annual occasion.

I am pleased to inform the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. Mackay) has kindly placed his suite at our disposal for a reception in honour of Human Rights Day at which there will be present many distinguished men and women representing all sections of our community in the province. At this reception, it is my intention to present to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, on behalf of all of us here in the Legislature, an embellished and framed copy of the Ontario Human Rights Code proclaimed by him on June 15 last, which, as hon. members know, is the anniversary of Magna Carta.

I am sure that all hon. members of this House take a great deal of pride in this code, representing as it does 18 years of collective endeavour in which members of all parties present here today, both past and present during that 18-year period, have participated.

I am happy to announce to the House that at this reception we will have a very special guest, Miss Marian Anderson, an American and a world-renowned artist. Prior to her arrival here in Toronto on Monday Miss Anderson will receive an honorary degree from Queen's University in recognition of the day and of her contribution over the years to the establishment of human rights on an international basis.

On the evening of Monday she will be accorded the place of honour at a Human Rights Day ceremony to take place in St. Paul's Anglican Church in Toronto under the auspices of the United Nations Association. In order to make it possible for all hon. members here to attend—and hon. members will all receive, if they have not already, an invitation to attend this reception in His Honour's suite, to which, as I say, hon. members and their wives have all been invited—we will have to adjourn somewhat earlier than usual on Monday afternoon.

I make this statement today so that we might all be aware of what will occur on Monday next.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF ONTARIO

Clerk of the House: Second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 2, An Act to authorize the guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say offhand at the start that I feel that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) in the development of this loan Act has made a really good contribution to the growth of the economic position of the province.

However, the loan itself does not, or is not, a cure-all or end-all, and I do not believe that the economic position of the province of Ontario is as bright as has been suggested. Though we may have a loan system which we can use to develop industries and other large developments within the province, we do not, through this loan system, make it possible for the basic economic sickness of the province to really improve.

I mean by this that although certain aspects of the province are improving, others are not. If hon. members want to start from one area, for instance northwestern Ontario, nothing has developed in that area. We have built up here, through this Department of Economics and Development, we have built up a very—through the hon. Minister—a very large structure which has been inaugurated as of the first of 1962 and which was originally designated not only to improve, but eliminate as much as possible, the problems which we are faced with here in Ontario.

There has been a great deal of talk about this, I know. This was a big thing, one of the biggest things with which we had ever been faced. I am quoting from the structure and aims of the economic council. I would like to give hon. members a few paragraphs.

It starts out with:

One of many steps being taken by the Ontario government to meet the new challenges is the establishment of the Ontario Economic Council. This council is intended by the government to be the vehicle for achieving co-operation between management, labour and government.

Now, has this Ontario Economic Council actually been such a vehicle? What has developed from this?

I might say that the council is basic. The main body is the economic council, but from

this we have the economic research secretariat and they are council's chief staff. After that, we have 28 committees. Now, have these 28 committees actually been put in operational order? If so, what real benefit have they been to the department, to the province of Ontario? Each of the 28 committees is a very complicated and complex entity, as I derive it from the way it has been set up.

For instance, we have the committee for industrial research which is outlined in this book. It spells out the committee purposes. This committee will seek to promote the discovery and development in Ontario of improved industrial processes and techniques, new products and designs and new uses for existing products. It will attempt to do this by investigating present research—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): May I ask what this has to do with the principle of the bill? This is second reading, and I cannot see that this has any bearing on the principle of the bill at all.

Mr. Chapple: This has, I believe.

My interpretation of this is that the loan system has been set up to give impetus to the advancement of the basic economy of the province of Ontario. Now, if these loans are going to be available, what is their use if the economy cannot take advantage of it? Here we have the vehicle which was set up to put us in the position to do so; yet before we are in the position to take advantage of the loan, we have the loan.

How is the government doing this? I have no indication as yet that any real incentive to put the province on its feet has come from the government. Sure, we tell everybody to get together, we tell everybody to work together, we tell them "Buy Canadian". These things are good. But, to get back to the basic surge of industry and business in Ontario, coming from northwestern Ontario I would say no real progress has been made; and we, at least in our area, are very worried about it.

What is the use of a loan unless we have some projects on which to use this loan for the benefit of Ontario? This is what I mean; this was set up to do this. Here we have 28 committees—how many of these are in operation?

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): We are not debating the Ontario Economic Council. We are debating whether the hon. member's party believes we should have a development

fund or agency in this province or not. That is all we are debating.

Mr. Chapple: That is very interesting, very interesting. We could have it, yes; but where is the development? Where are these 28 committees? Are they operating? How much are they costing us? What about them?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Where does it appear in the Act?

Mr. Chapple: And if they are in operation, surely some good could come from a development loan?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chapple: For the amount of real use we have had or can have from this loan, and the real good that the government has done to develop the economics of Ontario, I might just as well sit down and everybody else might just as well sit down. Because certainly nothing can or will come from the big things we were told we were going to have, and the small things or the nothing which has been produced up to the present time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chapple: I say that it is quite possible that this bill in certain areas can do some good. And if certain incentives, which I could suggest, and you all know, were given by government to industry, to business, to the whole economy, then we would have some movement here. We would have some real need for the \$100 million which is going to be given out to the people of Ontario. I know it is very interesting as far as this giving out is concerned; \$100 million, well that is not too much, of course, but add it to the \$60 million that is going to be given to the subway and add it to a few other things which are going to be given away—well, the people of Ontario are going to be very receptive, I am sure.

As far as the bill is concerned we are going to vote for it; I hope the hon. Minister is happy about that. But it certainly comes with the very unfortunate situation that the government has placed us in by not getting out and giving the kind of real assistance that they could give if they had any real desire to do so.

An hon. member: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I have one word to say. In my opinion the debate here has gone far beyond the principle of this bill, but several things have been said which I would like to answer. I think I can do it very briefly.

Many aspersions have been cast upon what we have done or not done. I can only point out to you that there is nothing like looking at results to see just exactly what has been done. I doubt if anyone can argue with the figures of last year.

At the beginning of the year the net rate of growth in Ontario was approximately 2 per cent; it is now running about 6 per cent. When we started our programme last year the unemployment at that time was about 6 per cent. It is now about 3.7 per cent against the Canadian average of 6.1 per cent and an American rate of about 5.8 per cent—so I can only repeat that if you look at the results, it is rather difficult to get up and say that we have done nothing, and nothing has happened.

Mr. Chapple: The hon. Prime Minister did not say anything about business failures in both Ontario and Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Chapple: They are higher than ever before—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The DEPENDANTS' RELIEF ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill No. 1, An Act to amend The Dependants' Relief Act.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, this bill, as the hon. members will notice, merely corrects a misprint in the printing of the statutes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO-ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Macaulay moves second reading of Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that I need to explain any further than I did on first reading. This is one of a series of bills to remove from Acts which have to do with registration of documents in the registry office, provisions as to fees and to collect them all under The Registry Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE INVESTIGATION OF TITLES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Investigation of Titles Act.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, the same remarks that I made with respect to the previous order apply here. This is removing the fees provision from The Investigation of Titles Act and putting it in The Registry Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CUSTODY OF DOCUMENTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Custody of Documents Act.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this has, in addition to removal of fees from this Act into the regulations under The Registry Act, certain provisions for bringing the procedures in The Registry Act on the deposit of documents under The Custody of Documents Act into line with practices under The Registry Act for registration of documents.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PARTNERSHIPS REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this again removes the provisions as to fees from this Act and places them in the regulations under The Registry Act as in the case of Bill No. 7. It also provides for bringing the practices of recording and keeping books with respect to

registration under this Act in accord with those for other registrations under The Registry Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this is the provision which will allow the appointment of a Crown Attorney pro tem when there is a vacancy in the office. We already have provision in the Act for appointment of a Crown Attorney pro tem when the Crown Attorney by reason of illness or otherwise is unable to act. This will allow the deputy Attorney-General to appoint from the area concerned a Crown Attorney pro tem without having to move one in from Toronto or some other area. It commends itself very highly to those in charge of the administration of justice.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

REHABILITATION OF LANDS

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 10, An Act to provide for the rehabilitation and development of agricultural lands in rural areas in Ontario.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, do we have any assurance that this particular bill will go to a committee? The hon. member to my left, who happens not to be here, said to me some time ago that he would like the opportunity to discuss this. I do not object to a technical reading, if you wish.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I will hold this order and we can call second reading. Perhaps we can debate the principle of the bill tomorrow morning.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, before I take part for a brief time in this Throne Speech or debate, I would like to say, in all kindness to my good hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Chapple), that I know he is a man who is easily rattled. One can get his back up in a hurry; all one has to do when he is speaking is to nudge him, and heckle him, and he gets mad. I did not mean to do

this, but I know how easily rattled he is and I did this just to get a little fun. I appreciated what he had to say and I hope he did not think I was off base.

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate for a few minutes I would first, sir, like to extend my congratulations to you on the very lovely manner in which you continue to preside over the proceedings of this House. You have been very considerate, very kind. I think you are most efficient, and I would like to extend along with the other hon. members my congratulations to you and to trust that all hon. members will try to co-operate with you during the session as we have in the years that have passed.

There have been many changes in the composition of this House since the last session of Parliament. Regretfully, we recall the death of some members, members who were good friends and colleagues of all of us, and who made a great contribution to not only their ridings but to this House over the years. We regret their passing, but we do admire the great contribution they made during their time of service in this House.

There are major changes, sir, in the personnel of the Cabinet and in other government appointments, and to those who have attained Cabinet rank or have been appointed to any position in the government by way of directors, I would like to extend my congratulations.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): No matter who they are?

Mr. Letherby: I would not care who they are. They are all men who have proven themselves by experience and ability and I know that they will do an exceptionally good job in the months that lie ahead.

I have some regret though for those Cabinet Ministers who have served this House over a period of many years and who have considered it time to give up their duties in this House and retire to private life. These are Ministers who have helped many of us, friends and colleagues who have helped us with our ridings and other problems, and I do sincerely regret their passing. They have been good friends. And I do wish for them that they have continued good health and happiness and success in the months that lie ahead.

Here is another point that I would like to hammer home this afternoon. Over the years the hon. members from the Opposition have tried to impress upon the public that

this government, or this party, because we have been in power for some 19 years, are a tired and worn out old party. Let me tell them they are crazy.

This party has been continually renewed by youth and new blood over the years. Let me say that, with our youthful and capable hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) today, there is not a Cabinet that has ever sat in this House younger than the one we have at the present time. And those who are probably a few years older are there because of their great experience and their great ability.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Are you going to push them out too?

Mr. Letherby: No, no, we want to keep them there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is every likelihood that within the next year or year and a half there will be a provincial election. We have until a year from June to go so I say we have a year and a half. I would like to make this prediction—and hon. members watch—that hon. members from the Opposition benches have been bobbing up and down like a bunch of yo-yos all this session trying to make marks in their little home town paper, to try to strengthen their position for the next election.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): What is the hon. member trying to do?

Mr. Letherby: I do not have to do that, but the hon. members of the Opposition do.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to very respectfully caution my hon. friends, particularly of the Liberal party, that they do not make the mistake that their federal leader in Ottawa, Lester Pearson, is making at the moment.

Now let me spell this out. To many thousands of good Canadians in this Dominion of Canada, Lester Pearson has been looked up to as one who has distinguished himself in the diplomatic service of this country and then as a shining light in the Liberal Party. But let me tell my hon. friends opposite that there comes a testing time, I think, in the life of each and every one of us. And that testing time came for Lester Pearson last June, when the great Liberal Party in this Dominion of Canada went down to its third straight defeat in a row. The man who was responsible for sinking the party was none other than my old friend, Rt. hon. John Diefenbaker, the Prime Minister of Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Letherby: See, they cannot take it.

No sooner had they been defeated than these cry-babies, Lester Pearson and those old has-beens Martin and Pickersgill and that old gang, went and cried on the doorstep of the Prime Minister. Why it got so bad that Pearson had to go to the Prime Minister and say: "I want you to resign. Let me take over, I want to be the Prime Minister."

He did not get very far, though. He did not do anything. He could not win anything. He lost three in a row.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker, Lester Pearson is nothing more nor less than a political Esau; or perhaps worse, a political tramp who is looking for a handout.

Well, OK! Hon. members deny it. He goes to the Social Credit and to the ND Party and anybody else trying to get them to support him to defeat the government, to bring on an election. Now I would like to say this in all sincerity, that if Lester Pearson is responsible for bringing this government down in the next few weeks or the next few months, he will not only be defeated but he will drag the great Liberal Party down with him.

Now just to finalize this, let me say this that never would Laurier, never would St. Laurent or even Mackenzie King—as bad and all as he was—never would they stoop to the political trickery to which Lester Pearson is stooping today to become Prime Minister of Canada.

So much for the Pearsons and for the Martins and the Pickersgills and all that trash.

An hon. member: Tell us about Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Letherby: See, they cannot take it.

Oh yes! The new hon. member (Mr. Gaunt) is here from Huron-Bruce. I would like in all sincerity to join with others in extending my congratulations to this young man. I wish him well as he takes up his responsibilities and duties in this House and I will be the first to shake his hand, when I get an opportunity, and to do anything I can to help him.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Now explain it!

Mr. Letherby: Mr. Speaker, having looked over the Speech from the Throne, I think it is a great document. It is one that forecasts legislation which will be brought before this House for the next few months. It is one, I think, that is most progressive, most conservative in its outlook toward education, to

labour and to all the other departments of the government. I know that it will receive the careful attention, not only of this House, but the many people in this country who, I think, over the last 19 years have received probably the highest standard of living of any province in the Dominion of Canada because of these policies.

Now, sir, to get on, I would like to commend for a moment or two the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) for the great job he is doing. If I tell him that, that will please him, so let me tell him.

I refer particularly to the Ontario crusade, which he has fathered, and the more recent manufacturers' show and conference held here in Toronto.

Most men of average intelligence or ability, whether in business or whether in public service, can follow along in the footsteps of their predecessors and do a reasonably routine job. But it takes brains and creative thinking to try a completely new course of action and operation to obtain better results. I say, sir, that the hon. Minister has the brains and the ability, plus the drive, determination and boundless enthusiasm, to put over this Ontario trade crusade and all the ramifications that go with it. The sales mission to Europe by Ontario manufacturers and the manufacturers' show and conference held in Toronto recently, sponsored by the department, has exceeded all expectations and is proving to be a great success.

I am proud to say that a number of manufacturers from my riding at Simcoe East availed themselves of the opportunity to join the sales mission to Europe and the manufacturers' show and conference in Toronto, and are all loud in their praise of what Ontario is doing in this regard and the opportunities for new business which have opened for them because of this crusade.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the stakes are high. This is a new and daring venture, but the rewards are great: increased manufacturing for our Ontario industries and 60,000 more jobs a year for Ontario workers.

To use a phrase of the former Prime Minister, Mr. R. B. Bennett, some 30 years ago: "The hon. Minister of Economics and Development is determined to blast a way into the markets of the world. He is determined to blast a way into the markets of the world," and I figure that with the particular blasting power that he is using he is going to make it.

See, they do not like it. Now this is the punch line of my story.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter that I would like to bring to the attention of this House and particularly to the government, and that is the liquor licence regulations.

Let me talk—the hon. member will get his turn.

I refer to the liquor licence regulations as they apply to the legion halls and social clubs in the so-called dry areas in the province. I am speaking with knowledge of the situation which exists in my riding of Simcoe East, and undoubtedly the same situation in many other ridings in the province of Ontario.

Before I continue, perhaps I should make it abundantly clear that I am not trying to promote the sale of one extra ounce of alcohol, either in my riding or in the province of Ontario. There are others who are more dedicated to this particular task. What I am trying to do is bring to the attention of the government the reasonable and justified complaints of hundreds of good people in my riding.

The situation is this. In my riding, which is regarded as a dry riding, you can only have liquor and beer outlets by the package. Our legion halls, curling rinks and golf clubs—all clubs which are social and operate on a no-profit basis—maintained a bar at which a social drink could be had. Technically, these operations were in violation of the law. However, neither the public nor the police complained and the practice continued over a period of many years.

Occasionally the odd legion hall was pinched by the police, which was a considerable hardship to their financial situation. Now the people who belong or are members of these social clubs are a cross-section of some of the best people of our community. They are not carpetbaggers, they are not booze hounds, they are people who are workers, who are business men and they are parents, solid citizens of our community. After a game of golf or a curling match one could go to the steward and get a drink, a refreshing drink for relaxation; or the legion member could, after a day's work, go down to his club and have a little game of darts or euchre and have a pint of beer. Perfectly commendable, we like that.

Last year the government brought in an amendment to the liquor regulations and the fly in the ointment was this, that you must have been serving meals for a period of three years or you could not qualify to get a licence.

Now it was all very well for those great and wealthy golf clubs, curling clubs or

legion halls, because they could qualify. A man and his wife or friends could go out for a round of golf, afterwards they are denied a refreshing drink because they do not sit down and eat a meal. In most cases these people have been already warned by their physician to keep their calorie count down. It is bad enough to expect these people to have a drink of alcohol and build that calorie count, without asking them to sit down and eat a meal on top of it.

The same applies to those who like to curl. Their clubs, as a rule, are operated only in the winter months. Are they expected to have meal service for 365 days of the year when the curling club is closed up in the summer? I do not see that. Now this is the punch line—let us get back to legions. Let us look at the plight of the veterans and their legion halls. The average veteran that I meet, they are veterans who are battle-scarred, they have served in one or two world wars. They are boys who make a great contribution to the welfare of our communities. These legion members do a terrific job of public welfare. They support the YMCA, the Salvation Army, the retarded children, they contribute to the junior NHL hockey and all those great public services, and they do not make a dime for themselves.

Now these boys, they like after a hard day's work to go down to their legion room and have a little game of darts, a little game of euchre, or whatever game you have. But they say you cannot have a pint of beer unless you first sit down and sloop up a dish of porridge, or you have a plate of meat-balls and spaghetti and mashed potatoes. That is what the law says, you cannot do it.

Now there is another angle too, hon. members, that I do not think is fair. In many of our communities we have federal mess halls where members of the armed services or a large number of honorary members can go in and sloop up all the drinks they like. There is no provincial jurisdiction to prevent them, the police cannot go in there, they boot them out. But these poor boys who have done a great service for our country, they cannot get a little pint of beer unless they eat four meals a day or five meals a day.

However, I would suggest this, Mr. Speaker, that if the liquor licence board is going to insist on a meal with refreshments in our social clubs that it be deemed sufficient—and before I say this let me interject this. I read with a great deal of interest some

few weeks ago where a reporter of the Toronto *Telegram* interviewing Judge Robb on this very matter—now I have a terrific regard and respect for His Honour Judge Robb—this reporter asked the judge what in his opinion constituted a meal. Well, the judge, he hummed and hawed a little bit. "Well," he said, "some people like to have four or five courses, others just like a soda biscuit and a little bit of cheese."

An hon. member: Why does the hon. member not come to the biscuit?

Mr. Letherby: I am coming to the biscuit right now.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the liquor licence board is going to insist on a meal with refreshments in our social clubs, that it be deemed sufficient that the club or hall in question keep a bowl of crackers handy for the patrons to nibble on, or the members be requested to come into the hall with a soda biscuit in their pocket.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, no regulation or law imposed on the people is worth the paper it is written on unless it commands the respect of the people. This is one regulation which is held in contempt by thousands of good, sensible, law-abiding people in this province. I would respectfully suggest and urge that the government change this regulation and grant licences under supervision to our legion halls and all clubs and curling rinks without the necessity of having to serve meals. This change in regulations would correct a situation that is long overdue for correction and would be well and favourably received by the public.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before saying anything else, I think I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby) who has just spoken. I think that all of us in the House, regardless of which side we sit, enjoyed what he had to say and it brought some much needed humour into the House.

The second thing I would like to do, as is the custom, sir, is to congratulate you on once again being the Speaker of this honourable assembly. I might say all of us feel a great deal of respect for you for the way in which you handle a most difficult position. We hope you will be as fair and as impartial in the future as you have attempted to be in the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was just looking over the calendar and it did not take me long to find out today that this is the seventh opportunity that I have had in this House to

speak on what is known as the Throne Speech. In those seven years I think that I would be very truthful and most sincere in saying that I have made many close friends on all sides of the House and have made many close associates over the period of these years. Not only have I enjoyed the friendships and the work that we have done in the House, but I have also on occasions enjoyed certain activities outside of the House, in which I am pleased that the hon. members sitting opposite have taken part too.

In the past seven years I have seen many changes in the opposite benches. There have been many promotions and certainly a great many of them have been justified. As an example, our own hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) at the present time certainly was not in the leadership of this House when I first entered in 1956. He has come a long way since then. The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) was not even a private member of this House. To all of these hon. gentlemen I give congratulations and I know that to the best of their ability that they are attempting to do the job in which they have been placed.

Particularly at this time, when I am in the mood for congratulations, I would like to say something about the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) who a month or so ago was the Minister of Lands and Forests. He sponsored the northern tour for all members of the Legislature this past autumn. I hope that I am saying what everyone in our group believes, and probably what everyone in the whole legislative assembly believes, that this was a very well worthwhile tour.

I never had the opportunity to be as far north as Moosonee before and I think that it is most important that the members of the Legislature, regardless of their political beliefs, get the opportunity to go into all areas of the province, so that they may further their education and find exactly what the people in the various areas require. So to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, I now say that personally I enjoyed the tour very much. I believe that his staff did an excellent job and I hope in the future that the Minister of Lands and Forests, whoever he may be, will have other trips such as this in other areas of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word or two concerning what our hon. Prime Minister said, the day before yesterday I believe it was, in regard to something about what my hon. leader (Mr. Wintermeyer) said in suggesting

that we should have an election in this province as soon as possible. The hon. Prime Minister, in refuting this claim, mentioned the fact that in the last 19 years there have been 20 or so by-elections in this province and that his party has won the vast majority of them. We cannot argue with history and what the hon. Prime Minister said was absolutely true. But, on the other hand, I want to point out the fact that there have been six by-elections since he assumed the premiership of this province and, in a kindly way, I want to ask him how many by-elections has he won since that time? I ask this question, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is most important.

We cannot go back 10 or 15 years ago. What we are going to be judged on is history as it is being written in this Legislature today and during the last year.

We have been judged in this province since last February in six by-elections. I would just like, I think that I would be within my rights, to review some of those by-elections—and remember, while the former Prime Minister (Hon. L. M. Frost) sat in the premier's chair he did not lose one single by-election from the day that he assumed that position until the day he retired.

But now let us look at it. Last January we had a by-election in that great historic riding of Brant. Brant was most fortunate, it had sitting in the seat before the present hon. member (Mr. Nixon) one of the greatest men who ever came into this legislative assembly. Today we are very happy in having his son as the hon. member for Brant, a Liberal member.

This is the significant point: the hon. member for Brant today had a greater majority than his father ever had when he won the by-election in Brant last January. Surely that puts some thought to the possibility that all of the people of this province do not enjoy the confidence that the hon. Prime Minister seems to think they have on the other benches.

Let me point out the second one. In that great riding of Kenora, hon. members may remember—I remember him so well, the member who was here for many years, Mr. Albert Wren—hon. members may remember that he had a hard job to be elected. He used to win by maybe 45 or 50 votes and if he had 100 votes it was a landslide.

But, Mr. Speaker, may I remind the hon. Prime Minister that when the present hon. member, the Liberal member for Kenora (Mr. Gibson) won last January, he won

by approximately 30 times as many votes as the former member had ever won by.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They got a senator, though.

Mr. Whicher: Does this not suggest that everyone in the province of Ontario has not the confidence in this government that they may have had in the former regime? Renfrew South was held by a former Cabinet Minister, the late James Maloney. I know perfectly well that my Conservative friends have said that this is a solid Conservative seat as far as the province goes; but what happened? Why, the hon. Liberal member (Mr. Quilty) swept the election and he certainly will be there for a long, long time to come.

But, Mr. Speaker, two of the greatest wins that we, sitting on this side of the House, had were not where we previously had members. They were in the ridings of Beaches and Eglinton. In Eglinton, for example, in the past one of the most Conservative ridings in the whole Dominion of Canada, we lost by less than 40 votes. I think that that is most significant.

As I reminded my good hon. friend from Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) the other day, I really did not think there was much use in him trying to get under the pension plan here because he certainly would not be long enough here to enjoy it.

And what about Beaches? This was another great victory for us because Beaches has been Conservative for so many years you cannot count—

Mr. MacDonald: What happened in the federal election?

Mr. Whicher: Never mind the federal; we will talk about the NDP in a minute.

It has been Conservative for so long, but we lost that riding by approximately 250 votes. Now we come to another by-election, one in which I was most interested because part of that riding bears the name of the riding I represent, namely, Huron-Bruce. Our friend who just spoke congratulated the hon. member (Mr. Gaunt) who had taken his seat, most sincerely, I thought. Here we have a most brilliant young man who, in the days to come and in years to come, will make his mark in this legislative assembly.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out that whether the other side knew this or not they also had a reasonably good candidate running against the present hon. member for Huron-Bruce. This, sir, was not a defeat particu-

larly for the man whom they had running on their side; it was a defeat for this government. There is a feeling all around this province that this government has been there too long and the people of this province wish to do something about it.

This fact has been borne out by the people of the ridings I have mentioned and, more particularly, in the latest by-election in Huron-Bruce. Mr. Speaker, the people of Huron-Bruce, in the rural riding of Huron-Bruce, do not appreciate Cabinet Ministers running all over the place in big cars with chauffeurs—they do not enjoy that at all. They do not appreciate the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, coming in for a couple of days, strictly politicking, and then never seeing him for the next three or four years until just before the next election, whenever it may be.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: I may say, as far as Huron-Bruce was concerned, I was very pleased that the members of the government and their supporters were not averse to making very small wagers on the result. I am glad that they did, and that all of them were honest enough to pay off.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) suggested that the people of the province, and I quote his words: "have no confidence in the Liberal Party in Ontario". I want to point out that, in the showing of the Huron-Bruce by-election, these people who claim that they have all the confidence of the people of this province did not even have the nerve to put in a candidate.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest the reason why they did not put in a candidate—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, the reason that they did not have the nerve to put in a candidate is most obvious. In every by-election in the last year that we have had in this province the NDP candidate has run last; and if there had been five candidates they still would have been last. And naturally they would not wish to put a candidate in a rural Ontario riding where he might get approximately 150 or 160 votes. They would be sunk so low that they would never be able to rise again through the electorate of this province.

I also want to remind this House that the hon. Prime Minister suggested that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer)

was wrong in calling for an election as soon as possible. He said to us here: "Let us all go back and represent our ridings as our ridings deserve, and put through the legislation that the Cabinet and the government is going to present to us."

Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. Prime Minister, if he honestly meant that, why does he not call by-elections then in the ridings of Sault Ste. Marie, in Halton and in Hamilton Centre, because they too deserve the representation of some member, and I suggest that if he has no intention of having an election for approximately a year and a half or thereabouts that we should at least have by-elections in the 3 ridings that I have mentioned so that they may have proper representation.

I want to say that I have been most impressed by one thing that this government has done. It does appreciate the fact that the industrial growth of this province must improve, and I might suggest that this is a very welcome change from the tired ideas of the previous administration.

I agree, too, as the hon. Prime Minister has suggested this afternoon, that we are in much better shape as far as unemployment is concerned than we were last year. There are not nearly as many people unemployed in this province today as there were a year ago, but this is not an unusual situation in the world.

I say to the government opposite that this is a world-wide situation; that in France and Italy and England and Germany and Japan there is practically no unemployment today; that there is no reason why we should have even as much as we have now in this great province of Ontario. There is much still to be done as far as the industrial growth situation of this province is concerned, and we simply must have these people who are now unemployed paying taxes into the various treasuries of the governments of this country instead of accepting welfare or unemployment insurance.

The trade crusades that have been so publicized by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) are good, but they can only do so much. I wish to emphasize what was said by the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) yesterday, that it is simply an impossibility in the province of Ontario for us to grow oranges or grapefruit or lemons and it certainly is an impossibility for us to manufacture certain machinery that it is completely uneconomical to do because of the lack of people to buy it. We simply are not big enough.

Also emphasize to the government that in

order to sell we must buy from the world markets. What do you think the people in Japan are going to do if we stop importing?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Well, do we have to buy more from Japan than—

Mr. Whicher: Just a minute. The hon. member got into enough trouble last year when he opened up his mouth. Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member like me to go out in the hall and give this speech?

Mr. White: I wish he would.

Mr. Whicher: Well, I would certainly be glad to. I would suggest that the hon. member would be sitting in the front row somewhere were it not for the boner that he pulled last year.

Mr. Speaker, we must be prepared to import goods from countries such as Japan, Germany and England.

Mr. White: Do we have to buy more from them than they buy from us?

Mr. Whicher: We must buy from them if we expect to sell, and I will give an example. Last year we sold approximately \$100 million worth of goods to Japan, but we only bought back probably half that amount in goods from them. Now, I know that it is good business and I am all for it.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, may I—

Mr. Whicher: No, I am not answering any questions, because the hon. member will just get into trouble. His hon. leader will hardly speak to him now and I do not want to get him into any more trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to ask this. What about the long-term plans of this government?

Oh, here is another friend of ours coming in that we are very glad to see.

Mr. G. Lavergne (Russell): Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege—

Mr. Whicher: Here he is.

Mr. Lavergne: Mr. Speaker, I would just ask my hon. friend to repeat that because I do not like him to say I am a friend of his.

Mr. Whicher: That is what I said.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the government about its long-range plans when England enters the European Common Market, as it is almost bound to do. The

facts are these: If England does enter this market, and if we have not got places in which to sell our goods that we manufacture in this province, we are going to be in a sorry state indeed. And, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, with the great advertising schemes that he has in this province, tells us what he is doing on a daily basis, I think that there are people in this province who would like to know what he is going to do when England enters the European Common Market.

We must find other markets in which to sell our goods. It is one of our best customers; in fact we sell much more to it than it does to us. If there are no plans made for this, what I consider an almost accomplished fact, then there could be chaos in this province and in this country.

I agree, however, and certainly stand up for the attitude of the hon. Minister when he says that many goods that are now imported from the United States should be manufactured here. The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that there is not enough incentive to make money when government takes the great majority of the money that is made by industry. As I said yesterday when Bill No. 2 was presented by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, when one considers the fact that if industry today makes \$100,000 profit—and one considers that it gambles if it puts up the whole amount of the capital expenditure—and then loses that capital it will lose the whole thing itself. But if it wins, this government and the government in Ottawa take 52 cents out of every dollar and leaves only 48 cents for the corporation or for the individual who has put up all the money in the first place.

This is simply not right, and we in the Liberal Party of this province advocate that there most certainly should be tax reductions for pioneer industries; tax reductions for industries who will manufacture goods that are at the present time imported, particularly goods imported from the United States. I mention that country particularly because that is the place where we have the great imbalance of trade at the present time.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is most necessary.

Mr. White: Does the hon. member think that the government should start manufacturing automobiles?

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if there are tax reductions in the United

States within the next year, and there is quite liable to be just that from what we read in the paper—there is a suggestion that the corporation tax will be reduced to 47 per cent—then it is going to be very hard to have American capital start firms in this province of ours. It is going to be a situation that is going to have to be faced by the government and there are going to have to be steps taken.

Mr. MacDonald: It might be desirable to put our own capital into it.

Mr. Whicher: Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the other day that some of the islands of the Caribbean area have taken a realistic approach about what they call pioneer industries. There, in all of their literature, they suggest that if the manufacturer will come in and manufacture goods that are not now being manufactured in Trinidad or Jamaica or the Barbadoes, then that individual or that corporation will have a 7-year tax holiday. No taxes whatsoever.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House in this group we don't go that far, but we say this: In order to get industry started to manufacture the goods that we are now importing from other countries, there must be tax concessions made by this government and by their colleagues in Ottawa. We also say, and we have said it for some years now, that in this age when the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission has large quantities of electricity going through the electrical wires all over the province of Ontario, if power is a main cost in any particular industry, we should not let that industry get into another province because we cannot match the rates.

To me, Mr. Speaker, that is the height of silliness; to allow a large industry, that may employ 200, 300 or 1,000 men, to go to our neighbouring province because we, who have all sorts of power, will not cut the rate a little bit in order at least to match the rates of a situation in Quebec! If it is a pioneer industry in this province, manufacturing goods that are not now manufactured here, then we should go much further. We should cut the rates and give that industry, which is going to employ men who will spend money in this province and who will pay income tax, a reduction in the rates so that it can be competitive, certainly during the first 5 or 6 years that it is in business. Then it can be on a competitive level with our friends in the United States or whatever other country with which it may be in competition.

Thirdly I say this: When I was up in northern Ontario, under the auspices of the former Minister of Lands and Forests, I saw and went over much territory—all of the hon. members did—on the great Ontario Northland Railway. And I am convinced, after watching it operating, that there is something that could be done for industry in northern Ontario by a reduction in freight rates—if some industry wants to start manufacturing something that is not made in northern Ontario.

What is the difference, Mr. Speaker, to the Ontario Northland Railway, whether they have 20 cars behind a diesel engine or 30 cars behind? Surely if we can get more freight going over the same rails to help industry in northern Ontario to employ more people this would be a worthy cause.

As a matter of fact, one does not have to look very far in the railway picture in Canada as a whole to know that subsidies to railways are something that is not new—it is being done all the time. And I think that if we really mean business in this province, as far as northern Ontario is concerned, before anyone is willing to invest large sums of money, not only we should be at least willing to listen to their arguments for cheaper hydro rates, but we should most assuredly listen to their arguments for cheaper freight rates.

These are the three things that we in the Liberal Party recommend as far as helping industry at the present time is concerned.

(1) We must have tax reductions in order to provide an incentive for industry to invest their money.

(2) The Hydro-Electric Power Commission should make special rates for special industries who are going to employ large numbers of men or women.

(3) The Ontario Northland Railway should do something about reducing rates as far as pioneer industries are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has done a great deal in talking and in advertising the fact that we must sell more and import less. But one of the tragedies—and I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) is not in his seat at the present time—which has happened in this province in the past years is that one of the exports which we have, which has risen, and which is far more precious than all the wheat we sell from Canada, or the paper, or the nickel, is that of our young people.

This year, four thousand students who legitimately passed grade 13 had no place

to go. Many of them have been exported not only from this province but from the country as a whole. This is a sad situation for any government in any part of the world to be in. Four thousand of these students who legitimately passed grade 13, who got 50 or more per cent, have no place to go.

Mr. Speaker, these students should be paying taxes to us in the next 5 or 6 or 7 years. They should be paying taxes to us as lawyers or doctors or architects or plumbers or teachers or whatever career they would normally have entered. We have a great investment in those students who have nowhere to go—both parents and the province. I want to give you a true story, an absolutely true story, of a friend of mine who had a boy 18 years of age. This boy, ever since he was a youngster, wanted to be a medical doctor. This year he passed, with an average of 58 per cent, in grade 13. He was not what we call a brilliant student, but he was a good student. Average plus and most sincere in his desire to become a doctor in this province. He had nowhere to go.

He went to the University of Toronto, to Western University, everywhere—nowhere to go. But most firmly in his mind was the conviction that he wanted to be a doctor—a medical doctor—during his life. He had some friends in Windsor, so he first went down there and then went over to Wayne University in the state of Michigan. Today that student, in whom the hon. Prime Minister, as the former Minister of Education, had invested thousands of dollars, is in Wayne University studying to be a medical doctor. And when he graduates, the chances are that he will remain in the state of Michigan, and pay income taxes to that state, instead of having the privilege of paying them in the province of Ontario where he had the right, and where we have the right to expect him to pay them.

This is an absolute tragedy. If it were just one case it would not be so bad but we read, and our educationalists tell us, that there are 4,000 students such as this. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. Minister of Education—he is not here, maybe the hon. Prime Minister could tell us—how many students are going to be exported from the province of Ontario next year?

Because these people, these doctors, these lawyers, from the professions, are the people who pay a high rate of income tax. And there is hardly a small town in the province of Ontario today, or city for that matter, which is not in need of dentists and doctors. I know that certainly in my area we could have

another half-dozen dentists easily in Bruce county. But the present government, by not providing the places for them to attend, in the form of colleges, is not allowing these boys and girls to become professional men and women as they desire.

Another thing that I wanted to mention, Mr. Speaker, before I leave this educational theme, is what I regard as an absolute tragedy in the democracy in which we live. This government knew, 10 years ago, that in the year 1962 there would be so many hundreds or so many thousands ready to enter university. It knew that certainly 10 years ago, certainly 5 years ago; but it failed to produce the colleges or the technical schools for them to attend; for example, Ryerson.

There is one more thing that I wish to say about the educational situation. All of us, ever since I entered this legislative assembly, have been saying in one form or another that the taxpayer who is paying land taxes has paid far too much for education in this province of Ontario. Many people have said this. I have said it myself. I have heard many hon. members from the other side, from the government benches, mention this fact, and they do not know what to do about it. Personally I have regarded the situation as most unfair.

Let me give an example of what could happen if the status quo remains as it is now. Let us take a farm that is worth approximately \$25,000 today, perhaps in the county of Lambton or Kent or Oxford, wherever it may be. And let us suppose, just to use figures, that the man had \$500 a year taxes on that particular farm worth \$25,000. I would suggest that of that \$500, \$250, half of it, would be for education purposes. Now we know, from figures that the government has given us itself, that in the year 1971—assuming that the provincial grants remain the same as they have been for the last 10 years, on an upscale, as far as volume is concerned—if nothing is done the education tax on the farm will increase by 62 per cent. This is \$435 for education alone on this particular farm worth \$25,000 in the province of Ontario. It increases to \$435 from the \$250 today.

Mr. Speaker, the question is: Where is it to end? If it is going to be \$435 in 1971, what will it be in 1981? Obviously something must be done, and the time to do it, in my opinion, is right at this session. If it is not done now it certainly will be done in the next session when we have a different government.

I give this fact, too. If that farmer, with his farm worth \$25,000, sold it for cash and put it into Ontario government bonds, the irony of the situation is that he would not pay one five-cent piece directly for education taxes. It is not fair.

We on this side of the House know that land and buildings must pay a certain amount, as far as education is concerned, but that line must be drawn some time and that line was drawn, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. leader of the Opposition two days ago when he made the promise to the people of Ontario that there would be a foundation plan and a levelling off—a standard mill rate for all of the people of this province wherever they may live—and that that mill rate would go no higher. That, Mr. Speaker, is what the people of this province want to hear, because they know perfectly well that some time taxes on land, as far as education is concerned, must cease. They are delighted, I know, to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition take a definite stand. The time to do that is right now.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about another department that is most interesting to me because I come from an agricultural county. I wish to say a few words about the agricultural industry. Firstly, I would like to say that I acknowledge, along with the government and the hon. members of this House, that the prices for the farmers today are much better than, say, a year ago. But I wish to remind this House that farmers are still very much behind financially than practically every other segment of Ontario life.

Industrial workers are making much more money — plumbers, electricians, carpenters, machinists and dozens of others. But, nevertheless, conditions, as far as farmers are concerned, financially have improved.

This government, Mr. Speaker, would have us believe that they have had a hand in it. They would have us believe that they have increased the price of beef and pork, and so on. Mr. Speaker, I tell you this—and if the hon. members opposite will be truthful and honest, they would admit it—if it had not been for the devaluation of the Canadian dollar, prices of beef, pork and other farm products would be much lower than they are today.

Mr. Speaker, the point is this: the government opposite had nothing whatsoever to do with the devaluation of the Canadian dollar, nothing to do with it whatsoever. This is an artificial condition that could change at

any time; and by the way the hon. leader in Ottawa jumps around it could be changed tomorrow or the next day or a year from now, or even before we leave here tonight. One never knows what is going to be in the paper.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to impress upon this House that while prices of pork and beef and other farm commodities have gone up because of the devaluation of the Canadian dollar, they are still caught in the increase in the cost of machinery, so important to agriculturalists today. In the future, farmers who are buying such things as tractors, trucks, ploughs or combines or any type of farm machinery, because of the devaluation of the Canadian dollar are going to have to pay more. At the present time, they are getting more for their goods but in the immediate future, people who have to buy a new combine next year, will pay more for that combine, more for their tractors and more for their ploughs, and so on, so that the net amount of money that the farmers of this province need will be approximately the same as it was before.

Therefore, we on this side of the House, while appreciating very much the fact that the position of the farmer in this province as far as beef and pork and products such as that are concerned, have increased, we appreciate it is because of the devalued dollar. We warn the hon. members opposite that this is strictly an artificial situation and could change at any time. If the Rt. Hon. Mr. Diefenbaker put the Canadian dollar back to the same as an American dollar tomorrow morning the price of beef in this province of Ontario would be down three or four cents a pound and so would the price of pork. And hon. members opposite would not be able to do one single thing about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about something that is very close to me—

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Is the hon. member an Ottawa Conservative now?

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): What is the hon. Minister? That would be a good one to answer. Where is he going or where did he come from?

An hon. member: Is there a difference in Ottawa Conservatives and Ontario Conservatives now?

Mr. Whicher: I wish to speak now in dealing with agriculture on a subject that is very close to me and I refer to the situation of the

dairy farmers and the dairy distributors in this province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, as was said by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) in their speeches in the last two or three days, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) said only a year ago in this House that if a milk plan in the province of Ontario was not forthcoming there would be chaos in the dairy industry in this province. He never said a truer word in his life; because really there is chaos in the dairy industry in this province at the present time.

I realize that many hon. members will know what I am about to say, but I feel there are some who may not and for that reason I am going to talk for just a few minutes about the differences in the prices of milk to farm producers in this province of Ontario.

I would like to start this way, by saying that the dairies, the people who bottle fluid milk in the province of Ontario, pay approximately—the average price across the board—approximately \$5 per hundredweight to the producers of the milk that they bottle. For approximately 90 per cent of the milk, which is exactly in many instances the same quality, the producer of that milk only gets half the price or \$2.50 per hundredweight.

Let me give hon. members an illustration of this. In my own particular businesses in Warton and Southampton, we are on a basis of paying \$4.81 per hundredweight. But during the summer months, because this is a big tourist area, it is necessary that we buy extra quantities of milk. We buy from our local farmers and I would give hon. members this situation. I am thinking of one man particularly who sells us approximately 1,600 pounds of milk a day. On June 29 he goes right by the dairy to a powdered milk plant and gets \$2.50 per hundredweight for his milk; and on June 30—because our tourist season really starts on July 1—on June 30 he does not go by the dairy, he stops. And for exactly the same milk that he took to the powdered milk plant at \$2.50 yesterday, today he gets \$4.81.

This, Mr. Speaker, continues all during the months of July and August. The day before Labour Day, that farmer does not stop at the dairy any more. He takes his milk on another 10 miles to a powdered milk plant and instead of getting \$4.81, he gets \$2.50. For exactly the same milk that he sold to the dairies yesterday, he gets \$2.50 tomorrow.

This is a situation that is going on all over the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, this is not right and proper. It is not right that we have prices that are differentiated by 100 per cent, not right by any means. If this government would give leadership in the form of a milk plan it would be possible that this differential could be changed over a period of years. It was with this in mind I am sure that the hon. Minister last year suggested that there should be a milk plan or, in his own words, there would be chaos in the province of Ontario.

I want to give hon. members one other example of what I consider to be a chaotic condition as far as this department is concerned regarding milk. We can have two farmers side by side, both good friends of the dairy operator, and this one farmer—we will call him farmer Brown—has a milk quota. He buys milk from farmer Brown but he cannot buy any from farmer Smith because farmer Smith has not got a quota. That is the law of the land in this province.

Both of these farmers are real good friends of the dairy operator. He would like to take milk from both of them, but because he sells only so much he can only take from one. I am not quarrelling with that particularly. But say the man who has a quota decides to sell his farm, and he may sell it to somebody who the dairy operator does not know at all, he never met him in his life, he may be a newcomer coming from Holland, for example. Certainly not that there is anything wrong with our Dutch friends, they are good dairy farmers. But the point is that this chap, farmer Smith, from whom the dairy operator has not been able to buy milk, now there would be a chance for the dairy operator to buy milk from him; because Mr. Brown, who has been selling milk for the last 20 years, is selling his farm to a newcomer whom the dairy operator does not know at all, but under the rules of The Milk Control Act legislated by this department the dairy operator cannot take any milk from the farmer whom he has known for the past 20 years and who is a personal friend of his. He still must take it from the newcomer.

Mr. Speaker, this is not right. It is not proper at all that this should take place. I suggest that something must be done, that there must be a milk plan for the dairy industry of this province and it must have some leadership by the hon. Minister who sits at the head as the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Ontario. No-

where has there been more proof of chaos in this department and in the dairy industry than what has been mentioned by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party the other day, when they mentioned the fact that there was a directive put out—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Whicher: At the end of my speech I will.

There was a directive put out by The Department of Agriculture increasing the price of fluid milk in this province. I want to read it; I want to read the directive that went out to all of the distributors in the province of Ontario signed by the director of the fluid milk division of The Department of Agriculture, the Milk Industry Board of Ontario.

This is the note that all milk distributors got, dated October 4, 1962:

Notice to all milk distributors in Ontario. Re increase in producer prices. Please take note that in each market covered by a collective bargaining agreement or board award which provides for a basic price to be paid to producers based on the formula, there will be, in accordance with the terms of the formula, an increase of 19 cents per 100 pounds in payment for milk on and after November 1, 1962. Please check your market agreement and make any necessary change in producer payments for milk purchases commencing November 1, 1962.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this notice was put out by the Milk Industry Board of Ontario. But I say to you, and to all the hon. members of this House, that it is a sad state of affairs when we have the hon. Minister of Agriculture, to whom the Milk Industry Board is responsible, and that same hon. Minister knows nothing about this order going out and being circularized all over the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the government of this province, under the leadership of the hon. Prime Minister, so the press report stated, decided at the last moment—it was not just the eleventh hour by any means, it was 5 minutes to 12. As a matter of fact I did not get notice of what I am about to tell you until the next day. The price increase was already in effect when any dairy with whom I am associated got the notice, and the only place we got it was on television and through radio and, I believe, through the London

Free Press who evidently got a scoop on this particular matter: "The government of this province decided that there should be no milk increase as far as the fluid milk is concerned."

My question, and I believe this is an honest and legitimate one, is: If the government decided that the price of milk should not go up, why did it not decide it before this notice went out to all the milk distributors of this province and through them to all the people of this province?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Does the hon. member want me to tell him why?

Mr. Whicher: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is he going to let me tell him?

Mr. Whicher: I have got more to say about this.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): He asks the questions but he does not want answers.

Mr. Whicher: All right. As a matter of fact, I will take it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend has alleged that this was an order that went out from the Milk Industry Board. My hon. friend is also aware, as a dairyman, and he knows very well that in the final analysis of any milk price arrangement in the province of Ontario between a producer group and a distributor the price is arrived at by negotiation. The very fact that a moment ago my hon. friend suggested that he pays \$4.81 for milk in his particular market is indicative of the fact that it is a privately negotiated price in any particular market. It does not apply across the province as a standard fixed price.

The very fact also that this increase in the formula—as was indicated by the Milk Industry Board—was simply a notice and it was identical to the notice that went out on two previous occasions because I have the copies of the letters.

It simply means that the basis of agreement, under The Milk Industry Act through the milk producers league, was that this amount of 19 cents would be warranted as an increase. There is nothing fixed about it whatsoever. As positive proof of this very fact, at least 31 markets in the province of Ontario had asked to negotiate, to maintain the price before any action ever was taken. We had all kinds of producers suggesting to us that this suspension of the application should be made and this was what was done.

Mr. Whicher: May I say something now?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Just a minute. We waited until the eleventh hour, as my hon. friend suggests, we waited because 31 milk markets in Ontario had already indicated that they were taking action to hold the price and we thought that all of them would take the action to not take the increase; but at the eleventh hour we realized that this was not the case, so we suspended the application of the formula.

But I want to point out to my hon. friend that on November 1 he was as free to negotiate a higher price with his producers as he was on the last day of October. We did nothing to stop the increase of the price of milk to the producers as he suggests we did. This is a matter of negotiation between every milk distributor group and every market group in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I wish to point out to the hon. Minister is that if this were all so very simple and they wanted to discuss these things with the various markets and the producers of this province, why did he not do it in the first place before this notice went out all over the province of Ontario and created more chaos than there already is in the dairy industry?

An hon. member: A good question, yes.

Mr. Whicher: The answer is, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister had no idea that this notice was going out in the first place, that it slipped out under his nose, that he did not know what was happening. And I suggest this, that the hon. Prime Minister had no idea of the chaos that it was going to create until two days before when the dairies had already advertised to the tune of many thousands of dollars across this province that unfortunately they were going to have to put up the price of milk because they had got the order from the Ontario Milk Industry Board of the province of Ontario. Under whose department? With the hon. Minister's name at the head of the department.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was not an order.

Interjection by hon. Mr. Robarts.

Mr. Whicher: I never got a notice until the next day, and I suggest this: he may be the hon. Prime Minister, but he did not know anything about this and probably still does not know anything.

An hon. member: We had already brought it to their attention.

Another hon. member: That is right.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I just want to go on. I have one more question to ask my hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

I think that he will agree, because he said it himself last year, that if there was not a milk plan in this province there would be chaos. If he was as good as his word then he would admit that there is chaos in the dairy industry, an industry that comes under his department, in this province today.

An hon. member: He is nodding his head; yes.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. Minister this: what does he intend to do about it? Not only is there chaos in the milk industry as far as agriculture is concerned today, but there is chaos in the tobacco industry. I want to point out to this honourable House a headline in the *London Free Press* of December 1, only last Saturday:

FEARS POLITICS IN TOBACCO SALES CRISIS
SCUTTling OF MILK PLAN INSPIRES
STEWART'S WORRY

That is the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Politics must be kept out of the current crisis in the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Industry, Agriculture Minister W. A. Stewart said last night. At the same time, the Minister charged, there is too much evidence of politics in the recent scuttling of the proposed Ontario Milk Marketing Plan.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister of Agriculture makes a serious charge such as that, that politics have scuttled the milk plan and he fears politics in the tobacco sales crisis, he places all of us, particularly on this side of the House, under a cloud. He suggests to the people of this province that some Liberal members, or member, has scuttled this plan. What I want to know, Mr. Speaker—and I give him the opportunity right now—I want him to name one man who is sitting in this Legislature who has attempted to scuttle the milk plan or the tobacco plan and I will be very glad to hear the name right now.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Whicher: He has not got anybody; he cannot name anybody. He has an excuse for his own inefficiency and the inefficiency of his department, he has suggested the Liberals or our hon. friends, for that matter, the NDPs, have scuttled this plan—

An hon. member: Ask him to get it in the—

Mr. Whicher: Nobody has scuttled the milk plan or the tobacco sale crisis in this province except the inefficiency of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the department which he heads.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not be hurt by the comment, because the Tories have been playing politics in agricultural affairs for years.

Mr. Whicher: Well, I want to know if he means me! Or anyone else—who does he mean?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the reason there is chaos in the milk industry and the tobacco industry at the present time in the province of Ontario is not because there are not enough advisory boards to advise the hon. Minister, because I do not think there is any department of government that has so many advisory committees and boards as the hon. Minister of Agriculture's. I suggest that all of us here, I do not want to mention anybody's name who does not sit in this House, go home tonight and read the names of the people who are sitting on the committees and the advisory boards to the hon. Minister of Agriculture in this province.

I will say this without fear of any contradiction whatever that there are too many people on boards, advisory boards and committees of this government and, particularly this department, who, instead of being active farmers who can really advise the hon. Minister, are retired farmers and Tories at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Name some of them.

Mr. Whicher: I could name one.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: One—just one?

Mr. Whicher: I will name one, don't ever think that I cannot.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Come on, name them all; you say there are several.

Mr. Whicher: I will tell you who he is. The man who sits as the head of the Conservative agricultural committee, who advises you. How many boards and commissions—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Who is he? Name him?

Mr. Whicher: You ought to know.

An hon. member: Name him!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is no such man that I know of.

Mr. Whicher: Well there is; you should know what is going on.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: He said there were several. Come on and name them. Who are they?

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say there is a lack of leadership in the agricultural situation in the province of Ontario; and in order to have these plans going we must have active government leadership. We must have active government leadership, too, in the field of financing as far as government is concerned in this province of Ontario. We must provide incentive for industry, not take it away.

Just as a matter of interest, without casting any aspersions on the New Democratic plan for financing the health scheme, may I point out that they advocate a 3 per cent additional corporation tax to help finance it. All of us know that the money has to come from somewhere—

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Where do you suggest it should come from?

Mr. Whicher: May I merely say that if you increase the corporation tax from the present 52 per cent it will then be 55 per cent; and on top of that—

Mr. Thomas: What is the alternative?

Mr. MacDonald: Are you going to increase the sales tax?

Mr. Whicher: —and on top of that we read in many speeches of the hon. leader in years gone by that he advocated that there should be additional corporation taxes. So, instead of having 52 per cent, it could very well be that the corporation taxes in the province of Ontario could be at least 60 per cent—the highest in the whole world!

Mr. MacDonald: Where are you going to raise it?

Mr. Whicher: How can we expect to get industry into this province, if we raise the taxes instead of lowering some of them?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Whicher: We are never going to get industry or financial institutions to invest money in this province or anywhere else in the Dominion of Canada if we continually raise taxes as far as corporations are concerned. We must have realism in the financial planning of this province—

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: —and I would just like to ask: If the NDP advise additional corporation taxes in this province for a medical plan, why did they not increase the corporation taxes in the province of Saskatchewan's medical plan?

An hon. member: That is a good question.

Mr. Whicher: Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the corporation taxes—

Mr. MacDonald: What are you going to do in Ontario?

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Wait until the election and you will find out.

Mr. Whicher: Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the corporation taxes in the province of Ontario right today are higher than they are in that great socialist state of Saskatchewan? I will tell hon. members why. Because the leaders of the CCF government in Saskatchewan have not got enough nerve to put the taxes up, because they know they will drive all the industry, the little bit of industry that now is left there, out of the province altogether.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say that in all departments of government the Cabinet is put there to provide leadership and nowhere is that more important than in the field of financing and the great amounts of money that the government is probably going to have to borrow in the future. In mentioning the medical plan that all the parties in this province are now very much in favour of, I take hon. members back just two or three years to the hospital plan which has turned out to be so very successful.

There is only one thing wrong with the Ontario hospital plan today. There are too many people in the hospital who should not be there and there are too many not there who should be there because of lack of beds. Somewhere along the line, we must have enough direction from the government so that people do not go to hospital—the odd person goes to hospital just for a rest. If we

are having—and we certainly will have—a medical plan in this province, then we must have some direction by the government so that the financing of this great line of human betterment will be done in a realistic and businesslike manner. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL LANDS

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 2, An Act to provide for the rehabilitation and development of agricultural lands in rural areas in Ontario.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this bill, I feel that this is one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation that has affected rural Ontario for many days. I believe all of us are agreed that in the province of Ontario, even during this past generation—certainly for a number of years, particularly since the last war—there has been a change taking place in our rural communities. A good many of our farm people across the province have gone to complete mechanization of their operations. Many of the farms that were at one time self-contained family units, providing a living for the family on that particular farm, those same farm families now find themselves, because of soil characteristics, not in a position to use mechanization. Many of these farms were turned into pasture farms; some of them were abandoned.

In many instances farms were expanded and other family farms were connected so that we have larger units. But in many areas of the province, that did not lend themselves to this type of development, there appeared to be areas that could be better used in other ways.

It was with this thought in mind that the federal government drafted The Agricultural and Rehabilitation Development Act in order that studies and surveys might be taken of rural areas in Canada so that the provincial governments, in co-operation with local community groups, might enter into agreements with their respective provinces, and with the federal government for the rehabilitation and development of these rural lands.

The chief objective of many of these projects, that might be described under the ARD Act, would have to do with conservation. It does seem to me that all of us who

have any regard for the future of this province and of this nation, must be interested in conservation and all that it implies. While we respect the amount of work that has been done on conservation already, there does seem to be room under the ARD for many expanded projects.

I believe that one of the main purposes of this Act is that, in areas where farmers are continuing to carry on as farmers, through surveys and work in their respective areas, we might be able to develop additional sources of income for these rural people by providing employment opportunities not presently available in these rural areas.

We might also be able to provide different ways of getting an income in these rural areas. I am suggesting that there are opportunities under this Act for the establishment of private recreational and camp sites in many areas of the province that particularly lend themselves to this type of thing. It seems to me that we must recognize the fact that while the person may live in rural Ontario, it does not follow by the same theory that that person must earn all of his income from agriculture or from the tilling or operation of the soil of his farm.

There are many ways that this can be done. I have reference to an area in Ontario in which a farmer had quite a nice lake frontage. He had been operating a farm, milking a few cows and carrying on his farm operation trying to provide a living for himself and his family. He thought that it would be a good idea if he were to build a couple of cottages back by the lake front and provide a track through the farm to get to them. This he did and he found that there was no problem in getting these rented to families from distant urban communities who wanted to find a place they could take their families for a couple of weeks holiday in the summer. He expanded this service to the place that it provided quite a substantial source of revenue to his farm and he found that by providing camp sites in the following year he built his income up to a substantial figure.

This is typical, to my way of thinking, of some of the things that can be done to increase the standard of living of rural people in many of these areas. Under conservation we could certainly do something about water storage areas, and reforestation programmes. It may well be that there are areas in the province that could very well be planted back to trees. It seems to me that the ultimate object of this bill must be that, in co-operation with the local people of various communities across rural Ontario, we take a

good look at what is the proper and best use for land in those rural communities. I do not think that we can say all of a sudden: well, this ARDA bill is going to mean the rejuvenation of all rural Ontario overnight. I think it means that we must take a good look at areas of the province where local people have expressed interest in the application of this Act and determine what with their co-operation is in their best interests.

There are areas in the province that have very good agricultural lands; but because they have not proper outlet for drainage those lands are of no use to them. While we do not have drainage Acts in the province of Ontario, under the ARD Act of the federal government through which we are now proposing, by the implementation of this Act, to work, we would be able to bring about the implementation of drainage outlets in relationship to county boundaries that may be crossed and develop outlets that would be of too costly a nature for local organizations or local communities or farmers to develop themselves. This is one of the substantial projects that might be undertaken.

Then I believe one of the other things that offers a great deal of promise here in the province of Ontario is the development of our community pasture programmes. This is something that is not new in Canada. It may be new in the province of Ontario, but it has long been a practice of western Canada to have community pastures and they are to be found in eastern Canada as well.

I took the trouble to visit some of these community pastures and see them in operation. I could not help but be impressed with the potential of this particular project in eastern Canada. Every one of us recognizes that our population is growing rapidly in Canada—in fact, in all North America—and we are faced, as I see it, not only in eastern Canada but in North America, with a very possible shortage of beef in the years that are ahead.

In fact, we are told by those who are considered to be experts in their field that we need an additional 500,000 head of cattle every year for the next 10 years. Today our cattle population in Canada is something over 12 million head. But we have great areas in eastern Canada, particularly in areas of Ontario, that can grow abundant grass and forage crops which could be devoted to the establishment of cow-calf herds in order that we might breed and raise more feeder cattle here in the province of Ontario. We bring in from western Canada to the province

of Ontario a sizeable number of cattle each year, I believe something in the neighbourhood of 200,000 head—in instances it has gone up as high as a quarter of a million head and even higher—every year. It seems to me that we should be using some of the areas of this province to produce these feeder cattle.

Now then, on community pastures. We have talked to many farmers who would be interested in getting into cow-calf operations and breeding of beef cattle; but they tell us that the limitations they are faced with have to do with the size of their farms. They suggest that while they can grow feed on their 100-acre farm, or larger farms in some instances, they cannot carry a cow herd as well as grow feed. They suggest to us that if the projects that could be developed under the ARD Act were to include community pastures, they would then have the opportunity of carrying their cow herds on the community pastures and providing the feed for them at the home farm, they could carry them over the winter. In this way we could greatly expand the beef cattle population of the province of Ontario.

We think there are areas in Ontario that lend themselves particularly well to this kind of project. Under the ARD Act, the federal government would participate substantially in the purchase of these pastures, along with the provincial government.

We feel they would be best operated by local groups within the community with a minimum of government representation on the boards that would organize and operate these community pastures, and we would be able to provide a service for the expansion of the beef industry. We think that it has worked exceedingly well in other areas of Canada and see no reason why it would not work here.

But I feel that if the ARDA programme in Ontario under this Act is to be successful, then it must have the full support and co-operation of local people. There has been no thought and no suggestion in this Act or in the federal Act that whole groups of people be moved out of their communities. I know there have been things said along these lines, but this has never been the intent.

We have had representations made to us by various county organizations across the province suggesting that the way to do this is to have local groups participate with the federal and the provincial organizations. To set up this we feel that we should appoint

an ARDA directorate as provided in the Act, which would comprise representatives of various departments of government and I would suggest, since it is the administration of this Act that is vested in The Department of Agriculture, that the ARDA directorate might well include representatives of The Department of Agriculture, a representative of The Departments of Lands and Forests, of Municipal Affairs, of Economics and Development and of Treasury, and further that we appoint a representative from the advisory committee on conservation. Because this Act, to my way of thinking, does a great deal as far as conservation is concerned.

While ARDA is not wholly concerned with conservation, certainly conservation is a very great part of ARDA, and any of us who are interested in the future of this country must recognize the fact that we must be prepared to preserve those natural resources that we now have. That we must do everything within our power, not only to preserve them, but to develop them to the advantage not only of the people who are here today but those who will come after us.

It seems to me that we, in this province, should implement this Act and develop it to the full in order that we may participate in a programme that, to my mind, promises more for all Canada, and in particular rural Canada, than any legislation that we have seen on statute books either federally or provincially for a very long time.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I rise not to oppose the legislation as set out in this bill, but to suggest to the hon. Minister and to the House that I think there is a danger we are getting into a position where we have a multiplicity of legislation with a minimum of action under the legislation.

Now in this particular instance, sir, we are setting up by this legislation, a set of powers and an authority that to my mind closely parallels that which is already enjoyed by The Conservation Authorities Act of this province.

If one reads the conservation Act and then reads this bill, there is very little difference between the two. Now what I am suggesting to the hon. Minister is, that if we are going to pass this bill, then it seems to me that the place of conservation, as we have known it in legislation, no longer exists. One surely will absorb the other. To have two of them so closely parallel would, to my way of thinking, make it certain that neither one of

them would do the effective job that the hon. Minister has in mind.

The hon. Minister said a moment ago, that the conservation Acts that we have in this province do not go as far in some instances as is provided under this new Act. Now that, I think, is true, but certainly we have in this Legislature the power to extend the powers of the legislation dealing with conservation to include the extra powers that we need to make it completely comparable with this bill.

So I suggest to the House that the hon. Minister should consider streamlining our legislation in respect to this matter, not have two or three Acts and two or three departments dealing with what is, after all, one great big subject. I think that is what we are in danger of doing in passing this Act.

The other point I wanted to make, the only other point, has to do with the directorate. Under this government we appoint so many committees, advisory committees and commissions that we have found what to me is a comparatively new name. We say that there shall be a directorate of three persons appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

I have two things to say about this. I think we are going altogether too far in delegating the powers of this Legislature to outside and independent committees, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that there is not any reason that I can see at the moment why these matters could not be dealt with directly under the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

I see no reason, at the moment, why we should set up another committee, another independent committee, apart from the Legislature to carry out the duties imposed upon it by this Act. And I would ask, even at this late date, that the hon. Minister consider doing away with the idea of a committee independent from the department and independent from this Legislature, and bring this matter under the Minister of Agriculture and before the hon. members of this Legislature.

If the hon. Minister does not want to go that far, or refuses to, then I think we in this Legislature should demand that one of the members of the directorate should be a member of the Legislature. We are getting to the point in this province, with all these committees and directorates now, where the Legislature is being removed from what should be its prime role. One of the ways that we could bring it back into focus again, is to have a member of the Legislature interested in these problems, sit on this directorate. He would be responsible to the Legislature for the actions of the directorate and report to

the House from time to time upon its activities.

I suggest that perhaps the hon. Minister will say in a moment that we will benefit as a province, by going into this agreement with the federal government. I imagine that benefits will flow because of this union with the federal government in regard to these matters; I do not dispute that. I think if there are benefits that would accrue then we should catch on to them, but those two things that I have mentioned strike me as being important and I want the hon. Minister to consider them in the light of what I have said and in the light of the experience that he has had in these matters so far.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I think I can confine my remarks to a very few minutes and certainly anything else might be left to the committee stage.

The two brief points that I wanted to make are these: I agree completely with the hon. Minister that this is potentially one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation that has come into this House. I think that all across Canada we have gradually been waking up to the fact that we have a major problem in rural areas. You have the problem of dwindling population; you have a problem of increasing services in terms of cost, so that the increasing cost of the services has to be met by this dwindling population. Therefore, you have a desperate necessity for diversifying the economy to provide a broader economic base both for the purpose of carrying the services and providing employment and everything else. In areas which are predominantly agricultural, even more so than the province of Ontario—if I can say this as unprovocatively as possible—they have tackled this problem some time ago.

For example, in the province of Saskatchewan, which is predominantly a rural province, they came face-to-face with this problem so inescapably that some 6 or 7 years ago—if I recall correctly—they set up a Royal commission which has produced fairly weighty tomes that are really sociological studies of the problems faced by rural areas. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, they are not without some value to the province of Ontario because they deal with these basic problems faced in agricultural areas.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Grey South has certainly made a very good point in warning that we should not get overlapping—unnecessarily overlapping—legislation. I would be inclined, Mr. Speaker, just as a snap judgment on it, to

say, however, that if we have to make a choice it is the conservation Act that should go by the board. I believe, as the hon. Minister has put it, that conservation is a part of ARDA, and therefore this is only a part of a larger problem that we are now tackling. As we come to grips with the full range of problems and not just the conservation problems, it seems to me that finally we at the legislative level are facing up to the need for it.

Now, it may be true, as the hon. member for Grey South has said, that if you read the sections of the conservation Act, they gave the power to go beyond conservation theoretically. But the Act was called the conservation Act and we have never gone any further. I think as an embodiment and a symbol of the broader problem that we are tackling, that this ARDA bill is necessary, it certainly should have the whole-hearted support of everybody, and now we have got to get into the detail of trying to put it into effect as quickly as possible.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, if I may, to conclude this debate on the passage of the second reading of the bill, I would just like to make one or two comments. I find myself always respecting the comments of the hon. member for Grey South, but I do find it rather difficult to follow the thinking of his party when I suggest that a day or so ago, I believe, there was some criticism directed at my friend the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), because he was having one of his bodies or commissions—

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the Minister, if he intends to speak for a considerable time, perhaps it might be better to bring it up a little later, or could he finish in a few minutes?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I can very easily, yes. All I wanted to suggest is that I am being criticized for putting something outside of the department here, which at the same time is responsible to the Minister. This is the case. This directorate is not appointed from people outside the government service, it is appointed from representatives of the respective departments that I mentioned. And they are responsible to the Minister, completely, under this Act.

I can see some reason to believe that there could be some conflict under the conservation Act that we have now, but I believe that the conservation Act deals largely with the conservation authorities. This goes much

further and deals with a great deal more than that with which the conservation authorities can presently deal.

I am not sure whether the federal Act will include this, I rather doubt that it does. To me it is an entirely different concept than The Conservation Authorities Act in the province of Ontario.

I think it is only fair to point out that the province of Ontario leads as far as the conservation authorities are concerned. We are simply co-operating with the federal government in expanding the already magnificent services which we provide under conservation and this Act certainly does just that. I feel, sir, there is no reason why there

should be any hesitancy about giving this bill second reading and I do so recommend.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I want to announce that we will go on to the order paper and the Throne debate tomorrow morning.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Friday, December 7, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Friday, December 7, 1962

Reading and receiving petition	151
Township of East York, bill respecting, Mr. Beckett, first reading	152
Sudbury high school board and the high school board of the town of Coniston, bill respecting, Mr. Letherby, first reading	152
Sudbury Youth Centre, bill respecting, Mr. Letherby, first reading	152
City of Oshawa, bill respecting, Mr. Thomas, first reading	152
Young Men's Christian Association, Young Women's Christian Association of Cobourg, bill respecting, Mr. Brown, first reading	152
City of Sault Ste. Marie, bill respecting, Mr. Downer, first reading	152
Beechwood Cemetery Company of the city of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Beckett, first reading	152
Township of Innisfil, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, first reading	152
Gloucester high school board and the collegiate institute board of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Beckett, first reading	153
County of Dufferin, bill respecting, Mr. Root, first reading	153
Township of North Grimsby, bill respecting, Mr. Lewis, first reading	153
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Gisborn, first reading	153
George Taylor Richardson Trust, bill respecting, Mr. Chapple, first reading	153
City of Waterloo, bill respecting, Mr. Wintermeyer, first reading	153
University of Waterloo, bill respecting, Mr. Wintermeyer, first reading	153
City of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. Reaume, first reading	153
Township of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, first reading	153
Young Men's Christian Association, Young Women's Christian Association of Guelph, bill respecting, Mr. Worton, first reading	153
Association of the Chemical Profession of Ontario, bill to incorporate, Mr. Cowling, first reading	153
City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading	153
Township of Bruce, bill respecting, Mr. Whicher, first reading	153
Town of Fort Erie, bill respecting, Mr. Bukator, first reading	153
Township of Scarborough, bill respecting, Mr. Sutton, first reading	154
Boys' Home, bill respecting, Mr. Lawrence, first reading	154
Inspection of meat for human consumption, bill to provide for, Mr. Stewart, first reading	154
Dependants' Relief Act, bill to amend, reported	154
Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act, bill to amend, reported	154
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Cowling, Mr. Wardrope	154
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Dymond, agreed to	169
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	171

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1962

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery students from Hudson Public School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petition has been received:

Of the corporation of the township of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass establishing the board of education of the secondary school jurisdiction in Toronto township, Streetsville and Port Credit and public school jurisdiction in Toronto township and for related purposes.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the select committee appointed to consider The Municipal Act and related Acts be authorized to sit during the Christmas-New Year adjournment of this session and that the same allowances for expenses to the chairman and members thereof be payable for such meetings as are provided by Section 65 of The Legislative Assembly Act, R.S.O. 1960, Chapter 308, for meetings held during the interval between sessions.

Mr. H. E. Beckett (York East): Mr. Speaker, when we started out in the spring of 1961, we asked for briefs from all the municipalities in the province of Ontario and from different organizations and associations. We also put an ad. in all the newspapers throughout the province requesting briefs in connection with The Municipal Act and related Acts.

We have received over 85 briefs, which we have dealt with, and heard just about that many delegations. We are now in the process of preparing a report on The Assessment Act, The Municipal Act, The Local Improvement

Act and The Planning Act. Those, we felt, are the four major Acts.

When the committee was set up it authorized the committee to deal with The Municipal Act and related Acts. There are over 55 related Acts and it is a terrific problem to deal with them all, so we thought we would take the four major ones. Then, in the session of 1963, we will be able to present a report dealing with those four major Acts—The Municipal Act, The Assessment Act, The Local Improvement Act and The Planning Act. Thank you.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the last day for depositing private bills with the Clerk free of penalty be extended to the 8th day before the day on which the present session resumes after the Christmas-New Year adjournment; that the last day for receiving petitions be extended to the end of the second week, the last day for introducing bills to the end of the third week, and the last day for receiving reports from committees on private bills to the end of the sixth week after the session resumes following the adjournment.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Would the hon. Prime Minister give us any indication of the time?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this motion is simply to provide for those private bills which are brought into the House to have the same time limits in relation to the session, or the last part of the session after Christmas. We are therefore extending the same rights to anyone who wishes to submit a private bill, the same time limits, after Christmas as before. And this is brought about because we have had this divided session the last two years.

Mr. Thomas: My question was that I wondered if the hon. Prime Minister could give us any indication of when we are likely to reconvene.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No. We will see how we proceed with the business of the House. I would think—does the hon. member mean

when we would reconvene after Christmas?
Or rather, after New Year?

Mr. Thomas: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would think either the latter part of January or the early part of February. I have not worked out a date as yet, but I believe Easter is about the 14th of April, and we will assess the amount of business that we have to do and work it back. I would think we would reconvene probably in the last week in January. I do not know the specific date. I doubt it would be before that.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister a further question? Can one conclude from this timetable that extends into February and March that the hon. Prime Minister is laying to rest completely the possibility of a snap election?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, at this juncture may I ask the hon. Prime Minister when he intends to adjourn this portion of the session?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Once again, Mr. Speaker, it depends upon the work, but I thought that we would probably continue to the 19th or 20th of December. Hon. members are all aware that this year we opened a week later than last year. It was brought to my attention last year, particularly for the hon. members from some of the rural areas, that there is a good deal of activity in the ridings in the form of warden's banquets and that sort of thing taking place in the late fall and therefore I delayed the opening of the Legislature an additional week this year. But in view of the fact that Christmas comes on a Tuesday, if we were to adjourn approximately the middle of the preceding week I think that would give everyone an opportunity to get home and do their Christmas shopping and so on. So I should think it would be 18th, 19th or 20th of December.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

Mr. H. E. Beckett (York East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of East York.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SUDBURY AND CONISTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East) in absence of Mr. R. Belisle, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Sudbury high school board and the high school board of the town of Coniston.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SUDBURY YOUTH CENTRE

Mr. Letherby, in the absence of Mr. Belisle, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Sudbury Youth Centre.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OSHAWA

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Oshawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COBOURG Y.M.C.A. AND Y.W.C.A.

Mr. K. Brown (Peterborough) in the absence of Mr. A. Carruthers, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Young Men's Christian Association, Young Women's Christian Association of Cobourg, Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe), in the absence of Mr. J. A. Fullerton, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BEECHWOOD CEMETERY COMPANY

Mr. Beckett, in the absence of Mr. D. H. Morrow, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF INNISFIL

Mr. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Innisfil.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GLOUCESTER HIGH SCHOOL BOARD AND THE COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE BOARD OF OTTAWA

Mr. Beckett, in the absence of Mr. Morrow, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Gloucester high school board and the collegiate institute board of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF DUFFERIN

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the county of Dufferin.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF NORTH GRIMSBY

Mr. W. B. Lewis (York-Humber), in the absence of Mr. C. Daley, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of North Grimsby.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GEORGE TAYLOR RICHARDSON TRUST

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William), in the absence of Mr. J. Gould, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WATERLOO

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Waterloo.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

Mr. Wintermeyer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the University of Waterloo.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GUELPH Y.M.C.A AND Y.W.C.A.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Young Men's Christian Association, Young Women's Christian Association of Guelph, Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CHEMICAL ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate the Association of the Chemical Profession of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. Cowling moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF BRUCE

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Bruce.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF FORT ERIE

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Fort Erie.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

Mr. R. E. Sutton (York-Scarborough) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Scarborough.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE BOYS' HOME

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting The Boys' Home.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

INSPECTION OF MEAT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the inspection of meat for human consumption.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this provides for the inspection and control of meat intended for human consumption and of the plants where the animals for such meat are slaughtered.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Second order, House in committee.

House in committee; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

THE DEPENDANTS' RELIEF ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 1, An Act to amend The Dependants' Relief Act.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 1 reported.

THE ONTARIO-ST. LAWRENCE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 3 reported.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report two bills without amendment, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole begs to report two bills without amendment and asks leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to you, sir, on the excellent job you are doing and have done in your several years as the Speaker of this honourable House. I know that your decisions are fair and just to all of us.

I would like to extend my congratulations also to the new members of the Cabinet and to the recipients of the other appointments made by the government. I feel, along with so many others, that this present Cabinet certainly has a new look, new ideas and, as for us having been in office for 19 years, we are starting on a new programme. This Speech from the Throne indicates just how progressive the new Cabinet is in its outlook.

I would also like to offer, Mr. Speaker, my personal congratulations to the newest hon. member of the House (Mr. Gaunt). I am sorry he does not happen to sit on our side, but I wish the new hon. member for Huron-Bruce every success.

I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, in some of the comments of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) yesterday. He spoke at great length. It was a fine speech. He usually makes a good speech. But he also said many things which are open to conjecture.

As a matter of fact, up until the time he spoke I was beginning to feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition generally were in somewhat of a trance this session. They just did not seem to be able to get into action. Probably following the speech of the hon. member for Bruce they may get going, although that is doubtful.

When the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) spoke I was expecting some real fireworks, because we had read some news reports and press reports that the Opposition was really going to be on the bit this session. But as far as I am concerned, it was pretty much of a dud. I was rather surprised because usually the hon. leader of the Opposition comes up with something worth hearing about.

Following his speech, in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of the next day there was an editorial. I thought it was a dandy and I think the House might just be interested in hearing about it again. As a matter of fact, it is the type of well-written piece so often appearing in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* it might go down well in the record. It heads off:

THE CONVERSION OF MR. WINTERMEYER

It says:

The conversion of the Ontario Liberal leader, Mr. John Wintermeyer, to the cause of socialism, continues apace. He has already stolen the New Democratic Party's policy on Medicare, going much further than the federal Liberals and he has swallowed to a great extent the demands of the trade unions for legislation to prevent employers hiring new workers during a strike.

Now Mr. Wintermeyer, in his reply to the Throne Speech in the Provincial Legislature, has taken over much of the Socialist theory on public ownership of industry.

Socialists in Canada, as in other countries, have been modifying their theories on nationalization in recent years. Few now hold to the pure doctrine of public ownership of all the means of production, distribution and exchange. They suggest instead that the state should take over industry only in those areas where, in the Socialist view, private enterprise is not doing an adequate job. This is precisely the view which Mr. Wintermeyer appeared to be advancing as the Ontario Liberal policy in his speech in the Legislature.

He said: "If we in Ontario are going to prepare effectively for change in world training patterns and effectively develop full employment and orderly economic growth, we must go far beyond the traditional limits of governmental actions."

As an example of what he had in mind, Mr. Wintermeyer proposed a provincial Crown corporation to manufacture stampings and other major items for the automobile manufacturers who now import about \$400 million worth of parts each year. This newspaper has commented before on Mr. Wintermeyer's tendency to rush into major policy statements without apparently much thought and we wonder if he has fully considered the implications of his proposal to invade the automobile industry. His suggestion would involve the most drastic intervention in one of our largest manufacturing industries and would lead very probably to public ownership of all the companies concerned.

The automobile companies import components because they find this cheaper and more efficient than manufacturing them in this country. We agree that this creates a balance of trade problem and represents a loss of thousands of jobs in Canada. We trust that the companies will be encouraged by tax and other incentives to increase their efforts to do more manufacturing in this country and less buying abroad. But the plan to set up a provincially-owned company to produce auto parts could be made to work, in our view, only by legislative compulsion.

The private companies might be compelled to buy from the Crown corporation regardless of price or quality or the Crown corporation could be subsidized to the extent that it could quote prices attractive to the automobile companies. Either method would mean higher costs at a time when we are striving to cut industrial costs to improve our competitive situation in the world. In any event, it seems doubtful, to say the least, that the industry could continue to operate when half publicly and half privately owned. Much of the driving force of competitive free enterprise would be removed.

If Mr. Wintermeyer is going to press this plan and perhaps produce other similar ideas, we suggest that he should in all honesty resign from the Liberal party and apply for membership in the NDP. Failing that, Ontario Liberals who still oppose Socialism might begin to inquire just where their leader is taking them.

It is getting around in this House, Mr. Speaker, to our side being truly free enterprise, private enterprise, and the Opposition en masse being more socialistic in their views. This is not a very happy situation because the Liberals profess to support free enterprise in the same way that we do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: I think it would be a good idea—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Speaker, I might add too, while we are at it, when the other two parties are quibbling, that I was not too much impressed by the hon. member's speech either.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: The only speech so far that I was really impressed by was the Speech from the Throne; an outstanding document, very good.

Now, to get down to some of the local issues, Mr. Speaker, we had an election here in the Metropolitan Toronto area on Monday, and one of the things—

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Well, is that news?

Mr. Cowling: I wish the hon. member would just sit and listen for a couple of minutes. I always sit and listen to what he has to say with my ears wide open.

We voted on the matter of fluoridation and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, I have had some things to say about this in the House from time to time in support of fluoridation. And it was this government that passed legislation to permit municipalities to fluoridate their water by local vote.

I think it is very significant, Mr. Speaker, that this was a Metropolitan-wide vote and to the best of my knowledge it is the first time we have had such a vote in this area. And, of course, the fluoridation proposal was supported by a majority of the voters. Unfortunately those who are not believers in the matter of fluoridation—and I know most of the hon. members in this House are—are proposing, in another two years, to have a petition—if they can get 10 per cent of the people to sign it—to force another vote, which, to my mind, is absolutely unnecessary.

I do not think the legislation we passed in this House at that time thought of such a ridiculous situation. After all, in a free democratic way the majority usually rules. The majority have voted for fluoridation and that is the way it is going to be. So I would certainly support any move in this direction. I noticed where the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has already commented on this problem and the necessary changes will, no doubt, be made.

But the thing which impressed me, Mr. Speaker, was that we had a Metro-wide vote which could be an indication or a forerunner of other votes that could be taken on this same Metropolitan-wide basis.

I would like to talk for a few minutes this morning about the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the original Bill No. 80 which set this thing up in 1953. Many of us were here at the time and I do know that we have a couple of our hon. members who were members of the Metropolitan council too. Just to go back a bit to bring us up to date, I would like to say that the establishment of the Metropolitan area was brought about to a great extent by the popu-

lation move to the cities following the second world war and the Toronto area where they came particularly. Metropolitan Toronto entered this era of post-war population explosion with a municipal structure fragmented by the cessation of movement between the wars.

Many, many thousands of people came into this area during the last 10 years. For example, the population of the city and the 12 suburbs has increased by an average of over 50,000 people annually. The area that housed 900,000 in 1941, gained 700,000 in 20 years and in 1962 there are 1,650,000 persons. Over 650,000 live in the townships of North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke, which, in 1941, had fewer than 63,000 altogether.

To give an idea of the tremendous growth here, Mr. Speaker: In the late 40's and early 50's, some suburban municipalities found it difficult to borrow money at reasonable rates to finance the demands of the new population. In suburbs such as North York, denied physical access to Lake Ontario, the traditional method of supplying water from wells and sewage service by septic tank proved not only incapable of satisfying the growing demand but also very dangerous. As a matter of fact, I was on the Toronto city council at that time, Mr. Speaker, and to my mind the sanitary situation in North York was one of the main reasons for bringing about this setting up of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, along with many others.

I think it is a very good idea to note that by 1959 after five years of operating the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, Professor John G. Grumm of the University of Kansas was able to say in his published work on the Metropolitan area government that Toronto experienced:

Despite some deficiency, its accomplishments have been impressive. It has provided co-ordinated and cheaper financing for the whole area, has virtually solved water and sewage disposal problems, is finally beginning to make some headway in regard to spreading the financial burden of education, has established an efficient centralized police force, is making progress in resolving the area's deficiency in parks and recreation centres, is spreading a modern freeway system throughout the area and is providing better welfare services, particularly to the aged without causing any undue stress upon the finances of any one sector in the Metropolitan region.

You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that in the great townships of North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke, the population is increasing presently at a much faster rate than it is in Toronto.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Toronto is decreasing.

Mr. Cowling: Yes, remaining about the same. It certainly is not going ahead. So that many of the suburbs are quite justified when they say that they should have more representation on the Metropolitan council. This is one of the problems that has to be dealt with. I am sympathetic to their thoughts and pleas in that regard. Basically in order to promote and establish the proper democratic way of government, it is necessary, of course, to have representation by population, although this is not always the easiest thing in the world to do.

Bill No. 80 was passed in 1953 to take effect on January 1, 1954. Much credit for setting up this government must go to Mr. Lorne Cumming, now the deputy Minister of The Department of Municipal Affairs, who at that time was the chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board.

Some of the services which are now handled on the Metropolitan level include assessment, water supply, sewage disposal, air pollution control, transportation, health and welfare, housing, administration of justice, education, licensing, police, planning, parks, emergency measures, acquisition of assets for local municipalities, and so on. Some of us may forget, from time to time, the very important part that the province plays in the financial situation here in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

Just to refresh our memories, Mr. Speaker, I have here the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto estimates for 1962 and they list there very completely our important financial contribution to the government and the reason why we have a prime interest in it. For example, the provincial grants and subsidies, unconditional grants per capita, the estimate was \$8,600,000; the actual in 1960 was lower than that.

The estimate for 1962 was \$8,608,897. The provincial grants on highways, \$2,767,000. Homes for the aged, \$2,037,000. Child welfare, \$1,815,000. Unconditional grant compensation for indigent hospitals, \$762,853. Share of provincial liquor licence fees, \$370,000. Emergency measures, civil defence, \$658,012. Police protection, \$115,000. Jail, \$100,000, and, of course, for the winter

works programme, our contribution was \$89,500.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are not just familiar as to how these provincial grants are made up, and I think it might be a good idea to take a look at this situation. For example, there is a \$5.50 per capita grant, based upon the population of the Metropolitan area as determined by The Department of Municipal Affairs, for grant purposes. The grant in 1962 will be based upon the 1961 census. So we supply a \$5.50 unconditional grant.

We supply 50 per cent of eligible expenditures financed out of current funds with respect to the maintenance and construction of highways, 70 per cent of net expenditures for maintenance, and 50 per cent of expenditures of a capital nature financed out of current funds with respect to homes for the aged. Forty per cent of eligible net expenditures with respect to maintenance of children by children's aid societies; based on 40 per cent of the average annual statutory payment for hospitalization of indigents made in the years 1955-1957, inclusive.

Twenty per cent of provincial liquor licence fees collected from licences within the Metropolitan area. Ninety per cent of eligible expenditures for emergency measures, civil defence, and 30 per cent for firefighting equipment. Ten per cent of expenditures for pension contributions and workmen's compensation with respect to policemen. Ten per cent of the annual cost of maintaining the jails. Seventy-five per cent of labour costs incurred in the winter works programme.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, that our contribution—and when I say “our” I mean the province—is very substantial. In the matter of education I thought you would be interested in this figure: The education expenditure for public schools in the Metropolitan area in 1961, \$84,241,750; separate schools, \$8,156,757; secondary schools, \$43,586,083; for a total of \$135,979,189. Our legislative grants totalled \$34,290,640 or just a little better than 25 per cent of the total outlay in Metropolitan Toronto.

Now that is a lot of money, Mr. Speaker. We sometimes overlook the substantial part that the province plays in the Metropolitan area.

Just the other day there was a little ceremony here when our hon. Prime Minister made a presentation of about \$10 million to the chairman of the Metropolitan government, Mr. William Allen, QC, to assist in

the construction of the east-west subway. This is the first part of several cheques which will no doubt total about \$60 million. So we have done something to encourage the subway construction.

Mr. Singer: Why do they not get grants instead of loans?

Mr. Cowling: Well, that is something that is being considered. Yes, it is under consideration. As a matter of fact this whole Metropolitan concept is being constantly studied and improved.

An hon. member: Nothing has been done about it.

Mr. Cowling: We are doing something about it. We gave this money to the subway on Wednesday; we gave the first \$10 million on Wednesday and this is Friday. That is pretty well up to date, is it not? And we are going to give more.

Mr. Singer: It was a loan.

Mr. Cowling: I am glad to see the hon. members are not so lethargic as I thought they were. Get up and at 'em a little bit.

I think at this time we should pay a special tribute to Mr. Frederick G. Gardiner, the first chairman of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, who retired recently after doing a most tremendous job. He will always be associated with this government. Mr. Gardiner has been confined to the hospital but he is coming along and I know, Mr. Speaker, that I speak for all the hon. members when I wish him an early return to good health and back on the job.

We have had many visitors here from all over the world looking at this government, this special government here, Mr. Speaker. I understand we have had delegations from Japan, from Australia, from London where they have the borough system of course, New York where they have a borough system, from all over the United States, to see how our plan works out. Most of them are very much impressed and are going back to see what they can do for their own crowding cities.

At the present time we have before the Ontario Municipal Board an application from the city of Toronto for outright amalgamation, one from Long Branch, New Toronto and Mimico suggesting that they have a little set-up of their own, and then one from New Toronto suggesting that they go in with some suburbs in the area to form a separate municipal government. These things are difficult.

They require a lot of consideration, Mr. Speaker, by the municipal board, and my own personal feeling is that eventually it will be up to the government to take some action in this regard to bring about the desired results.

Mr. Singer: How long is "eventually"?

Mr. Cowling: Right away. This government moves fast. It moves fast.

Some of the things that have been suggested to add to the present system, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a consolidated Metropolitan housing authority and that we consolidate many of the welfare offices into one. There has been some talk of putting the fire departments under one head, much the same as the police.

One could not help but be impressed during the local election campaigns. Everybody had a platform of amalgamation, either for or against. Most of the people speaking—

Mr. Singer: Some of them went down the middle.

Mr. Cowling: Yes. Most of the people speaking in the city were for amalgamation and most of the people in the suburbs were opposed to amalgamation. And you can understand their concern. I think many of the candidates and with no reflection on their ability, did not really have an understanding of what they meant by amalgamation—whether there was total amalgamation, amalgamation of services, whether it was going to continue to be a federated government, whether they were going to annex other areas into the Metropolitan system or not, I do not know. But the fact remains that Toronto is asking for amalgamation.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, when you stop to consider that this brand new proposition has not been in effect for 10 years yet—it will not be in effect for 10 years until January 1, 1964—it seems to me that when you start dealing with 1.65 million people and their local problems it is something you should not move too quickly on.

The suggestion running through my mind all the time is that at the end of a 10-year period we take a good look at this Metropolitan situation. Maybe the government would consider setting up a committee. I think a committee of the House is probably the best kind of a committee to deal with the situation—they are all elected people, they have a knowledge of affairs here, and they could come up with some recommendations to the Legislature which might be more satisfactory than any. Quite frankly—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: I am talking about a select committee of the House which would include all hon. members. The hon. leader of the Opposition could have a crack at it too, and probably come up with some good ideas.

Mr. Singer: What hon. members need is leadership.

Mr. Cowling: Oh, we have lots of leadership too, and that is why we have committees so that everybody else has a chance to participate in the deliberations. I suppose the hon. member would have just one man and he would call the whole shot.

Mr. Singer: Why does the hon. member not show it?

Mr. Cowling: We are showing it every day. Every day in every way we are getting better and better.

On this matter of amalgamation, Mr. Speaker, I am just doubtful whether we should have a total amalgamation. In my own mind the local councils perform a very useful function at the local level and if any hon. members have had an opportunity to look over the proposals and the report of the committee studying the borough system in London, England, I think they would be impressed with the fact that they feel that many things should be dealt with locally, because when one moves into the other governments, such as the provincial and the federal, one quickly gets away from the problems that the local man wants to talk about.

For example, tree removal, garbage collection, paving lanes and filling in pot-holes and what-not—those are the things that local council is responsible for. Those are the things that the local resident wants to get fast action on, and he does not want to have to appear before or appeal to a higher level of government. I think, even though we may take more services from local government, we always have and should have a place in their particular set-up.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Does the hon. member favour amalgamation or not?

Mr. Cowling: I do not favour amalgamation at the present time.

Hon. members might be interested in this bit about the borough system. The principle on which the borough plan is founded holds that there are definite advantages in the system of municipal government which preserve as great an amount of local autonomy

in the preservation of essentially local services as is practical. If this was the only advantage of the proposal, however, there would be no reason to abandon the present system which is founded on this very principle.

Two additional advantages are anticipated. In the first place it should be possible to allocate voting strength on the Metropolitan council in a more equitable fashion by regrouping the constituent members. In the second by equalizing, or at least bringing up a standard minimum size, the administrative divisions, which would constitute the basic governments of the federation.

The plan apparently anticipates that the boroughs would have the resources to effectively provide their assigned functions. We have had the suggestion that we should be amalgamated. We have had the suggestion of five boroughs or four boroughs, and many others. I think that our government had the good sense and the vision to establish this municipality of Metropolitan Toronto in the first place; and I think that it is our government that will take the lead in making any changes which may be necessary in the future.

Mr. Singer: When is that going to be?

Mr. Cowling: Almost right away.

Mr. Singer: How long is "almost"?

Mr. Cowling: Well, it is right away too. There is another thing, too, Mr. Speaker, that might give a little incentive to the municipalities outside of Toronto. Toronto, as we all know, is the capital city of the great province of Ontario and we are all very proud of that fact. I wonder if there has been any consideration given to the idea of having the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto become the capital city of the province, rather than just Toronto. Now that is something to think about. I am not suggesting it, but it might be an idea.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend—

Mr. Singer: The mayor will not like that.

Mr. Cowling: No. I want to commend you, Mr. Speaker. I want to commend the government and our great leader for this far-reaching and effective Speech from the Throne. If we are given the opportunity, if we can have the co-operation of the Opposition benches in putting forward this far-reaching legislative programme, I am sure that the people of the province of Ontario

will benefit and we will too in so many, many ways.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): As so many of the other hon. members have done, sir, I want to congratulate you on the way you direct the sittings of this Legislature. My association with you over the years personally has been most pleasant. You are gentlemanly in all your actions and I often wonder how you have the urbanity to withstand the jibes and the interruptions and the noise that comes from all sections of this House and which, I often think, is rather a disgrace to parliamentary procedure.

But I certainly do admire the way that you have in ironing out these difficulties and bringing some calm out of the turmoil which so often exists. I do not want to cast any aspersions on anybody but I am looking across the House at the Opposition benches and my remarks are not always channelled in that direction, although at present I must say they are.

I also want to congratulate that great little hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris) for the excellent job that he did in moving the Speech from the Throne. He is the son of a revered illustrious father who, for many years, was a member of the federal House in this country. I predict for him a long life in this Legislature. He fought a great fight against tremendous odds in the last election. Now that he is seated in this House, his opponents might as well leave their candidate at home in the future, as far as the hon. member for Beaches is concerned.

I also want to congratulate the song bird from Welland (Mr. Morningstar) on his great job of seconding the Speech from the Throne. What a great representative he is in this House for that area. He also will be there for many years to come.

I also wish to congratulate the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). I have not had the pleasure of knowing him personally but from what I hear he is a fine addition to this House and I expect to hear great things from him. His record in his own home constituency has been outstanding indeed. I welcome him and congratulate him on his election.

On a sadder note, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sympathy, along with the rest of the hon. members on the passing of the late member for Halton (Mr. Hall), who made a significant contribution to the halls of this Legislature during his term of office. He has gone to a well-earned rest and I express my

sympathy, along with the hon. members of the House, to his loved ones who are left.

And also on the passing of a great personal friend and colleague of mine, the late member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons)—a man I think who was known by all of us to be the finest speaker that ever came in this Legislature. We used to listen on both sides of the House with a great deal of interest to his speeches and he certainly never let us down. And along with the hon. members of the House I express sympathy to his wife and his loved ones in the loss of a great parliamentarian.

I also am regretful at the passing from our chamber of our former Minister of Labour (Mr. Warrender), formerly the Minister of Planning and Development, Minister of Municipal Affairs, and vice-chairman of Hydro. He made a great contribution to the government of Ontario, sir, and I was most pleased to see him elevated to a judgeship. I know in that capacity too he will make a tremendous contribution to this province; we are going to miss him sorely in this Legislature.

I also want to congratulate the new hon. Ministers. I am in a congratulating mood this morning; so many pleasant things have happened on this side of the House that I cannot help but make some mention of them. The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), a man—the Opposition will take note of this—who is going to make a great mark in this province as the Minister of that department, an outstanding young man.

Also the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Auld), a great hon. member and Minister, who will be heard of. He was formerly with the St. Lawrence Parks Development.

And our new Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), the hon. member for Peel, formerly the vice-chairman of Hydro. I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that here is a young man who has a law degree, a parliamentarian of merit, now in charge of a great portfolio at the age of 33—and they tell us we are an old government.

The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer), has he got anybody of the age of 33 that probably could fill this post? Just check up the ages. Check up the ages and see. This is a young man who will be in that position for many years and will make an outstanding contribution, Mr. Speaker. I predict that, and my predictions are not often far wrong.

Then we have, as the leader of the “no down payment” party said, the new hon.

Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Simonett), with his aeroplanes and so on, a successful businessman who has made a worthwhile contribution to his part of the country and will be heard from in this House further. I welcome him to the Cabinet and to this House as a Cabinet Minister.

And my old friend from the north, who is now the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) after doing a tremendous job in Lands and Forests. We northerners will be sorry to lose him in that portfolio, but he will make a mark in the new one, I have no doubt.

Then from Municipal Affairs to Attorney-General (Mr. Cass), a man who could fit into any portfolio and we expect him to do an outstanding job, which he will do in this new one.

And then our veteran of the House, the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Goodfellow), who gave up The Department of Highways, will make a great contribution in his new duties because he is knowledgeable, has served many years and will be an inspiration and help to our younger Cabinet Ministers and our hon. members.

I would like the hon. members of the Opposition to note the young men in this Cabinet. They should tell their people at home that they are now assured of a youthful, progressive outlook in government, which will, mark my words, be so after the next election, whenever that may come.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of a story that will probably fit in there, of four Irishmen who went out one night and imbibed too much and on the way home one of their members, Mike Kelly, was killed by a car. It devolved on the other three to choose who would go down and tell the widow Kelly. So it fell to Pat Flanagan who went down to the house and rang the bell. Mrs. Kelly came to the door and he said, "Are you the widow Kelly?" She said, "I am not, I am Mrs. Kelly, the wife of Mike Kelly." He said, "Do you want to bet?" I would say to the Opposition who feel they will form the next government "if any of you hon. gentlemen on the opposite side want to bet, you know my office. Come on over."

So the average age of this Cabinet is young and there is vigour in every man in it, I would like hon. members to know. I am sorry to say that we have lost the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Daley) who gave long years of service to this House. I understand that the hon. member for Lincoln is not too well but I believe he will be fully recovered soon and to him go our wishes for

a very speedy recovery, for he is very much loved in this Legislature.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts)—the hon. Minister has not mentioned him yet.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, I beg pardon. The hon. Minister is an old friend of mine for years, a man who lived in Cobalt and the north, knowledgeable in mining, knowledgeable in law, a man who brought several mines into production in this province and a great record he has.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Did the hon. Minister say "mines", or "crimes"?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: And when hon. gentlemen talk about crimes—

Mr. Reaume: Do not get mad now, we just asked you a question.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Well, I can always smile.

Mr. Speaker: I might point out for the benefit of members that my speakers' list for today is very short and I am quite sure that anybody who wants to take a legitimate and orderly part in the debate would be allowed to do so.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for using the word "orderly". I doubt if it is understood across the Chamber.

I was very interested in the former hon. speaker's (Mr. Cowling's) remarks about Toronto. As a northerner, I want to say this about Toronto. I have been in many cities of the world in the past two or three years, and I do not think there is a more beautiful city in the world than the city of Toronto. It is clean, it is becoming more up-to-date each year, and I am all for the growth of Toronto. I think it is a wonderful place and Canada should be very proud of it.

I am amazed and grateful, Mr. Speaker, when I note the tremendous progress that has been made by this government in conjunction with private enterprise in north-western Ontario, and I am going to give you some of the factual things that have been done. And when you can compare them with the former Liberal Party's efforts in that area, their efforts pale into insignificance.

I would like hon. members in the Opposition to listen to a few of these accomplishments and they will probably learn what a

vigorous, purposeful government can do for the people of the north when they really work at it. I will confine my remarks, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, to northwestern Ontario, because that is the area where my love lies and my efforts. But I hope to have an opportunity later on in the session to address you on the mining industry throughout the whole province.

During a period which our opponents would like to call a relatively high national unemployment period of last year, northwestern Ontario has counted substantial gains in industry—primary, secondary and service, in transportation and communication facilities, commercial and banking establishments, educational and hospital plants, and a region-wide upsurge in new and expanded accommodation for growing tourist industry. In every facet, Mr. Speaker, our economy has increased greatly in the past year.

The population—these are factual figures—of northwestern Ontario is now about one quarter million, compared to 160,000 10 years ago. Manufacturing production is estimated at more than \$260 million. Nearly \$100 million more than 10 years ago. Personal income has climbed steadily toward the \$350 million mark. New construction in 1961—I am not talking about old times I am talking about last year, and mark it down in your book and see if hon. members opposite can deny it—new construction in 1961 exceeded \$30 million exclusive of highway, bridge, communication and other projects. This total is up \$5 million over 1960 and compares with a total of \$7.2 million in 1951, 10 years ago.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Would the hon. Minister permit a question at this stage?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Certainly, go ahead.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, I have previously advised the hon. Minister that in the town of Kenora alone there are 761 men and 279 women unemployed at the moment. What has this government done and what does it propose to do to alleviate this problem?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is an intelligent remark. Listen and learn. New construction—

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): The hon. Minister had better answer it first.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I will answer it, do not worry. Because his figures may be correct today, they will not be tomorrow. My unemployment figure in Port Arthur is 1,000

down from this time last year. I do not know where the hon. member got his figures. If I thought the hon. member's figures were factual, I would answer him.

Mr. Gibson: Would the hon. Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I gave the hon. member a chance; now he should sit down. That is too petty to even answer. The pulp and paper industry benefited—now I would like you to listen to this—from the depreciated Canadian dollar in exports from the 10 plants in the region. Ask any pulp and paper man what he thinks of the 92.5-cent dollar. Ask the unions what they think. Everyone with a big smile on their faces, realizing the prosperity the dollar devaluation has brought. I tell you that up in our area they do not call it the austerity programme; they call it the prosperity programme, and that is what it is.

Mr. Gibson: I have another question—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Would the hon. member like to make this speech? Get on the list.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would point out that it is all right for members to ask questions, and it is the prerogative of the speaker to answer them or otherwise as he sees fit. But I would point out that it is obvious that if a speaker stands to ask a question and the person who is speaking at the time does not actually recognize him, it can be taken for granted that he does not wish to take the question at that point.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would say that it would not confuse me very much anyway, Mr. Speaker.

The St. Lawrence Corporation at Red Rock, and Great Lakes Paper Company at Fort William, together spent \$6 million in plant improvement and extensions. I am talking about this year, Mr. Speaker. Dryden Chemical Limited, subsidiary of Dryden Paper Company, brought into production a \$4.5 million plant, for the production of chlorine, caustic soda and other chemicals.

New machines introduced in woodland operations continue the trend toward mechanization to keep mills competitive. Reforestation production now totals 13 million trees annually in the Thunder Bay, Dryden and White River areas. This year The Department of Lands and Forests planted 6.5 million trees, timber companies 1.7 million, and private landowners 400,000.

The estimated forest products produced last year \$185 millions, Mr. Speaker. Canadian Car division—the hon. member for Fort William might be interested in this—the Canadian Car division of Hawker Siddeley at Fort William has shown startling revival from two years ago, when it appeared to be on the way to oblivion. It is producing four machines for forest products industries; is mass-producing transportation dwellings for the RCAF; and is doing advance work on major components of jet fighters and test equipment, with a large number of employees. This was a plant that the Opposition were saying was going to be closed down for good.

Mr. Gibson: Are there no problems in the northwest?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: I will come to that.

I am telling the hon. member about the startling and amazing work that this government has done for the north, when all the Liberals did was close down the Trans-Canada Highway for years, and ship all our pulpwood over to the United States. The Conservative government had to come in and persuade our American friends to build the mills in that area. And they did. The Liberal government has a very sorry record in that area that I love to call my home—the Great Northwest.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): What federal members did you elect up there?

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. Minister has a new Senator.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: The new Senator happens to be in the House today and personally I am very proud of him. He represents the labour unions and the railways and I predict that he will do a tremendous job for this country.

Mr. Singer: The Rainy River Conservative Association did not think very much of it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: That is all right; that is one person. It is something the same as the hon. member for York South. Production in 1961—York Centre I should say; I get those Yorks mixed up.

Referring to mining in the north—and I am just talking about the north—the hon. members for Kenora and Fort William can bear these figures out. They had better get them, go up and check them, and they will find out they are right.

Production in 1961 was 81.28 million. The

figures for 1962 are not yet available, but the total is expected to be about the same or higher this year. There are now 17 mines, Mr. Speaker, in northwestern Ontario, including two which started in 1962—Consolidated Mosher and Nickel Mining and Smelting. In Red Lake there are six gold mines. Pickle Crow—gold; Steep Rock—iron; Caland—iron; Canadian Charlston—iron; North Coldstream—copper; Nickel Mining and Smelting—nickel; Then down in the Manitouwadge, that great country to the east of me, two great copper, lead and zinc mines, Geco and Wilroy. And in Geraldton two gold mines, McLeod-Cockshutt and Consolidated Mosher.

In the Beardmore area there is one gold mine—Leach.

The production breakdown, Mr. Speaker—and these have all come into production under this government, and a former Conservative government. Under the Liberals there was one mine and that was the Howey in Red Lake. Gold—25 million—that is last year's production. Iron ore—23 million. Copper—19 million; and zinc—13 million. And they would like to tell you there is nothing being done in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Well, you fellows did not mine these—

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Did we not? We put the roads in to them. And we made the—

Mr. Chapple: Finally.

Hon. Mr. Chapple: Finally? Well, we did not shut down the Trans-Canada Highway—No. 17—anyway.

Mr. Chapple: You certainly did not improve it very much this last couple of years.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Did we not? Well, I can tell the hon. member that I can get him any number of people who will tell him it is the most beautiful highway in this country. The hon. member would know this too if he travelled over it, but I do not think he does.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Those are the statements the Liberals like to make. If the hon. leader of the Opposition would wait just a moment, I am coming to him. Mosher began production early in 1962, 1,000 tons daily milled by McLeod-Cockshutt.

Interjections by several hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would point out to all members of the Legislature that remarks are addressed to the Speaker, not directly to the members across the floor. I would also mention once again that if any member wishes the floor after the present speaker gets through, to take his orderly and legitimate part in the proceedings, that arrangement I believe can be made.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. member did not tell me why those three mines closed up. Perhaps he did not know. They were out of ore.

Mr. Chapple: I lived there for 10 years. The hon. Minister can tell me.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, I know the hon. member did; but I do not think he had very much to do with the mines. He was selling material to them and doing a good job too because Chapples are in a fine business. He was not developing mines but was making money for himself.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, the hon. member made a lot of money out of it, too, by the way. He was not doing it for fun. And he is still doing it with the mines and the roads builders and so on, so do not decry them at all. They built up his business, do not forget.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Nickel Mining and Smelting began production in October following a capital outlay of \$3.5 million. They are milling 500 tons daily and hope to increase this to more than 700 tons. They have arranged also with Norpax to concentrate nickel ore from neighbouring property. As for Steeprock—you know, they would like to tell you that northwestern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, is in the doldrums—Steeprock Iron Mines plan to spend \$4.5 million on a conveyor belt system starting next year. Geco is now spending \$9.5 million on a new shaft three-quarters of a mile from their present one. It will double the output of that great Geco mine in Manitouwadge.

Large-scale expenditures are being made at Red Lake on development of new favourable ore bodies. Promising new discoveries in the Manitouwadge, Fort Hope and Marshall Lake area, focus additional attention on mineral resources of northwestern Ontario, and now, since I wrote this speech, yesterday or the day before, new silver finds are being made up in that district, Mr. Speaker.

Northwestern Ontario is very rich in iron ore. Several deposits of major importance are already known and will be developed as soon as a market becomes available. That today is our problem, over which we have not full control.

Anaconda, a great property with 375 million tons of ore running a grade of 68 per cent ready to go to the markets of the world as soon as a market can be found. Canver Iron and Steeprock up at Lake St. Joseph—two other great properties containing vast resources of iron.

Power and fuel resources up there—these resources are now abundant in northwestern Ontario. I heard some derogatory remarks about Hydro's \$26 million thermal electric generating station at Fort William completed early this year. It brings our power generating capacity of the region to 700,000 kilowatts and provides security for periods of low water flows, and is the greatest inducement we have to attract new industry.

When you have not got a supply of power you cannot get new industry, and I am amazed at some hon. members in this House saying that it was a foolish thing to build this thermal plant. It was not a foolish thing to do when I was trying to get it located in Port Arthur rather than Fort William. I know the fight that was put up and I think the hon. member for Fort William was one of those that fought the hardest, yet now he says it was a foolish thing to do.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Is it operating?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, it is not, because it is not needed at the moment. When you want to attract new industry to your area you are proud to tell industrialists that you have plenty of power for them. Do you know how long it took to build that plant? Six years. We are 6 years ahead of other areas in being able to attract new industry. Do hon. members see the sense in that or do they not? Or do they think we should be without sufficient power for new industries?

Mr. Chapple: It is your kind of sense.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: There is no answer needed to that remark, Mr. Speaker.

At present there is a substantial power surplus in our region but two or three large-scale resource industry projects could alter this situation materially. It is on the way. And we are called foolish for building a \$26 million hydro plant! We are six years ahead of industry with power.

Trans-Canada Pipelines Limited established 3 new compressor stations this year at Dryden, Upsala, and Orient Bay.

Twin City Gas and Northern Ontario Natural Gas spent together another \$2 million on gas main extensions.

Husky Oil Limited, northwestern Ontario's petroleum industry, continued plant improvement projects.

Now we get down to agriculture. The hon. Minister is not here.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, I am.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Oh! Another young fellow who is doing a tremendous job, I might say.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture in our region relies on dairying, as the hon. member for Fort William, who has a beautiful place and beautiful cattle, a herd which was started by his dear father who was a great personal friend of mine. He was the engineer of that great herd. Unfortunately for us, he has passed on to his reward.

Agriculture in our region relies on dairying as its mainstay, but the annual harvest of field crops is valued at about \$5 million. Steps are being taken by this government to increase the production of beef in the area.

Some startling things have happened in agriculture just recently. It has been announced that a federal experimental station is being planned in Thunder Bay district and interest is being reviewed in a cold storage and processing plant to stimulate beef raising. This year saw the second international beef auction in the Rainy River district, where my old friend, the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden), had a great part in initiating the programme.

We come to the Keefer Lakehead terminal. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members in this House know why it was called Keefer Terminal and who Frank Keefer was. In the first place, he was a very fine gentleman, an outstanding lawyer and a great Conservative member of Parliament—a great Conservative who made a great impact on things in northwestern Ontario.

He advocated the St. Lawrence Seaway before the hon. member for York Centre was born and did a great job. Probably in the future the hon. member for York Centre may be able to take some credit for something in the city of Toronto.

The Keefer terminal was opened in 1962. This great terminal is a complex of ship

berths, storage and transit sheds with rail and motor truck services. It was more than 3 years in building and is one of the world's most modern and efficient terminals.

You know, Mr. Speaker, our pulp and paper mills are shipping pulp from the Head of the Lakes to any country in the world. They can do that today via the St. Lawrence deep waterway—a tremendous project that Canadians are very proud of.

An hon. member: Things are really tough up there.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: We are very tough people to hold down. The cost of that great terminal was \$8.5 million. This terminal is a national asset, offering accommodation for ocean-going ships at the heart of the continent. It was undertaken by the federal Conservative government with the advent of the St. Lawrence Seaway to provide expanded facilities for an increasing volume of general cargo into and out of the Lakehead, to coincide with the steady development of northwestern Ontario including the north.

Facilities there, Mr. Speaker—and I would like the hon. members to listen to this because that is an amazing structure—the facilities include two transit sheds with a total area of 180,000 square feet, berths for two lake ships and one ocean ship at the same time, and there has been a continuation of the dredging of the harbours to seaway standards.

Other great facets of that programme are the track platforms which accommodate 116 freight cars and 40 trucks at one time. The rail marshalling yards will hold 200 freight cars. The general cargo now averages 600,000 tons annually and it is estimated that this will increase to 1,345,000 tons by 1970.

The air services up there were expanded in 1962 with the inauguration of regular passenger flights via Trans-Air Limited between Winnipeg, Fort Frances and Kenora. The daily Trans-Canada bus service by Greyhound buses started this year. By the way, Mr. Speaker, the Greyhound buses are not complaining about the roads. At peak season as many as five trans-continental buses traverse northwestern Ontario each day.

Bell Telephone Company completed a \$2.5 million cable route between the Lakehead and Dryden, constructed nine new dial exchanges and made other improvements to bring its total capital investment in northwestern Ontario to \$25 million.

Northern Telephone Company also expanded its services to new communities.

Dryden converted its municipal system to dial telephones. These are things that are not told in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Northwestern Ontario, we are told, is down at the heel with unemployment, and so on. This is a combination, as I said at the start, of a vigorous, foresighted government working hand-in-hand with private industry.

Mr. Gisborn: Municipal government.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Yes, municipal government. They have a part too, but do not forget—

Mr. Gibson: Tell me one thing this government has done for the town of Dryden.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: I just finished telling you a lot of things that have been done for Dryden.

Grain elevators. Let us go into the grain field. We have heard some of the others—grain elevator companies are completing expansion programmes to add 15 million bushels storage capacity to bring the total for the Lakhead to 106 million bushels.

An hon. member: Which government did that?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: We certainly made the area acceptable to them by levelling it out, dredging the harbours and all the other things, supplying them with power. Perhaps if the Liberals had been in power then they would not have had any power to attract them, since they kick about the new \$26 million plant. The programme includes the United Grain Growers, Manitoba Pool, Saskatchewan Pool, Federal Grain, Superior Elevator, Cereal Grain and Canada Malting.

Manitoba pool this year launched the second phase of its great expansion project by awarding the contract of more than \$4 million for new storage bins, new work houses, power house, automatic car dumpers, driers and administration offices. It will bring the Manitoba pool terminal capacity to 17.25 million bushels.

Fort William, as well, embarked on a \$200,000 expansion and improvement programme. Now the CBC has announced it will establish television stations at Fort Frances, Atikokan and Red Lake, has already authorized stations at Dryden and Sioux Lookout—another improvement for Dryden. We hope soon to get TV in the eastern area, east of my area, which we have not yet had. We have given it to Dryden and Kenora first.

Kenora's station's power is to be increased at a cost of more than \$2 million and will serve an additional 50,000 people by autumn of 1963 in Kenora.

Roads to resources—some more roads; there was never one built during the Liberal regime—five of the 6 so far approved are in northwestern Ontario. The Spruce River road—55 miles completed, 20 miles to go. Savant Lake to Highway 17—90 miles, 34 completed. Intervening distance over private roads is usable although they are not finished.

Minaki to Pellatt—21.5 miles completed in 1961. Nakina to Terrier Lake—47 miles completed in 1961. Pickle Crow to Lingman Lake—260 miles, survey work started. That is the road I was asked about, the northern road we announced—survey work started, route determined by first airborne magnetometer survey, and a contract now called for 20 miles.

Mining and access roads, Superior Junction road, access from Sturgeon River bridge, bridge now completed and road graded to Superior Junction, and that was a beautiful bridge and road. Manitouwadge industrial road, co-operative effort by Highways and Marathon Corporation completes route between Highway 17 to Highway 11. So, if the hon. leader of the Opposition wants to come up Highway 17 to Manitouwadge he can shoot right through to Highway 11 and cut off some 200 miles or so.

Mr. Chapple: How many years did it take to build that road?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: How many years were the Liberals in before we were, in the federal government? When we took over all highway work was closed down. We went to work and built these roads the Liberals neglected.

Mr. Chapple: How can one build a highway when there is no town?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: There used to be a contract let every year from Fort William to the U.S.A. boundary at Pigeon River, a distance of about 30 miles. That was a paving job every year. It was laid in the spring and then the next spring it was all broken up, and the next year a new pavement was laid. That project was continued year after year. Why, I do not know, but that is how much road work was done in the Liberals' time.

The Manitouwadge co-operative effort by the Highways and Marathon Corporation completes route Highway 17 to Highway 11.

The Marathon Corporation, Mr. Speaker, deserves a lot of credit. That is the first tertiary road where an industry goes along with the government, both federal and provincial, and builds the road on a three-way cost basis. I congratulate the Marathon Corporation and I hope many more of our industries do that, because it will save a great deal of public money and get more roads built for the benefit of our people and industry.

Then the extension of Highway 11, Atikokan to Fort Frances, and I see my hon. friend from Fort Frances (Mr. Noden) starting to smile. He had a great part in that tremendous road and I compliment him on it.

Mr. Chapple: When is it going to be finished?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Well, I will tell the hon. member. There is not anything he has asked yet, I do not think, to which he has not got answers, because we have got all the answers for his questions.

This road will open an important area for tourist travel, forestry and mining potential. The causeway—it is known as the Causeway Bill—across the Rainy Lake completed and highways completed for 10 miles eastward. Contract under call for further 10 miles construction and for clearing additional 10 miles.

The same situation exists from Atikokan westward—10 miles finished, 10 under construction, 10 to be cleared. The total length we expect will be finished some time next year—the end of next year or in 1964.

Mr. Gibson: Does the hon. Minister want to bet?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: I told the hon. member a story about that, did I not—does he want to bet? He would try to decry everything and if he approaches things as he does all he will do is obstruct the building of roads in that area.

The tourist industry, Mr. Speaker, has gone ahead by leaps and bounds—52 existing establishments now and they have undertaken additions totalling 128 units. And 34 establishments reconstructed with another 83 units up through that area. There are now more than 700 establishments for tourists offering 5,500 units of all kinds—a tremendous surge in tourism—but I am not going to take time to go into it any further.

We as a party admit we make mistakes. Any party that has the great record of achievement that we have is bound to do

that, but we admit it. We are doing something all the time and we are bound, in a percentage of times, to be wrong; and we admit that we sometimes are. But what is our record in schools, roads, homes for the aged, health, welfare, and all these other facets of our economy? The record is there to read. These things have been accomplished and done, and we will continue to ever increase their size and their number as we go along.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to mention three things in the Speech from the Throne and I want to extend through you, sir, my congratulations and my love for His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. Mackay) and his lovely wife, for the way he presents the Speech from the Throne and carries the dignity of the Crown into this House. It is always a great source of satisfaction to me to know that I am a Canadian and an Ontario man who can watch fellow citizens such as he carry it out with such great dignity.

In the speech there was Medicare, there were portable pensions, there was our great trade crusade, and our winter works programme.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Opposition. I have listened to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts). He is a man who is honest and factual in all he undertakes, and when he speaks he speaks in a factual, honest way. He is not making idle promises, or is he not going to take these steps until he is sure of costs and the good it is going to do, and it is something that will be of benefit to the people of this province. Medicare by our government has been studied for two years. We are going to avoid the pitfalls such as occurred in Saskatchewan. When we hear from the Opposition about 60 cents a week and other Opposition promises, let me read this, it is too good to let go by. In yesterday's *Toronto Globe and Mail*—now I will not go all the way through it, but I will quote from the article:

The chief claim that the New Democratic Party has in the affections of the voters is that it is utterly, some might say appallingly, frank about its intentions. While the other parties edged the public little by little into the cold waters of socialism, the NDP gave promise to throw us all in right over our heads. On the issue of medical care for example, the Ontario Conservatives and Liberals are making vague plans and promises, but carefully avoiding any full explanation of how much it would cost.

Not so with the New Democratic body. In the Legislature this week party leader

Donald MacDonald explained his Medicare plan in detail. He estimated the cost of supplying medical care to 96 per cent of the Ontario population of about \$160 million plus \$5 million for its administration.

This bill would be covered by premiums, 30 cents per week for a single person and 60 cents for a family, to raise \$57.3 million by a 3 per cent increase in corporation tax—

and they are kicking about taxes

—and by a 6 per cent levy on income tax paid by individuals to raise \$58.2 million. There is no pretence that this Medicare plan would be a form of health insurance. It would be a straight welfare scheme, financed by soaking the rich and the not-so-rich to pay for the poor.

These people who pay no federal income tax would contribute nothing to the Medicare fund beyond the premium of a few cents a week. But while Mr. MacDonald and the NDP party is frank about its figures he is of course hopelessly in error. He bases his estimate of the cost of Medicare on present expenditures and medical services in Ontario. Although all experience proves that as soon as care became free of direct charge to the consumer, public demand would soar.

The increased taxes he proposes would soon fall far short of meeting the Medicare bill. And the only answer would be yet higher taxes or a reduction in services. Mr. MacDonald's other error is that he has ignored the law of declining returns, there is general agreement that taxes in this country are already so high as to discourage enterprise and development. Increases in personal and corporation taxes on the scale proposed by the NDP leader would add insult to injury and quite possibly drive industry out of this province with consequent loss instead of gain over the long-term in tax revenues.

And with that I agree. I tell hon. members that the sooner we quit this foolish picture of socialism in this province, the better off we will be, and get back to a sound business system that our people can afford.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this government will have a Medicare plan and it will be well thought out and well worked out. Portable pensions have been studied by this government exhaustively for two years and a half, and when our hon. Prime Minister brings that out it will be one that the people will appreciate and will be sound.

Our trade crusade—I am sorry our very enterprising young hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) is not here—but the trade crusade paints a great picture for the future of this province. If any of the hon. members who have attended these trade conferences—I might cite the case of my own nephew, who was taken down to Jamaica. He has been doing business down there ever since, selling large quantities of Canadian manufactured goods, and he says the foreign markets are a great lucrative field for us. This is the first time that any government has gone ahead and tried to get into foreign markets to sell our products to other parts of the world on a planned progressive basis. We sat back a long while, but now I think hon. members will see these trade crusades will do what we are trying to make them do, have our people spend \$100 less in foreign countries than they are now spending and through this provide 60,000 new jobs for our own men here at home by creating work in the manufacturing trades in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell a little story that I think illustrates what the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the NDP indicate to me when they promise Medicare, portable pensions, outlawing strike-breakers—all these things. Perhaps it is done in foolish moments, when they are off guard, but after all, they puzzle everybody and people do not know whether to believe them or not. I am reminded of the story of what a fellow said to me one time about a fellow he did not like; and mind, that does not say I do not like the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the NDP, because I do like them.

He said, "You know, that fellow reminds me of Christopher Columbus." And I said, "Christopher Columbus, what about him?" He said, "You know, when he started out to discover America he did not know where he was going, when he got there he did not know where he was and when he got back he did not know where he had been; and he did it all on somebody else's money."

Mr. Speaker, if that is not an exact example of these two hon. gentlemen and the things they are constantly saying in the press, I miss my guess. I know it is going to cost the Ontario public a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, both these hon. gentlemen—Mr. Wintermeyer and Mr. MacDonald—are what I call confirmed desultors. Now if hon. members do not know what that word means, look it up in the dictionary. Both these men are confirmed desultors and they are

carrying that desultor project on at the present time. We are a party that has been tried and not found wanting. I predict after the next election this will be the party in power, the present hon. Prime Minister will be the Prime Minister of Ontario, and as with the story I told hon. members before, "would anybody like to bet?"

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for letting me present these remarks. It was a great pleasure and I want to thank every hon. member in the House for being courteous during my presentation.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, during the course of the hon. Minister's remarks, he asked me a question, and he indicated that he would be answering questions of mine. I wish to be very brief about this. In reply to the hon. Minister's question—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, next week we will deal with various bills which have been introduced this week and will be up for second reading and we will resume the Throne Speech debate. It is also my intention to introduce some estimates.

There will be other legislation coming forward, of course, and in all probability next week we will be able to have meetings of the committee on agriculture to consider Bill No. 10. There are 3 bills to go to the committee on education, there are 5 bills to go to the committee on legal bills. We now have before the House close to 40 private bills and as soon as they can be processed we will call the private bills committee to deal with them.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Before the adjournment, may I ask for an explanation of the estimates? Is it the intention of the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, to introduce estimates before the budget is called?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Wintermeyer: What estimates does the hon. Prime Minister intend to introduce before the budget is called?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, when I have them ready I will bring them in and give the hon. leader of the Opposition notice of them.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, I absolutely object.

Now, year after year this point has come up. Year after year we have been promised that it would not be pursued in the future. We have no assurance that a budget will ever be brought down.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): How naive can the hon. leader of the Opposition get?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, all right then, give it to us. Let the hon. Prime Minister commit himself right now. Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Prime Minister commit himself to the simple proposition that a budget—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, surely we have a right to insist that a budget be brought down before this session—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. leader of the Opposition did not want it, he wanted an election.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, surely we on this side have some rights to orderliness.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: To what?

Mr. Wintermeyer: To orderliness.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. leader of the Opposition would not think so if he were listening to the comments from that side of the House—if he were sitting over here.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of real import to this House. Heretofore we have been told that we would discontinue the procedure of introducing the estimates before budget. Now again this year apparently they are to be introduced. We are now told that certain estimates, when they are determined upon, will be introduced.

We have no assurance whatsoever that a budget will be presented before this House is prorogued. I want a specific undertaking that that will be done. That is all I am asking and I think it is a very sensible request.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, this discussion has taken place each year we have had a fall session. This is the third year in which we have had a fall session. I can assure

the hon. leader of the Opposition that the estimates we present will not be of the larger departments; they will not be the big spending departments. I have given this assurance before. The hon. leader of the Opposition said he had received assurances before that this practice would not be followed. At no time have I ever given him any such assurance.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Certainly in the past—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, we have not, because in anticipation of this I read the *Hansard* reports of last year and we went through this discussion in exactly the same way. No assurances were given. As a matter of fact as far as the New Democratic Party is concerned, last year the hon. leader of that party (Mr. MacDonald) in his remarks said he did not see what all the debate was about. He does not necessarily object to this procedure as long as we do not take departments such as Education or Highways or Health, where there are very large expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, the departments I have in mind calling are, my own department, the Lieutenant-Governor, The Department of Insurance, the Provincial Auditor, possibly Reform Institutions and possibly The Department of Mines. The expenditures in those departments are relatively stable over the years. They do not involve large additional sums of money. I would not think of introducing the estimates of the larger departments until the budget is in, so hon. members could see the larger departments in the total framework of the budget, as presented.

But in order to make this fall session effective, in order to ensure that we proceed with the business of the province and get the business of the province done, I think it is quite reasonable to bring in some of these departments where we can examine their functions as is ordinarily done in the estimates and where the actual estimates and the actual amounts of money expended are not as important as in the big spending departments.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister has avoided the specific question that I asked. Will he assure this House—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have avoided it because I do not intend to answer it—

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is an insult to the House. What the hon. Prime Minister has said is that he will give us no assurance that he will introduce a budget before this House is prorogued—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think it is well known and established, certainly in my opinion, that the government is responsible for the business of the House and this is part of the business of the House; the government's responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to unduly alarm the hon. leader of the Opposition. In the normal course of events the budget will, of course, be presented and I can tell the hon. leader of the Opposition that it is my present intention to introduce a budget at the earliest possible moment when we resume after the Christmas recess.

If those hon. members who are prepared and want to speak on the Throne debate will prepare themselves, I would like to complete that debate before we adjourn for the Christmas recess and then the way would be clear for the introduction of the budget at the earliest possible moment when we resume after Christmas.

Mr. Wintermeyer: That is basically all that I am asking. Is the hon. Prime Minister specifically undertaking that a budget will be introduced here in this House before the House is prorogued? That is all I am asking. It is a very direct and simple question and it can be answered in a very direct and simple fashion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Sitting in the Speaker's chair it appears to me—I may not have just caught it properly—that certain assurances have been given and this question is just a repeated question.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, in view of the length of this discussion, I could just say one word on behalf of the New Democratic Party group. I would like to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that although we are in opposition and oppose the government every time we think they merit opposition, we have no objection to the practice of estimates being brought in before the budget is brought down; in fact, we think the practice helps to expedite the business of the House.

It is a well established practice in Ottawa and I do not think they would ever get their very large volume of business completed there if they did not follow it. We certainly have no objection to estimates being brought down before the Christmas recess and indeed we hope that some will be brought down.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister said that he would try to wind up the Throne Speech debate before we adjourn. As he said this morning, there are over 30 private bills before the House, and government legislation as well. Surely that would be decided when we get near the end of the adjournment and not at this time. I do not think it would be fair to say that he was going to take a vote on the Throne Speech in a matter of a week or so when there are so many—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I said I would like. The debate will come to a vote when there are no more debaters. This is the usual course of conduct of any debate and that, of course, will be when the Throne Speech debate will end.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.50 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Monday, December 10, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Monday, December 10, 1962

Reading and receiving petition	175
Statement re Ontario-Manitoba reciprocity of commercial vehicles trailer licensing, Mr. Auld	175
Statement re redistribution, Mr. Robarts	176
Statements re fourteenth anniversary of the declaration of human rights, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Wintermeyer, Mr. MacDonald	177
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, second reading	180
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Dymond	180
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Belanger, agreed to	185
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	186

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1962

The House met at 3:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have here a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: J. K. Mackay, the Lieutenant-Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for The Department of Insurance, the office of the Lieutenant-Governor, The Department of Mines, The Department of the Prime Minister, the office of the Provincial Auditor and The Department of Reform Institutions for the year ending March 31, 1964, and recommends them to the legislative assembly. Toronto, December 10, 1962.

We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery, students from Danforth Technical School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petition has been received:

Of the corporation of the city of Guelph praying that an Act may pass to make new arrangements for the control and management of the Guelph General Hospital.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I should like to report that late last Friday afternoon an agreement was concluded between Ontario and the province of Manitoba in respect to reciprocity of commercial vehicles trailer licensing which I am sure will be of interest to all the hon. members.

This agreement was the fourth to be signed by this province. We now have reciprocal agreements with Alberta, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Manitoba. The agreement

provides that all commercial vehicles having a registered gross weight of 3 tons or less will be exempt from paying the registration fee in other than the home province. For vehicles over 3 tons gross weight a uniform fee of \$10 per gross registered ton will be levied in lieu of the registration fees in the contracting provinces while the full fee will only be payable in the resident province.

This can mean a saving to truckers of up to \$700 for each tractor-trailer combination in each contracting province.

Such reciprocal arrangements will facilitate the flow of commerce and are beneficial to each contracting province and the overall economy of the country. In particular, the agreement with Manitoba will be beneficial to the movement of goods between the lake-head ports and the western provinces.

I should also like to inform the hon. members that my department is continuing its efforts to effect similar agreements with the remaining provinces.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister a question arising out of that statement? In the conversations with those officials from Manitoba, was there any progress made in reciprocal arrangements about automobile insurance cards?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The conversations with the officials in Manitoba to which I referred had to do with reciprocal arrangements on trucks.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of privilege. In *Hansard* of December 5, 1962, page 115, I am inaccurately recorded as being accredited with the statement: "Well, the hon. Minister said it did." I would like to have it on record that I did not say that.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question of the hon. Prime Minister. Can the hon. Prime Minister advise us whether any progress has been made in the past two weeks towards achieving in this House a more equitable representation of the voters of Metropolitan Toronto area through redistribution of the provincial constituencies?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of this House are aware that upon the recommendation of this government to the Legislature a Royal commission was appointed to inquire into the distribution of electoral districts in the province and to recommend to this House the number, area and boundaries of such electoral districts, to be defined in the schedule forming part of a new representation Act. It was the view of the government, endorsed by this House, that the commission, in making its inquiry and investigation, should give consideration to the following:

1. The concentration of population in various areas of the province as indicated by the 1961 federal census.
2. The varying conditions and requirements regarding representation as between rural and urban electoral districts.
3. The existing and traditional boundaries of the electoral districts of the province.
4. The community or diversity of interests of the population of such districts.
5. The means of communication between various parts of such districts, together with the physical features thereof.
6. All other related and relative factors and, with particular reference to rural electoral districts shall, as far as practicable, include the whole of any one municipality in one electoral district.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the first time in the history of this province that any government has asked for such recommendations to be made by an impartial commission entirely divorced from political considerations.

Following certain questions and discussions that have taken place in the Legislature since we opened on November 27, I undertook to get in touch with the commission concerning the progress they had made. I am happy to report to the House that I have had an opportunity to discuss the question of redistribution and the functions of the commission with Mr. Justice E. A. Richardson. I have expressed to him, Mr. Speaker, my concern over the whole matter of redistribution and, more particularly, as it relates to the great concentrations of population in the Metropolitan area of Toronto.

The commissioner was very sympathetic and I am satisfied that I will be able to report further progress to the House in due course, I would hope before we rise for the Christmas recess.

I would point out to the House that the purpose in appointing this commission was to

leave the commissioners free to deal with this problem without pressures from any source, and I have certainly endeavoured to leave them free of any pressure from the government. However, I can assure the House that I will implement whatever recommendations may come forward at the earliest possible moment as I recognize the need for further representation in certain areas and also the dislocation that redistribution and the revision of riding boundaries can cause to the citizenry at large and to the organizations of all three political parties in the province.

After my discussion with Mr. Justice Richardson, I am hopeful that we will have at least an interim report in the very near future; and as I have said, this will be implemented with all due dispatch.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, there is a question I would like to address to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Haskett). Would the hon. Minister care to inform the House of the situation at the Mimico drug clinic following the resignation of most of the full-time professional staff?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge advance notice of this question by the hon. member for York South: Would the Minister care to inform the House of the situation at Mimico following the resignation of most of the full-time professional staff?

I am informed that the situation at Mimico is working out satisfactorily.

To improve our treatment services a programme of transferring some of the professional staff in our clinics was undertaken. At the Alexander G. Brown Memorial Clinic at Mimico the superintendent was moved to parole and rehabilitation office; and Mr. Scott Keene, the head social worker at OTC, Brampton, was appointed as superintendent, thus placing a treatment man in charge of this important work. Mr. John Sunday, the former supervising psychologist at Guelph, who has done work at the Yale school of alcohol studies, was appointed the new supervising psychologist. I am satisfied that better work will result from these appointments.

In the face of these changes, in which 3 officers were transferred, two of the 3 that were given transfer and 6 other members of staff have tendered their resignations. I think we must recognize that in this kind of work some of these professional

workers find it difficult, as indeed one of the resigning workers said, to work within a department whose first obligation is custody.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask the hon. Minister a question? In the instance of the drug clinic, is the first obligation custodial?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In the clinics at Mimico they are custodial institutions. They are about as open custodial institutions as we could have. Indeed, one of the officers to whom we offered a transfer from there was offered a transfer to the OTC at Brampton, which is perhaps the most open institution one could find anywhere.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to speak to the House on a matter of great importance to our community here in Ontario. Much as we all enjoy the spirited debates on public policy which take place in this Chamber, and no doubt there will be many more such encounters before this 26th Legislature concludes its work in 1964, I am sure that all hon. members of the House particularly welcome those occasions when we are of one mind and heart and are able to speak with one voice.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the 14th anniversary of the signing of the universal declaration of human rights upon which our human rights code in the province is based, is such an occasion.

Recently, one of our Toronto newspapers noted that 25 years ago a then member of this House introduced a bill to combat racial discrimination. Although his own party was in power at that time, the bill did not become law, for in those days the tendency of most of us was to feel that such a subject had little relevance in a community such as we had in Ontario. But within a few short years Canada and the world at large discovered that if racial prejudice and bigotry are permitted to take root and gain ascendancy anywhere in the world, their evil effects are soon felt everywhere in the world. And so, 18 years ago, in the midst of a great world conflict against racism and its attendant evils, this House, with the concurrence of all parties, passed the first of a series of measures which now constitute the Ontario human rights code.

The underlying principle of that first bill was stated by one of my distinguished predecessors when he said: "If any group of people are denied the ordinary rights available to all other people, then those who should be

most indignant are not the people to whom these rights are denied but rather those whose principles of freedom, justice and equality have been insulted."

Mr. Speaker, that sentiment, so eloquently expressed, became and continues to be the heart and centre of our human rights code in this province. As I have said on an earlier occasion, and I am sure that all hon. members in the House will agree, the code has a two-fold aim.

First, to make secure in law the inalienable rights of every citizen.

Second, and certainly no less important, to create a climate of understanding and mutual respect among our people so that all will be afforded the unhampered opportunity to contribute their maximum to the enrichment of the whole community.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario human rights code is much more than a series of laws designed to deal with a prejudiced minority. It is rather a set of inviolable principles to be practised and lived from day to day by all of us; not only because the law requires it, but rather because enlightened social behaviour demands it. Or, to put it another way, if as sometimes happens an act of discrimination is committed in a locality, it is our view that the moral sanction of the community in which it takes place may very well be a vastly more effective corrective factor than the purely legal sanctions which are contained in the human rights code.

By this I mean that the ultimate effectiveness of the code depends on the degree to which our citizens, individually and collectively, play their full part in applying and living its principles in their respective communities.

For that reason we are particularly pleased that a large number of our municipalities are today joining with us in this observance of human rights day and are using the occasion to bring the Ontario human rights code to the attention of their citizens; and that many of our churches of all denominations did so at the services conducted yesterday.

On this important anniversary, Mr. Speaker, I think we in Ontario can feel proud that we have all moved forward together in this area of community living. I am sure we all became sharply aware of this when we picked up our copy of the current issue of Human Relations which is published by the Ontario Human Rights Commission and read the derogatory words alleged to have been spoken of another race by a member of an earlier

legislative body. I am sure that we are very gratified that we have now reached that stage of intellectual and spiritual maturity where we are proud to have as the director of our Ontario Human Rights Commission a distinguished member of the race referred to in such disparaging terms a century ago. It is also of great significance that the place of honour in tonight's observance of human rights day in St. Paul's Church has been accorded to that great American and world-renowned artist, Marian Anderson, who received an honorary degree from Queen's University today.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal more that could be said about the functions and the fine work of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, but as I said a year ago in this House, proud as we may be of the progress we have made there is no justification for resting on our laurels. There are, unhappily, areas of prejudice in our community life which demand our concern, and it remains the task of individuals and organizations to strive for still higher levels of improvement in the field of human rights.

I am sure that hon. members on all sides of the House will welcome the enlargement of staff in the Ontario Human Rights Commission and will heartily approve of its greatly expanded and highly effective programme of education and enlightenment. I am sure hon. members will be interested in knowing that arrangements have been made through the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) to distribute the Ontario human rights code in all of the secondary and inspected private schools of our province. As the hon. Minister said in his letter to the principals of these schools, "Nothing could be more important than to acquaint our young people with the aims of the code and to encourage them to play their full part in practising its principles in their school and community life."

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope, and one which I am sure accords with the thinking of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) and the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), that on this 14th anniversary of the universal declaration of human rights we should all rededicate ourselves to the task of tearing down the walls of prejudice wherever they may exist—whether in our communities, whether in our own minds—and in their place we should build bridges of understanding, of mutual respect, so that all the members of our multi-national family in Ontario may through equality of opportunity give of their best to the economic development, the social advancement and the

cultural and spiritual enrichment of our great province.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join with the hon. Prime Minister in the expression that he has just made in respect to human rights. As a matter of fact, he did me the courtesy and kindness of forwarding a copy of his remarks before he actually made them.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have the advantage over many hon. members of the Legislature in that I have had the opportunity to examine these comments and on this occasion I would compliment the hon. Prime Minister in his expression and I would like to repeat for the second time, Mr. Speaker, three distinct expressions and concepts that I think are worthy of repetition.

The first of these was on the first page, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Prime Minister said:

If racial prejudice and bigotry are permitted to take root and gain ascendancy anywhere in the world, their evil effects are soon felt everywhere in the world.

I think that is so true, Mr. Speaker.

The second recitation that I would make is this:

If, as sometimes happens, an act of discrimination is committed in a locality, it is our view that the moral sanction of the community in which it takes place may very well be a vastly more effective corrective factor than the purely legal sanctions which are contained in the human rights code.

By this I mean that the ultimate effectiveness of the code depends on the degree to which our citizens, individually and collectively, play their full part in applying and living its principles in their respective communities.

And the third and last, Mr. Speaker, the concluding remarks of the hon. Prime Minister:

We should all rededicate ourselves to the task of tearing down the walls of prejudice wherever they may exist—whether in our communities, whether in our minds—and in their place we should build bridges of understanding, of mutual respect so that all the members of the multi-national family in Ontario may through equality of opportunity give of their best to the economic development, the social advancement, and the cultural and spiritual enrichment of our great province.

Mr. Speaker, I think those expressions warrant my congratulations and my complete approval.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, on an occasion like this, to add to what has been well said. Just one point that I would attempt to express, which will be just another way of saying what has already been said, Mr. Speaker, and that is simply this: that obviously the code of human rights is written on a piece of paper, on a parchment, and it, in itself, is of little significance unless the spirit of those words is translated into action.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that very often we approach this problem in a spirit of toleration, if I may express it as such, rather than love.

And herein, Mr. Speaker, lies the great difference. This expression of human rights is not a question of tolerating others, but of understanding and loving them.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the second expression that I would leave with hon. members this afternoon is this: that I am inclined to think often we in the English-speaking world forget that our culture is essentially a spiritual culture. Our system of understanding, of living, founded itself, Mr. Speaker, not in words and laws but in a translation of the spiritual significance of the Judaeo-Christian religions which have been passed on and form the fundamental basis of our culture. I sometimes think that it would be an error, and it will certainly be an error, if we forget that the culture that we enjoy today was founded in a spiritual order. If we forget that, it may well be we will not make that realization until it is too late. It would indeed be an error if we forgot that, and felt that it was founded in some material or secularistic order instead of the spiritual significance that did found and develop our culture.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, it gives me great pleasure to join this afternoon with the hon. Prime Minister in the worthy expression that he has made to this House. I welcome the opportunity to try in my way to add to those thoughts, but knowing always that I must on this occasion compliment the hon. Prime Minister for the expression of what I think is the common thought of all of us this afternoon. Thank you.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) of this province in acknowledging this 14th

anniversary of the declaration of human rights.

I think a new stage in the history of the world was reached after the second world war when we recognized that it is necessary, that there is a purpose in setting forth the human rights of people wherever they live, whatever their race, colour or creed.

My comments, Mr. Speaker, would not be to repeat what the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition have so well said, but to underline one aspect of it.

I think there is always a danger with human beings, to assume that the job is done, to accept for example our human rights code in Ontario as a symbol of a victory. The fact of the matter is that there can never be a complete victory in this field. When the hon. Prime Minister, for example, referred to racial prejudices and bigotry being permitted to take root, I think we have to face the fact that they do, to an extent, have root, and what we have succeeded in doing down through the years is uprooting them. But those roots are still there to some extent, and this is the job that remains in the years that lie ahead.

I was particularly proud, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) will join with me, in recognizing that today our Alma Mater at Kingston has honoured a person, a very great person, who symbolizes in a real way this attempt of human beings to live as human beings, one with another, instead of living like animals as so often has been their conduct in the past.

In acknowledging what the hon. Prime Minister has already said—that there is no justification for resting on our laurels—I must say, Mr. Speaker, my attention was captured this past week by news stories that claimed—and I have no reason to believe that this is not the case—that in the recent municipal elections in the Metropolitan area of Toronto, in the township of Etobicoke, for the first time a Negro was elected to a municipal office. I think both the gentleman concerned and Etobicoke deserve our congratulations.

But, Mr. Speaker, if there is any further reminder needed that the job remains to be done, indeed right in this House, again my attention was captured last week when I listened to one of the hon. members of the Cabinet introduce a bill and in explaining the bill he said that the purpose of this bill was to place Indian mothers on the same basis as any other mothers in the province. Now I would be the first to acknowledge

that part of this problem arises from a divided jurisdiction between provincial and federal governments in their responsibility for the Indians. But the fact of the matter is that just last week in a province where we have the human rights code, we had a Minister coming into the house and introducing a bill which was going to place one group of our citizens finally on the same basis as other citizens.

This is a reminder of the challenge that lies ahead as we seek to implement the ideals and the objectives of the human rights code, and it is that aspect of the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition that I would like to underline in joining enthusiastically with them in acknowledging this 14th anniversary of the declaration of human rights.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, when the House will rise at 4.15 or 4.20 this afternoon we will have an opportunity to meet Miss Anderson and present her with a copy of our human rights code and also to the Lieutenant-Governor who has been gracious enough to invite us all to his suite for this ceremony.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Highways) moves second reading of Bill No. 4, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I just mention again that this bill will be referred to the highway and highway safety committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I find great difficulty in escaping a feeling of deep satisfaction with this opportunity to make some small contribution to the Throne debate. The speech itself, I think all in this honourable assembly are agreed, was a remarkable document of solid achievement in the first year of this government's life, and an outline of the sort of continuing programme that is already causing our province of Ontario to forge ahead of all others in our nation and ahead of most jurisdictions in the North American continent. Comment on it is really redundant—it speaks eloquently for itself, but I am now afforded

an opportunity to report in more detail on some of the many aspects and activities of The Department of Health.

Before I launch into the meat of what I would like to say, sir, may I again add my warm congratulations to you on the excellence of your presidency over this honourable assembly, and to wish for you long continuance in the chair you fill so capably and grace so well. The hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris), who moved the reply to the Speech from the Throne, is to be commended on the effectiveness of his contribution, which I am sure has already been well noted by the Opposition and which, I hope, will cause them to vote wisely with an eye single to the welfare of the province, and so support the motion.

Of the seconder, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) stated—"He is a man who has a great deal of weight behind his comments." I take it the hon. member referred to the seconder's physical weight, but the weight which impresses me the more is the weight of experience behind the words the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) utters. A labour man himself, he knows, and I suggest in all kindness, far better than the hon. member for York South, what the labour man thinks and what the labour man wants. Therefore, he can put behind his words the weight of authority born of experience, the best teacher of all.

I join with all hon. members in bidding welcome to the newest addition to our House, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), and congratulate him on his success at the polls and wish for him, as all his colleagues in this House do, a happy time while he is here and great satisfaction in the task of representing an historic riding.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because The Department of Health has some responsibility to all of our people, and touches intimately the whole of life from the cradle to the grave, often there are matters of importance and of interest that cannot always be brought out when the departmental estimates come up for consideration. I would like to touch upon some of these at this time by way of reporting progress in some areas and, in other areas, by bringing to your attention and the attention of the hon. members some important projects in which the department becomes involved but of which little is heard or known.

Much is written and read, spoken and heard about cancer in these days, and it remains one of the dread diseases of our times. The incidence of cancer in Ontario

and the mortality rate for this disease are both increasing. Also, it is still the second cause of death in Ontario. We must, of course, be concerned about these facts and strengthen our efforts to determine the cause or causes and to find the most effective treatment. Some part of the increase, however, is due to changes in the age structure of our population, but this is a minor factor only.

Perhaps more active and intensive basic and clinical research is being carried on in this field of medicine than in any other single area. Even the most cautious and guarded would admit to progress, but it is also agreed the oft-mentioned "break-through" has not yet come. Most hon. members, I am sure, know a good deal about the government's share in the broad cancer programme constantly going on in Ontario. It is disappointing, however, to find that many of our people are not aware of this. It is only possible to review briefly the historical background, the aims and accomplishments, of the Ontario cancer treatment and research foundation.

In 1931, the government appointed a Royal commission under the chairmanship of the honourable Rev. Dr. H. J. Cody, then Minister of Education of the province of Ontario, who carried out a prolonged investigation of the need for financial support to provide radiotherapy facilities for the treatment of cancer in Ontario. It recommended that:

1. A commission responsible to the Minister of Health should be established to carry out a programme of diagnosis, treatment and research as applied to cancer.

2. Financial support should be given to maintain radiotherapy treatment clinics in certain centres in the province.

3. A cancer institute should be developed, providing radiotherapy services and research investigation.

The foundation was established in 1943 to complete a programme of research, treatment and education. It consists of a chairman, Mr. Rhys Sale, and 13 members appointed by order-in-council. In 1957, the Ontario cancer institute was established and since then the foundation and institute have operated under boards which have interlocking representation.

Radiotherapy treatment is supported by the foundation at the Princess Margaret hospital, here in Toronto, and at clinics in Victoria hospital, London; the Ottawa civic and Ottawa general hospitals, in the capital city; at the Kingston general hospital; at the Hamil-

ton general hospital; at the Metropolitan general hospital, Windsor; and the Thunder Bay clinic, at the general hospital of Port Arthur.

Four of the centres, including the Princess Margaret hospital, Toronto, are associated with the medical schools of our province and provide opportunities for undergraduate and postgraduate teaching.

Two diagnostic clinics are maintained in Kirkland Lake and at Port Arthur, and 15 consultative and follow-up clinics are associated with the 7 regional centres located in Chatham, Cornwall, Galt, Kitchener, Westminster hospital, London, Owen Sound, Pembroke, Peterborough, Sarnia, St. Catharines, Stratford, Sault Ste. Marie, Welland, Wingham and Woodstock. Radiotherapists from the treatment centres attend these clinics every two to four weeks, consult with local doctors and conduct follow-up examinations of patients.

The only way in which the high standard of radiotherapy which has been developed for the treatment of cancer in Ontario can be maintained is by centralizing treatment in a limited number of centres and satisfying local demands elsewhere by maintaining these consultative clinics.

Hostels are maintained by the foundation in connection with the Princess Margaret hospital and the Hamilton and London clinics. Patients are accommodated in a home-like atmosphere at a small fraction of the cost of full hospital accommodation. These hostels are worthy of some thought by all of us. They are built by the cancer society and then turned over to the foundation to operate. The most recent one was built in London and was officially opened this summer by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts).

One only has to visit with, and talk to, patients in these lodges, as they are so well named, to realize what such accommodation means to patients who have to travel some distance to a hospital or clinic for treatment, and who otherwise might have to stay at a hotel or some other such impersonal place.

The foundation maintains 27 radiotherapists and 19 radiation physicists and biophysicists on the staffs of the centres. In addition, voluntary consultants in all branches of medicine and surgery co-operate in the care of the patients attending the clinics. All centres have a full range of equipment including cobalt 60 units and, in addition, a 22-million volt Betatron is in service at the Princess Margaret hospital.

In the last 10 years, the number of patients treated has increased by 47 per cent. Last year, to reach a high, 6,460 new cancer patients were treated, including 2,672 at the Princess Margaret, 1,023 in Hamilton and 998 in London.

The foundation has supported a speech clinic in Toronto since January, 1959. It is under the control of the department of rehabilitation medicine of the University of Toronto, and patients who have had the larynx removed are taught at this clinic to speak again.

Over 60 patients have been under instruction each year and the small number who are unable to learn this type of speech are provided with artificial voice-boxes by the cancer society without charge to the patient.

There has been a prosthetic laboratory at work in Toronto for a year. Here, facial and other replacements to overcome the deformity of radical cancer surgery are made by a skilled craftsman who was brought out from England by the foundation. This service is entirely free to patients, and it should be noted that these two services cannot be obtained elsewhere in Canada.

Speech teachers are being trained, and it is intended to train prosthetists also.

The foundation has developed a controlled plan for the provision of the newer and often very expensive drugs which are used in the treatment of various types of cancer. The distribution of these drugs is controlled by the cancer centres and is available to patients who cannot afford them and who are at home under the care of their family doctors. This service has been available since October 1960, and 522 doctors across the province have availed themselves of this help for their patients.

To encourage the early diagnosis of cancer, a free biopsy service is available to all doctors when they suspect that a patient may have cancer. In the last 12 years, 35,256 cancers have been diagnosed from 204,056 biopsies at a cost of approximately \$1 million. One can only conjecture how many of those may have failed detection had it not been for this service provided by the foundation.

The foundation has provided funds to train 16 cytotechnicians who are now available to work in laboratories across the province which can provide a cytology service. This has become very important, especially as a means of early diagnosis of certain types of cancer in females.

Uniform records are maintained in all foundation clinics under the medical statistician of The Department of Health. Records

of 100,000 cases of cancer are available, and, based on these, annual conferences are held by the combined clinic staffs on various types of cancer. All phases of the problems of diagnosis and treatment are considered and members of the local profession are invited to attend.

Since 1944, the foundation has maintained an increasing research programme. This now entails the support of all the clinical cancer research done in the province, at the Princess Margaret hospital, the foundation clinics and the teaching hospitals of the provincial medical schools. In 1961, 46 research projects were supported at a cost of \$370,000. In addition, the foundation supported 7 research fellowships and since 1958 has provided the salaries of the permanent research staffs at the Ontario cancer institute. This wide research programme cost the foundation \$930,000 in 1961. It will, no doubt, be interesting to note that cancer control grants paid to the foundation have steadily increased from \$348,792 10 years ago to almost \$2.33 million this year. These are matching grants provided by our government and the government at Ottawa.

The foundation provides short-term scholarships to physicians and scientists in the cancer field. It distributes medical literature on cancer on occasion and arranges for lectureships by visiting specialists in the field, including the annual Gordon Richards memorial lectureship. Certain members of the staff of the foundation, physicists and radiotherapists, have been enabled to take post-graduate work in Great Britain from time to time.

In the case of public education, the foundation has delegated to the Ontario division of the Canadian cancer society the responsibility for public education. In few cases has such a job been as well done by any group, and it should be noted this is entirely a voluntary organization. In addition to this, the society is much involved in many activities: making dressings, transporting patients to clinics, visiting them in hospital and homes, and in a host of other ways helping these sick folk through difficult and trying days.

The Ontario cancer institute's Princess Margaret hospital is the leading cancer centre in Canada. The Princess Margaret hospital, with 115 beds and special facilities for the detailed study of cancer patients by a full-time, full-salaried medical staff, is the best equipped radiotherapy centre in the world today. As already stated, in its facilities are included a 22-million volt Betatron, 5 cobalt units, specially designed Caesium units, which have been developed in the institute for the treatment of cancers of the head and neck.

In the Ontario cancer institute, there has been gathered together as outstanding a group of scientists studying the basic problems of cancer research as will be found anywhere in the world. The work of the department of biological research, under Professor Arthur Ham, has gained international recognition, and the department of biophysics, under Professor Harold Johns, has produced some of the outstanding discoveries in the world in their particular field.

The institute and the hospital were almost entirely developed by special grants from the Ontario government, and the institute is receiving a constant stream of visitors from all over the world.

Two years ago, the University of Toronto established a new department of medical biophysics. This is accommodated in the Ontario cancer institute and is the site for the training of a large and increasing number of post-graduate students in the basic sciences as applied to the problem of cancer.

The worth of all this splendid work is daily demonstrated in the success which, in steadily growing measure, attends the efforts of scientists and clinicians alike. So often we, in Ontario and, indeed, in our nation generally, appear to exhibit symptoms of an inferiority complex when research and progress in treatment are mentioned, yet in this one field alone, great progress has been made possible by the work of the teams on the staff of the cancer institute supported by this government. They have "chalked up" several firsts for Canada—among which are: (a) A brain scanner to more definitely and safely locate brain tumours. (b) The speech centre where the staff are trained as well as patients helped—and (c) The prosthesis centre—both previously referred to.

In the matter of payment for patient care, all patients suffering from cancer are encouraged to place themselves under treatment without delay. Fees for radiotherapeutic treatment of out-patients at the clinics associated with the foundation are graded in relation to the ability of the patients to meet the charges without embarrassment; full charges are only a fraction of the cost. The directors of the treatment centres have the authority to modify charges where indicated. Arrangements for surgery lie exclusively outside the jurisdiction of the clinics.

Commencing January 1, 1959, the cost of treating hospitalized patients by radiotherapy was covered by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. Transportation of needy patients to treatment centres for treatment or follow-up is paid for by the foundation

and is usually arranged through the local units of the Canadian cancer society.

Another foundation coming, in some measure, within the responsibility of the department is the addiction research foundation first established in 1949 as the alcoholism research foundation. Ontario was the first province in Canada to embark on an organized approach to this public health problem—alcoholism.

Since the foundation began to operate in 1950, there has been considerable activity in research, professional education and education of the public. During this year, 1962, Dr. G. Harold Ettinger, formerly dean of medicine at Queen's University, became chairman of the medical advisory board on the retirement of Dr. J. K. W. Ferguson, a world-renowned scientist who gave excellent service to the foundation from its inception and is still active in its interests. We are fortunate to have the experience and abilities of Dr. Ettinger for the foundation.

Over the first 12 years of operation, the foundation's responsibilities were limited to the field of alcoholism, consequently much more has been learned about this than about the broader field of other addictions. Investigation is now proceeding into those broader and less understood areas of addiction to other substances, including not only narcotics but a wide variety of frequently-used drugs that tend to be addicting.

The foundation, as we ourselves do, looks on alcoholism as a grave public health problem with a high prevalence rate which, in Ontario, as in almost every other jurisdiction, is increasing. While it has an over-all interest in alcohol addiction as it affects people in general, the chief concern of the foundation lies in the great majority of our people and the numbers among them who suffer from this disorder. That is to say, the alcoholic who becomes a law-breaker—or put another way, the offender who is an alcoholic—is not the responsibility of the foundation but rather that of The Department of Justice or of Reform Institutions. The foundation, however, has done research work specially directed at this group and, of course, readily makes available to all and any agencies its results, techniques, methods, knowledge, etc.

Records of foundation patients reveal that approximately 60 per cent of these victims are executive, professional, skilled or semi-skilled workers; mostly male and most often persons with considerable family and occupational responsibilities. Many of them have just reached the years in their lives when they might be expected to be making their

greatest contribution at work, in their community and to their family. The foundation recognizes that, with the knowledge now available, many of these alcoholics can be helped to overcome their disability.

No quick, spectacular solution to the problem is expected. However, knowledge is continually being extended by research. Such knowledge—and the treatment facilities for using it—can be and will be made more widely available. There is also considerable hope for prevention through the educational methods currently in use.

Major advances in reducing the prevalence of addictions depend on acceptance of responsibility for treatment of such patients by professional people. This acceptance of professional responsibility for treatment is, in turn, contingent upon the further development of knowledge and methods and the continuous communication of these at both undergraduate and post-graduate levels. The task of developing both basic knowledge and methods of treatment is the first and fundamental responsibility of the foundation.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that some of the things I have just said may have been said and may again be heard in this House—I may even have repeated some things myself—but the work being done in this very important area of public health is worthy of frequent repetition. I believed this to be particularly apropos as, recently, I heard of one hon. member of this House who had written to a jurisdiction to the south of us for “the latest information on alcoholism”, only to be advised to contact the addiction research foundation of Ontario, and again I quote: “It has one of the most modern programmes in the world”; and “Ontario is one of the most advanced areas in its efforts to remove alcoholism.”

I would remind you, too, sir, that those words are the exact words used only a short time ago by no less an authority than the World Health Organization. The reputation of this Ontario government agency is such that governments in Europe, the United States and Scandinavia send their officials to the foundation seeking information and guidance on the development of programmes in their respective countries. In addition, many researchers in other parts of Canada, Europe and the United States frequently ask for consultation from our organization in developing their own programmes. Indeed, it often seems to me the foundation is better known outside of Ontario than by our own people. Perhaps the old adage applies: “A

prophet is not without repute, save in his own country”. I do say to you, sir, we in Ontario have ample cause to be proud of the work the foundation has undertaken in this field and I am quite sure that pride will be reflected by everyone on both sides of this House, if I should have to come seeking an increased budget.

Just as a growing child cannot long be contained within his suit, so the growing foundation has again outgrown its physical plant. To provide adequate accommodation planning is now under way for a new building for the many-sided programme which is steadily expanding. More space will thereby be provided for treatment, education and research.

Greater emphasis is now to be placed on treatment by spreading out to satellite clinics centred upon the existing headquarters in Toronto and regional branches in London, Hamilton, Ottawa and the Lakehead. This is all mapped out in a 5-year plan which will be undertaken in orderly fashion. This, I would hope, can be dealt with more specifically during the consideration of the estimates for this agency.

Before leaving off comment on the two foundations just dealt with, I am sure you, sir, and this House, would appreciate knowing that much of the success that has been achieved has come about through the efforts of public-spirited people. The members of the cancer foundation, the cancer institute and the addiction foundation are all busy men and women who give countless hours of devoted service to the people of this province; and they do it all in the interests of public service. They come from industry, labour, commerce, the Church and the general citizenry. Indeed, it seems to me they spend so much of their time and effort with the affairs of these various boards, I am moved to wonder when they have time to look after their personal business. I am pleased to take this opportunity to put on the records of this House the deep thanks of the government and our people to those who serve so thoroughly and so selflessly.

In health matters, the calendar year now approaching a close will be remembered for several reasons. Because the killing diseases of other days have now for so long been well controlled here in Ontario, as in many other places, we tend to forget or ignore the fact they are only kept in control by constant vigilance. Within recent months, we have been dramatically reminded of this by the appearance of one case of smallpox

which, fortunately, ended in complete recovery of the patient; and also by the appearance of cases of diphtheria, at least one case of which was fatal.

These diseases are still serious if not kept under strict control, and the best control we have is by immunization. Parents need to be reminded constantly that every infant should be protected as soon as possible after birth and should also have this protection boosted as often as deemed necessary by their physician.

None of us will soon forget the tragedy of learning that deformity—sometimes very severe—of the newborn had been linked to the drug thalidomide, which had been taken by mothers early in pregnancy. The Department of Health, as soon as it was advised of the possible association, commenced a study of all newborn records in general hospitals in the province. With the full co-operation of all our hospitals, records for the year 1961 and the year 1962 to date were reviewed and all occurrences of deformities among newborn of the type stated to be possibly associated with thalidomide use were identified. A medical member of our staff then studied each of these records in search of evidence of thalidomide involvement. This has resulted in the following information.

During the period of January 1, 1961, to December 1, 1962, we have identified records of 9 living infants with severe deformity whose mothers took thalidomide in the early months of pregnancy. We have also identified 8 records of infants with moderate or less severe deformity with the same thalidomide association. In addition to these cases, we have noted records of 6 infants who showed minor or slight deformities which were also associated with thalidomide use by the mother. Although these minor deformities are slight abnormalities, nevertheless the drug association exists and we are including these cases in our total record.

We are now contacting the physicians in charge of these cases to assure that every case will have full opportunity to receive necessary surgical and/or rehabilitation care if this is not already being provided. The costs of such surgical and rehabilitation care, not covered by our hospital insurance programme, will be covered by joint subsidy by the provincial and federal governments, as will all other expenses attendant upon this problem.

While, Mr. Speaker, none will seek to set aside the seriousness of this experience, we do need soberly to realize that danger is

inherent in the taking of almost all drugs. For instance, poisoning of children by the common and lowly aspirin is a most frequent happening, as seen by the records of almost all children's hospitals. As a physician, I would hope that drugs which have even a limited use in certain areas—and this was proven of thalidomide—will not be completely banned, but rather their use be restricted to those who can benefit. We should remember this is true of all drugs—each has, as a rule, a specific area of usefulness.

For us as individuals, I believe the lesson in this tragedy is to avoid self-medication. If we are ill enough to need medication, we are ill enough to seek advice. The records of thalidomide will show that tragedy overtook at least some who took the drug given to them by kindly friends or relatives and not prescribed by a physician.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to have further opportunity to deal thoroughly with other aspects of the responsibilities of The Department of Health at other times during this session.

While I have not touched on the biggest single division of my department, the division of mental hygiene, there is a matter of very great interest which came about within the past few days I would like to bring to your attention. I am sure, sir, the hon. members would want to know of a signal honour conferred on Dr. Murray Barr of the University of Western Ontario by the President of the United States for the doctor's original research into mental retardation.

Since 1956, Dr. Barr has been carrying on intensive research in this area in co-operation with The Department of Health's clinicians. It was largely on the basis of his work and interests that we moved to establish the children's psychiatric institute in London. Dr. Barr's work is continuing there. He is also one of the research advisory group to this department. We are all very proud of this international recognition of his work.

It will no doubt be of interest, too, to know that the superintendent of the institute in London, Dr. Donald Zartas, was also nominated for an award. This is the first time in the history of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation, sir, that any foreign scientist has been recognized and I am quite certain that every hon. member of this House will share our pride in the accomplishments of these men.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would refer to the order of business for the balance of the week; I have just had distributed the estimates and the public accounts. On Wednesday we will take the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions and subsequent to that, depending upon the length of time they take, we will take The Department of Mines and tomorrow we will deal with the other departments mentioned which are really pretty much routine, and we will resume the Throne Speech debate tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Any night sittings this week?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: May I just answer that question, Mr. Speaker? Possibly there will be a sitting Wednesday night, but there will not be a night session tonight, of course, or tomorrow night.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.15 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

(Wednesday, December 5, 1962)

	<i>Page</i>	<i>Col.</i>	<i>Line</i>
Mr. Thompson: Well, the hon. Minister said it did.	115	1	22
(This statement was not made by Mr. Thompson.)			



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, December 11, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 11, 1962

Reading and receiving petition	189
Income Tax Act, 1961-62, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading	189
Statement re changes in Ontario grade 13 departmental examinations, Mr. Davis	189
Presenting report, Mr. Grossman	191
Estimates, Department of Insurance, Mr. Cass	191
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	219

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1962

The House met at 3:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petition has been received:

Of the institute of professional librarians praying that an Act may pass reorganizing the institute and its powers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the select committee appointed to investigate the manpower resources of the province be authorized to sit during the Christmas-New Year adjournment of this session and that the same allowances for expenses to the chairman and members thereof be payable for such meetings as are provided by Section 65 of The Legislative Assembly Act, R.S.O. 1960, Chapter 308, for meetings held during the interval between sessions.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-62

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): **Mr. Speaker,** these amendments are mostly of a technical nature to bring our Income Tax Act into line with that of the federal government, as a result of the present agreement to collect tax for us. The most important section has to do with providing relief from double taxation for those persons who live in Canada and work in the United States. It places them in the same position they were in under the former federal Income Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Before the orders of the day, hon. members of the House will be interested in several essential changes in the administration of the Ontario grade 13 departmental examinations which will be initiated in 1963 and will become fully effective by 1967.

In 1955, a total of 90,000 grade 13 papers were written. By 1962 this number was doubled and by 1966 it will be doubled again. The universities of Ontario have reached a size where it is of great concern that the grade 13 results be released earlier for them to grant admission on a fair basis, to make their scholarship awards and to carry out the multitudinous tasks coincident with the fall opening of large university classes. The Department of Education needs more examination markers and more time for the administrative procedures that follow the writing of the papers. And, the parents wish to know the results as early as possible that they may make the best arrangements for their children's welfare in post-secondary education.

In my opinion the people of Ontario wish to retain the grade 13 departmental examinations at the present high standard as a uniform basis for the issue of the secondary school honour graduation diploma and for admission of successful candidates to various forms of post-secondary education. Accordingly, after very careful consideration of the effect of the proposed changes on all concerned, I am asking for the co-operation of all persons in making the following changes:

1. The timetable for the grade 13 departmental examinations in 1963 will be advanced so that the examinations in that grade only will commence on Monday, June 3. Although this date is one week earlier than the customary beginning of these examinations, boards will not lose any attendance grant on behalf of grade 13 pupils thereby.

2. In order that sufficient time may be available for the usual careful consideration of the papers, the associate examiners will be required at earlier dates than usual. English

and French markers will be asked to report for duty in Toronto on June 18. Markers in other subjects will commence on June 24 or June 25. The marking of papers in several centres is not practicable in Ontario for several reasons. Boards and principals are asked to arrange for the release of 1,000 teachers, or one in 15, a few days earlier than usual for this important duty.

3. The closing date of secondary schools in June will not be affected by the earlier writing of examinations in grade 13.

4. Although the number of grade 13 subjects to be covered may not change, the number of papers to be written will be reduced according to the following timetable:

- (a) Commencing in June, 1965, a single paper will be set in each of the languages other than English.
- (b) Commencing in June, 1966, a single paper will be set in biology.
- (c) Commencing in June, 1967, two papers will be set in mathematics in place of three.

This reduction of papers cannot be accomplished sooner because a redistribution of topics in grades 11, 12, and 13 must precede it and in some subjects texts must be prepared to fit the rearranged courses.

Committees of teachers, university professors, and departmental officials are now at work in several subjects, and soon will be in others, bringing courses up to date, redistributing subject content in the grades, attempting to lighten the prescription of work in grade 13 in order that the final year in secondary school may be a better transition for students proceeding to university without any sacrifice of the traditional high standards of senior matriculation in Ontario.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question. It was originally to be directed to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) but I understand he is in the "windy city" for several days, so I was told to direct it possibly to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts). It is possible too, sir, that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests may not have had ample time to answer the question, but I can defer—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The hon. Minister of Economics and Development will be back in the House on Thursday and unless it is of pressing consequence the hon. member might leave it until then.

Mr. Troy: Well, possibly the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests may be able to answer it because it has to do with a forest product.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have read the question.

Mr. Troy: And does the hon. Prime Minister think I should defer it until—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think the hon. member might get a better answer, that is all.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

I would point out it is a general rule that the question is withheld if the Minister to whom it is directed is not present.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in connection with the statement the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) has made, I have a question I think he would be glad to answer. I believe he said grade 13 examinations were going to start on June 3, starting next year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is correct.

Mr. Whicher: And yet the marking is not going to start until June 18. I think all of us would agree that speed is most essential so that these students who pass or fail know what they are going to do the following year, starting in September. I have two questions. I am sure—

Mr. Speaker: Order. There again this is a statement and not a question. If the member has a question I would ask him to go ahead.

Mr. Whicher: I have to give some background to this question. Firstly, why is it that the marking must wait until June 18, that is, 15 days following the start? Secondly, when will the marking be completed so that the students concerned will be able to plan their next school year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that the marking will be finished approximately 10 days or two weeks prior to what it has been in the past years. Prior to this the markers were not requested to report until the end of the secondary school term; this has been advanced by roughly 10 days, so that the students should be in a position to know, I would think, roughly 10 days or two weeks sooner than last year.

Mr. Whicher: I agree with the hon. Minister, as I am sure all of us do, Mr. Speaker, that this is a step in the right direction, but

I still feel that it could be speeded up. I would hope that he would ask his officials if possible to start marking even a few days prior to June 18, to get the results as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio) begs leave to present the 36th annual report of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Today I have a couple of questions, Mr. Speaker, which I trust the hon. Prime Minister will permit me to ask of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell). Due notice of these questions was given to the hon. Minister.

The first question: Would the hon. Minister advise this House as to when tenders will be called and when construction will commence on the promised \$600,000 provincial building in the town of Kenora?

Secondly: Has the government taken any steps to implement the request for modernization and alteration of the courthouse at Kenora?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Gibson) that we do not know when tenders will be called but plans are proceeding with the building.

To his second question—I would like to report a little more lengthily on this part. The grand jury report to which I presume the hon. member is referring, states that the space occupied by the Ontario provincial police is hopelessly inadequate for their purpose. I have not yet received any request from The Department of the Attorney-General for new space for the provincial police. But due to the great growth there are a number of detachments in northern Ontario which are occupying inadequate space and we are remedying it as quickly as possible.

This year we opened 3 new headquarters buildings and we have two more in advanced planning. We are now building 6 more detachment buildings and have 9 on the boards which we hope we will call during the next 12 months.

The Ontario provincial police are now occupying cramped quarters in the basement of the Kenora courthouse and until they are removed from this space a major overhaul of the building is not possible. This does not stop us, however, doing jobs such as

rewiring, tenders for which have been called already. We are currently looking for a suitable site for the Ontario provincial police building, depending on the need for it.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, with respect to question 1, would the hon. Minister permit a supplementary question? Is there any change in the status of this project from the time I inquired about this during the last session?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, I say, plans are proceeding.

Mr. Gibson: That is the remark the hon. Minister made last session.

Mr. Troy: May I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question in his answer to question No. 2?

Has there been any request made in regard to the OPP headquarters in North Bay? I notice detachment buildings are being erected in various sections, but here we have the headquarters for all that area from Parry Sound right through to Kirkland Lake and we have not got any kind of a building that is worthy of a headquarters building for the provincial police. Has the hon. Minister had any request for a headquarters building for the OPP in North Bay?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I cannot answer that question with certainty now, but I know we are building one at Powassan, which is only 18 miles south.

Mr. Troy: Yes, but that is only a detachment. Where are the headquarters?

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, on the same question, will Fort Erie get one at the same time?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Nineteenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE

Mr. Chairman: Department of Insurance, on vote 901.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, this today is a new and pleasant duty for me. My only previous connection with insurance, I presume, has been very

much the same as that of most of the hon. members of this House and members of the public, that of a reasonably satisfied customer who is looking for safe, sure and economical protection of his property, income and estate.

I am pleased to say that from what I know and what I have learned in the past few weeks, the industry in Ontario in all its ramifications is in a healthy condition. And in the department we do take some pride and satisfaction from this, as I am sure that the good practices engendered by our provincial legislation and our departmental inspections have had their effect.

Last year my predecessor, sir, the then Minister in charge of The Department of Insurance (Mr. Roberts), in his preliminary remarks on the presentation of the estimates which are reported in *Hansard* on page 391 and following, very substantially set out the jurisdiction and functioning of the department. There has been little change in this in the ensuing period, and I shall not repeat that portion of the remarks which normally might be made at this time.

However, there are some current figures which might be of interest to all the hon. members. Very briefly, I would just like to bring them to their attention. Perhaps they could be compared with last year's figures as recorded in *Hansard* and give a measure of the operations of the department.

We still have under administration the same 8 Acts. There is a staff of 70 which is up to full strength now, except for two examiner-inspectors. The Insurance Act provides for the licensing of all insurers and we have some 596 now being licensed by us in Ontario, of which 398 are Dominion-registered companies and 199 are Ontario and extra-provincial. I need not say, because I am sure we are all aware of it, that the examination and the protection of the solvency of Dominion-registered companies are under the supervision of the federal Department of Insurance.

And then with respect to the licensing of insurance agents, brokers and adjusters, the information I have is that in the past year we have had 8,600 life insurance agents licensed by this department. Insurance agents, other than life, total 8,700. In other words, there are 100 more casualty, general and other types of agents than there are life insurance agents.

And we have 600 licensed insurance adjusters in Ontario, making a total of 17,900 licensed agents and adjusters in Ontario.

Under The Loan and Trust Corporations Act we have a total of 35 companies being

licensed, of which 3 are foreign, 12 are Dominion registered and again subject to the inspection and examination of the federal Department of Insurance, and 20 are our own Ontario or extra-provincial corporations.

Under The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act we have approximately 2,600 real estate brokers registered and 6,000 salesmen.

The Credit Unions Act has now some 1,400 active credit unions subject to the Act and there are 26 examiners supplied by the 3 large credit unions working with our inspectors and examiners in the department. I note that last year the former Minister said that with the staffs available the credit unions could be inspected once every 3 years, and I am advised that this schedule is very well being adhered to.

We have 3 investment contract companies registered under The Investment Contracts Act, and 39 prepaid hospital or medical plans registered under The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act, a total of 135 collection agencies under The Collection Agencies Act, and now 650 mortgage brokers under The Mortgage Brokers Registration Act. The hon. members will notice that there is a considerable reduction in the number there due to the fact that following the amendment to the legislation last year those real estate agents who are also mortgage brokers have but a single registration and appear only in the figures that I have quoted for real estate agents.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to proceed to the items of vote 901 and certainly will be glad and do my best to answer any inquiries of the hon. members, either as to the operation of the department or the particular items of the vote.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, if I may beg leave of your kind indulgence and that of the hon. members of the House to refer to a matter which has bothered me for some time, and I think it of sufficient importance to repeat it in this House—I have said it other places—about the operation of The Insurance Act and in particular reference to one part of it.

The hon. Minister, in introducing these estimates, made the comment that he was satisfied with the statutes that are administered by this department. But I want to say, sir, by way of parenthesis, that I cannot share his enthusiasm.

I recall last year at a meeting of the legal bills committee, where we were making some—we had before us, I should say—some statute that made some minor amendment to The

Insurance Act; which is a very compendious statute, if you have ever looked at it, sir, as I am sure you have. It is about that thick—as I measure off about an inch between my two fingers to indicate to you how big it is.

One portion of this statute deals with life insurance and the bill before the committee to which I refer encompassed some minor amendment to the provisions dealing with life insurance. It did not excite any great interest in the hon. members of the committee and the statute would have passed, the bill would have passed through the committee without any comment at all, I am sure, but at the back of the room there was a delegation of people who never did identify themselves and one of the members of that delegation got up and said: "Mr. Chairman, if I may make a comment". And he went on to say that we of such and such an organization—and it had a very sterling and sophisticated name, I forget what it was now but it had something to do with the insurance life underwriting—he said: "We want to tell you that we make no objection to the committee passing this amendment"; which I thought to myself, and I did not articulate the words, I thought: My, that is a nice, fine, gratuitous comment. He has come here to tell us that he approves our passing of this particular bill. Everyone will be happy, I am sure, that this very sophisticated group have looked at it and approved of what we are doing in the exercise of our functions as members of the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, it was illustrative of another principle to me. It was illustrative that so far as The Insurance Act is concerned, that the only representations, I daresay, and I would not expect to be contradicted, the only representations the government ever gets about The Insurance Act are from the insurance industry. They are the only people who come and make representations to the government. It is a highly organized industry, it is a very powerful industry.

There are some of us in this country—we are a very small minority—who realize that the main business of insurance companies is not the selling of insurance; that is so far as pertains to life insurance. Their main business is not the selling of insurance. It is a sideline. But this very powerful group who employ very intelligent people, very well educated people, are the people who police The Insurance Act and they make representations to the superintendent of insurance or the Attorney-General or the Cabinet. And I go so far as to say that The Insurance Act as it stands in the statute books of this province is precisely what the insurance com-

panies want it to be—what they want it to be. If they wanted The Insurance Act to be changed to suit them, they would make representations to the government to have it changed.

I just point this out, that this young fellow, very dapperly dressed and very well articulated in his speech, came to the committee and said, "I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, and all of the members of the committee, that we approve of this change." Whereupon somebody should have whispered "Amen" at that point.

Now, to turn to one specific part of The Insurance Act. I wrote to the hon. Attorney-General about 3 or 4 weeks ago, and I remind my hon. colleagues who sit with me that the hon. Attorney-General, hon. gentleman that he is, is not a person who answers his mail in the most expeditious fashion, he is not the quickest to answer his mail over there.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): He is one of many.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, my hon. friend from Windsor-Walkerville says he is one of many.

I wrote to him and I pointed out to him one provision of The Insurance Act so far as it applies to automobile insurance. There is such a thing as is known in our society as the standard automobile policy. My hon. friend from High Park (Mr. Cowling) would know all about that. My hon. friend from Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) would know about that. The standard automobile policy. The standard automobile policy has included in it, in the smallest possible print, the smallest possible that is allowed to be used, a section known as the statutory conditions. Anybody with less than 20-20 vision cannot read these without the aid of a magnifying glass, but these statutory provisions are a copying of the conditions as they are found in The Insurance Act. They are imposed by statute.

One of the provisions, and the one I recently wrote to the hon. Attorney-General about, was the provision dealing with the obligation of the insured after he has suffered an accident to make a report to his insurance agent, to make a report to the company. It does not say the agent is to make a report to the company. My hon. friends would be truly surprised to learn of the number of people who are in serious accidents to whom the thought never occurs that they should report this accident to the company. There are a great many that do not take that immediate first step.

The obligation of the insured, says the statutory condition—I think it is No. 6 or No.

7—says that the insured must forthwith report the accident to his company, and I am not using the exact words. Then it goes on to say that within 90 days, I believe it is—it might be 60 days, but within a certain fixed period of time—within 90 days he must furnish the company with a statutory declaration. Now, many of my constituents would not know what a statutory declaration is unless they called me up to ask what it was. He must furnish them with a statutory declaration setting out all the details of the accident: time, place, weather conditions, who was driving the car, how the accident occurred and so on. A statutory declaration, of course, is a very solemn declaration taken under oath before a commissioner or a notary. The statutory condition says within 90 days he must furnish the company with a statutory declaration. All right, let us go on from there.

A later statutory condition says—and I hope it becomes readily apparent to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) who is paying close attention to me, that these conditions are not there for the benefit of the insured, they are not there for his protection. A later statutory condition says that unless the earlier one requiring the statutory declaration is supplied, no action shall be brought, no action shall be brought upon the policy unless there is compliance. So what happens in fact—just let us review what happens in fact following an accident.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): The Liquor Commissioner is not paying any attention to the hon. member at all.

Mr. Sopha: No. He is engrossed with other things. He is worried about all the profit he is going to lose between 6:30 and 10:30. He is counting his dollars that he is going to be missing from the treasury.

Well, I started to say, let us review what happens. The insurer suffers an accident, he goes to his agent. The agent tells him: "Go to an adjuster and make a report," and he names a firm of insurance adjusters.

Over goes the assured to them and gets a sheet of paper out and he either writes down himself, but most often the insurance adjuster writes down, what the assured tells him; or in some cases he gets the assured to write it out in narrative fashion himself. At the bottom of it, they affix the signature; he affixes his signature, whoever writes it out. The assured signs it and it is dated. I have never known a case where the insurance adjuster ever gave the assured a copy of what he had written.

But it is not a statutory declaration! It is not in compliance with the statutory condition in the policy. Then the insurance adjuster proceeds to investigate the accident and it may be, as in an increasing number of cases, it may be the insurance company will deny their liability under the policy for various reasons that I am going to come to a little later on. They deny their liability, they tell the assured: "We are not going to pay you under this policy, go and get your car fixed and pay for it yourself," and the insured consults his lawyer.

As often as not, and probably the 90 days under which he was obliged to furnish the statutory declaration have now elapsed, so it is physically impossible for him to comply with the condition when he sees the lawyer.

The lawyer may institute an action on the policy asking for a declaration that the policy covered the risk and that he is entitled to indemnification and payment of his loss. Then when the pleading is drawn on behalf of the insurance company, one of the matters pleaded will be that there has been no compliance with that statutory condition which required him to furnish a statutory declaration.

Now, what is the situation at this point? The situation is that the insurance company, through their agency adjuster, had the insured in their hands and presumably could get him to furnish them with whatever they required at that point. It was in their power to ask for it. If they wanted a statutory declaration, they could have asked for it. But they did not.

Now I should go on to say—because my hon. friend would say it if I did not and I would not leave out parts of the story—that a later section of The Insurance Act says that the court may relieve, where there has been substantial compliance with the conditions; it is a discretionary matter in the court. But be that as it may, in a well-practised and very automatic method of dealing with insurance claims, what is the necessity of having such a statutory condition? Why should we have it at all?

Why not say in the statutory conditions in this perfect statute that the hon. Minister refers to, with which he is satisfied, why not have a statutory condition that says there is an obligation on the insured when he suffers an accident to go and report it to the company, period. That is the end of it. And if he does that he has complied with his obligation under the policy.

Why all this falderal in the statutory conditions, unless it is put there at the instance

of the insurance companies, about the furnishing of a statutory declaration and going on to say no action may be brought unless there is compliance?

I hope that is some evidence that I have adduced, at least it is evidence from my point of view, since I am the person weighing it and articulating it, that The Insurance Act is precisely what the insurance companies want it to be.

I have made reference in other places, made them unashamedly and I repeat them, that there are some insurance companies in this province selling automobile insurance who are more interested in law suits between themselves and the insured than they are in paying claims. Without naming—I do not think I will name it today—to the minds of all hon. members the name of the champion, the North American champion in that field, readily comes to mind.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Ottawa West smiles, because he named them, he named that company and they did with him what they did with me when I named that company and told a few things about them. They sent a man from Toronto up to entertain me in Sudbury, take me to lunch. They must have had two public relations people schooled in the Carnegie tradition, because they sent one down to Ottawa to speak to him.

The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) reminds me they sent everybody a letter. They sent one to see the hon. member for High Park, Mr. Chairman, because he shared the same enthusiasm or lack of enthusiasm for that insurance company that I did.

Now, if I may leave that—and I do not intend to resume my seat yet because I want to turn to another part of The Insurance Act. This committee on which my esteemed colleague from York Centre (Mr. Singer) and my other esteemed colleague from Wellington South (Mr. Worton) and my hon. colleague from Bruce, on which they are sitting dealing with the problem of compensation of persons injured upon highways, and which, though it made an interim report has not yet made its final report and one does not know when to expect it, is a committee that has a great area of very important problems under its jurisdiction. I made so bold as to appear before that committee and present a brief to it.

I do not know how much of my brief they are going to incorporate into their report, but if they wish to use the exact verbiage that I used in the brief they are welcome to it and I will not accuse them of plagiarism,

nor will they infringe any of the copyright legislation of this country.

One of the things that I said to them—and I wish to repeat here—is that I simply do not understand, as a citizen of this country and a resident of this province, I simply do not understand why it is, and why The Insurance Act makes it so, that if we believe in a principle of the payment of compensation as a matter of the organization of our society—that is all it is, that is all insurance is, it is part of the organization of our society so that we shift loss suffered.

Insurance is the shifting of losses, where the group pools some resources and pays to the person injured a portion of those resources in order to compensate him for his loss. If we believe in the principle of the shifting of losses, then let me go back to what I said earlier. I utterly fail to comprehend why The Insurance Act should set up a situation that where a person suffers loss, he is not able to collect. He is simply by reason of the existence of this Act, of which the hon. Minister is so proud, not able to collect the amount of money that the policy says the insured is insured for. Now to reduce it to an illustration.

My friend from Bruce, for example, has \$250,000 insurance on his automobile if he covers himself within those broad limits. Let us assume he is a man of some means, and let us assume that is the amount of coverage that he carries—a quarter of a million dollars. He is driving down the streets of Wiarton, let us say. And visiting in Wiarton on a balmy, beautiful afternoon in mid-summer amid one of Canada's finest wonderlands, the Bruce peninsula, is a world-famous violinist, a virtuoso who plays at Carnegie Hall. Let us say that he is walking down the street in Wiarton, when my friend from Bruce strikes him with his car, and breaks his right arm so that it is beyond repair and he can no longer play the violin.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): He cannot fiddle any more.

Mr. Sopha: He cannot fiddle any more, says my hon. friend from Wellington South, Mr. Chairman. Well, let us assume that set of facts—the man's future earnings have disappeared, he can no longer resume his occupation of playing the beautiful strains of Mozart or Hoagy Carmichael or some of the other more famous composers. Let us assume at the same time that my friend from Bruce is going off on a trip to Alabama with his family and neglects to report the accident. One cannot imagine my friend from Bruce

being so irresponsible but let us say he is caught up in the spirit of euphemism and he says: "I won't report the accident." He is away for three months and the company never knows that he struck the world-famous violinist.

Now, what happens? Finally the violinist goes to his lawyer and starts an action against my friend from Bruce. He issues a writ. My friend looks at this very imperial-looking document with a red seal on it, rushes into his insurance company and says: "Here! I have been sued for a motor vehicle accident." Immediately the company produces a document that is like a form and says to my friend from Bruce: "We want you to sign here. This is called a non-waiver agreement. We will investigate this case and we will defend you in this action but we are not waiving any of our rights to come back against you because you are in breach of your policy."

Then if, in the pleadings, the violinist prosecutes his action, and delivers a statement of claim, the statement of the defence is given as: Whicher, the plaintiff, failed to report the accident to the company.

What is the final result? The final result is that if the company makes out their defence of breach of condition against my friend from Bruce, under present legislation the violinist, instead of getting what his injury is worth, is confined to the statutory limits of the policy, now \$35,000. It used to be \$10,000 for one person but last October it was increased to \$35,000.

Take the case of the wife who is at home—I have used this illustration before, you will permit me to repeat it. The wife is at home, cooking supper for the man of the house, waiting for him to come home. He has stopped at the golf course and has had perhaps two or three drinks. On the way home he is involved in a motor vehicle accident and perhaps is killed. If you assume that he was partly at fault in the happening of the accident, let us say he is 50 per cent at fault, then the amount of her recovery is 50 per cent of the amount of the judgment.

My argument is: What has the wife done? What has she done by way of causing wrong or doing wrong to any other person? At least in the picture that I paint, if her husband is negligent and the other motorist is negligent, then she, of all the people who are involved, is completely innocent of any blame whatsoever. Mr. Chairman, in regard to this statute which the hon. Attorney-General describes as being completely satisfactory, why should it not be—if we believe in the

principle of shifting losses—that the whole of the insurance coverage become available to persons so injured? Why should there be any restriction, any restriction at all, to artificial bounds that are set out in The Insurance Act?

Mr. Chairman, after some publicity had been given to some submissions along this line to that select committee to which I referred, then the Law Society of Upper Canada—a very august body to which I belong and to which my hon. legal friends who sit on these benches also belong—in fact, if you practise law, as hon. members know, in this province you must be a member of the Law Society of Upper Canada—a very fine organization, steeped in the history of this province. It is so steeped in the history that the thought has never occurred to them, has it, to change the name from Upper Canada to Ontario?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: My hon. friend from Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Belanger) says that it sounds more dignified.

Well, we have the Dental Society of Ontario, we have the Ontario Medical Association but the really prestigious group in the professions is the Law Society of Upper Canada. It resides in those historic and ivy-covered halls down there at the corner of Queen Street and University Avenue.

Well, they came before the committee and they presented a brief also.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): A committee of the benchers of the Law Society of Upper Canada.

Mr. Sopha: My hon. friend from York Centre corrects me. The front of the book in which they presented the brief said: Brief of the Law Society of Upper Canada. But, on the day they arrived their counsel, one of the stellar ornaments in the legal firmament, John Josiah Robinette, presented the brief for them. They said it was not the brief of the Law Society of Upper Canada, but a brief of certain of the benchers—of a committee of the benchers. And all of these, and all of this committee were people of great prestige in automobile insurance litigation.

They had one thing in common, those who acted as counsel. They almost universally appeared for insurance companies, automobile insurance companies. One of them is now a judge of the high court. This brief echoed, if I may make so bold and I blush with embarrassment at saying it, the same thing that

I had said to the committee in regard to making available to injured people on our highways the whole of the insurance policy. If the injury is worth \$85,000 and there is \$100,000 worth of insurance then let the plaintiff be paid \$85,000. Let him have it, and stop this niggling and this litigation about whether the insured is in breach of the statutory conditions or not.

The pitiful thing about it, and I cite my experience, is that after the plaintiff starts his action, has his case tried and determined by the courts, it is not a case then of taking out the writ of execution and sending the sheriff down to the head office of the insurance company and getting paid. It is not so easy as that, because you may have this other litigation going on between the insured and his insurance company—parallel sets of litigation. Whether the plaintiff is going to get full recovery on his judgment or whether he is going to be confined to the statutory limit has to await the outcome of this other litigation.

That refers me naturally to another part of The Insurance Act which—perhaps I go a bit too far—which I would like to call an iniquitous section. It permits an insurance company to invite themselves into the plaintiff's litigation by way of a third party proceeding. And nowhere else in the law—I think I am correct and I will soon be corrected if I am not correct—if A is suing B, can C, a stranger to their quarrel, can C invite himself into their litigation, if you follow me?

A sues B, but C, the insurance company, under The Insurance Act may invite themselves into the litigation by taking out what is known as a third party notice under The Insurance Act. There is nowhere else in the law that I know of where a foreigner to the litigation, a stranger, can come and get in the litigation.

Hon. Mr. Cass: But only if they have an interest.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. And this statute, this great statute, permits them to do it. They invite themselves into the litigation, and whether the plaintiff, after he recovers judgment, is going to get his full judgment or is going to be restricted within the statutory limits depends on the outcome of that third party proceeding. It might be years, it might be a question of years, certainly many months, but it might run into years, until the plaintiff determines whether he is going to get the full amount or be restricted to part of it.

Here is another thing about it that offends

the person who is conscious of the quality of justice. In the fight between the insurance company and their insured, the plaintiff who is waiting to see how much of his judgment he gets, cannot take any part in that at all. In other words, it boils down to this: the insurance company, under this great statute, invites itself into the litigation and having invited itself into the litigation and set up an issue between it and its insured, then the plaintiff is powerless to intervene in that third party issue but has to wait, sedentary, powerless, unless that issue is determined.

Now, in my opinion, whoever wrote The Insurance Act went a long way in derogation from the judicial principles which we revere in setting up any such opportunity in that statute as is set up in the provisions that I refer to.

Once again I put it against this background, and I put it against this background fearlessly, that I believe The Insurance Act is precisely what the insurance companies want it to be. They are happy with it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It might have been passed by a Liberal government.

Mr. Sopha: Well, my hon. friend from York South, who is not known for his reticence, intervenes and says it might have been passed by a Liberal government.

Mr. MacDonald: It likely was.

Mr. Sopha: It might have been. My answer is, so what? It long antedated any responsibility that I had for what a Liberal government did. But my hon. friend from York South normally suffers from that constipation of thought that his words indicate—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it is not constipation the hon. member for Sudbury is suffering from.

Mr. Sopha: —and he should treat what I am saying as some form of enema to help him, you know. Now, is there anything more he wants to say?

Mr. MacDonald: No Liberal government would implement your proposals.

Mr. Sopha: Now, to return to the important things that I was saying.

I say to the hon. Attorney-General, Mr. Chairman, that he would better serve his office and better serve the people of this province,

if I may make so bold as to put it that way, if instead of getting up in this House, as he does, and says, God is in his heaven, all is right with the world, our Insurance Act, our insurance legislation is the best that can be manufactured by man and we are happy with it. He would be better off, I submit most humbly to him, if he really had a look at it and saw what is in the four corners of that statute with the spirit of inquiry—with the spirit of inquiry that I commend him to follow—as to whether that insurance legislation really carries out the social policy that we want to effectuate, for which we are responsible as members of this House.

I have only referred to one aspect of it, one section of that Act, and that is dealing with automobile insurance. Now who knows but that in the other sections, that dealing with life insurance, that dealing with mutual benefit societies, that dealing with health and accident, that dealing with fire insurance—which leads me to make this observation: I have never been able to understand further why there should be a limitation period in these policies.

Why should there be a limitation period? In the automobile insurance policy you must bring your action to recover on the policy within one year. Why? There may be any number of good and valid reasons that the insured is not able to bring his action within that period. On the fire insurance policy, I think I am correct in saying that it is again a period of one year. Why? Why should it be one year? Why not make it 3 years or 5 years, or as in the limitations statute that is hoary with age and has been upon our statute books where personal actions may be brought within a period of 6 years. Is it? Within 6 years you may bring a personal action. But under The Insurance Act, in the two cases I have cited, you must bring your action within a period of one year.

And if you miss, if you do not bring the action on the anniversary date of the happening of the loss, if your loss is today December 11, 1962, you bring your action before December 11, 1963, or you are out of court. If you miss by one day then you are completely without relief under that policy and the company escapes.

What social policy is there that is crystallized in this legislation so as to give these companies the opportunity, by the mere efflux of time, to escape the liability for which they have been paid by way of premium? They have got the premium. Why should a technicality allow them to escape?

I am a Liberal of the school, I say to the hon. Attorney-General, I belong to that brand of liberalism with a small "l".

An hon. member: The Otto brand?

Mr. Sopha: Well, I have never met Mr. Otto. I have never met him so I judge not the persons I have not met.

I was saying that the brand of liberalism with a small "l" that I belong to believes that the little fellow should get the break where it is possible to give it to him, because the little fellow is not articulate, and here is the note I am going to beg leave to end on: He is not articulate. He is not represented at these committees. He has not got a fellow to come to the legal bills committee on his behalf and say: "Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, but I think this should be done in order to protect me."

He has not got the lobby. So the responsibility then devolves upon those who have the public power and those who have the responsibility and the duty of exercising it to scrutinize statutes of this type and to see whether they protect him, the little man, as opposed to the interests of the bigger financial institutions, powerful and sophisticated and educated people.

Then if you do that, if you really have a close look in the statute book, I say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Attorney-General, on these provisions in that statute, that having had a close look and directing an impartial objective mind to it, then he will not get up in this Legislature as he has done and say our insurance legislation is perfect, because it is not perfect and that is my humble opinion about it.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I can sympathize with the problems that the hon. member for Sudbury has encountered, no doubt in his own personal experience and in hearing of the experiences of others. I believe our system for handling automobile accident claims is totally inadequate and quite unfair to the victims of automobile accidents.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the way to solve this problem is not to berate the hon. Minister or the government or some previous Liberal government for inadequacies in the present Insurance Act, but to adopt a sensible, up-to-date approach to the problem, and that is to set up a public automobile accident insurance fund. That surely is the answer to the question, and as long as we fail to meet our responsibilities in that regard in this Legislature we will no doubt hear

again and again very justifiable complaints of the type that have been raised by the hon. member for Sudbury.

Unfortunately the Liberal Party still clings to its notion that the so-called private enterprise method is the best way of handling automobile accident insurance claims. However, Mr. Chairman, they have flip-flopped so many times in policy and on so many different matters of policy that I am hopeful that with persistence and patience we might in time educate them to see the light on this matter too. That will be part of the battle won. If we could just educate the government, then we could proceed even at this session with a proper automobile accident insurance law.

I think most of the hon. members of this House recall that at the beginning of this year, at the opening of the winter assizes I think it was, Chief Justice McRuer of the high court dropped something of a bombshell on the legal world and on the province generally by openly and eloquently advocating a totally new approach to the problem of automobile accident insurance. He said, for example, and I am now quoting from him as reported in the *Toronto Daily Star* of January 10, 1962:

When I see a judgment for \$1,200 or \$1,500 that carries with it costs amounting to nearly as much or even more than the injured party receives, I cannot feel that we have devised the best method of dealing with these cases.

And he is quoted in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of January 12, 1962 as saying:

I can say with some conviction that I never preside over an automobile accident case that I have any real feeling of administering justice according to the law.

Mr. Singer: He made a later and better speech.

Mr. Bryden: Well, as a matter of fact, the hon. member for York Centre, Mr. Chairman, reminds me that he has commented more recently on this subject. I regret to say that I do not have with me the clipping that I took out of the paper at the time, and I would not purport to try to quote him directly. I will give my recollection of what he said, however. Referring to the fact that the legal profession seemed to be somewhat disturbed by the obvious development of public opinion in favour of a public automobile accident insurance plan, he said in effect that the legal profession is a very conservative profession and it is hard to get them into the present out of their dreams of the past. I

repeat that is by no means intended to be a quotation from Chief Justice McRuer, but I think it catches the spirit of what he said.

The plain fact is, Mr. Chairman, that our present method of dealing with automobile accident claims benefits nobody at all except lawyers and insurance companies. And my submission to you, sir, is that we should start thinking in terms of the need of the auto accident victim. This is a great social problem in our day of congested highways with more and more vehicles using highways. The problem of accidents exists; many people suffer injury, often serious injury, sometimes death, as a result of these accidents. Dependents are left without adequate protection, and I think it is the function of society to provide social legislation to deal with this very serious social problem.

I will also say that a public auto plan will go a long way towards relieving the log jam that now exists in our higher courts. An article in the *Toronto Daily Star* last March said that 6 out of every 10 cases on the higher court lists are auto accident cases. I do not know if that figure is accurate or not, but certainly it is close enough to being accurate to indicate the magnitude of the problem.

I would like to quote from an editorial that I happened to see in the *Vancouver Sun*, written last August 9, referring to this whole problem. I may say that newspapers all across Canada which, even a few years ago, considered the idea of a public auto plan as quite repugnant, are now swinging around in that direction. Even the *Toronto Globe and Mail* is moving that way as is indicated by an editorial they published on August 30, 1962. I will not read it but I would like to refer to the *Vancouver Sun* editorial. The heading is

SASKATCHEWAN'S CAR INSURANCE

Almost every court in Canada runs days, weeks and months behind in handling cases of automobile accident claims. What is often forgotten in this situation is that these court costs are added to the cost of car accident insurance.

Insurance costs are going up steadily in Canada, not only because of an increase in accidents, but also because of the great increase of litigation.

This holds true for every province except Saskatchewan, which has compulsory automobile insurance, operated by the government.

In this case, bureaucracy apparently has not made for waste.

A study by the Consumers' Union in

the United States, a non-profit organization which evaluates products and services, shows the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund of Saskatchewan is the most economical on the continent.

Eighty-two cents out of every dollar goes to pay claims. The other 18 cents goes for expenses.

By comparison, for every dollar paid into private U.S. plans, 52 cents goes for expenses and only 48 cents is available to reimburse claimants.

In the average Canadian province—except Quebec where claims and insurance rates are astronomically high—60 cents of every dollar collected by private insurance companies is paid in claims and the remaining 40 cents is eaten up by expenses.

The Consumers' Union Report says: "One of the reasons for this essentially wasteful and uneconomic system is the litigation surrounding the private plans. Companies collect for adjusting claims and often there are high legal costs for defending themselves and their policyholders against claims."

In Saskatchewan every car is insured when the licence plate is issued. In an accident, both motorists are entitled to collect full damages less \$200. It does not matter whose fault it was.

Just a couple of months ago Saskatchewan had 6 car accident cases before the courts, Ontario had 1,800. No figures are available for British Columbia. But it is not surprising that the cost of private insurance causes many motorists to look fondly upon the Saskatchewan programme.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad we have a convert over on that side of the House too. It will not take too long, I trust, until we will have all the Conservatives converted.

In fact, I recall being down at City Hall some time during the past year when one of the aldermen, who was an alderman at that time and still is and who is well known as a Conservative, made a very eloquent appeal on behalf of a public automobile accident insurance plan and, I believe, persuaded the board of control to propose that representations to that effect be made to the Ontario government. I do not know if the representations ever were made, but if they were I have no doubt they encountered the same stubborn resistance as is always encountered when anyone proposes progress to the government opposite.

But I would like to suggest to the House, Mr. Chairman, that the whole concept that one can assess degrees of fault in court in relation to an accident that may have happened in a split second a year, two years or even five years ago, is a completely phony concept. Chief Justice McRuer said so.

It is impossible to determine fault, so what is the use of pretending in our law that damages are awarded according to degrees of fault? I do not think it is even a just principle. If a person needs help I submit he should get help, and his family should get help. If he has broken the criminal law he should be dealt with in accordance with the criminal law, but if he needs help he should get help whether or not he was at fault. But the principle becomes completely specious when one realizes that it is impossible to assess fault in any case, and the idea of compensation regardless of fault is an idea that is gaining support everywhere.

In fact, I was quite surprised to pick up the August, 1962, issue of a magazine entitled *Ontario Agent*, which is the official journal of the Ontario Agents Association, and read there an article entitled "Compensation Regardless of Fault" in which the author, the past president of the association, came out quite positively in favour of the principle of compensation regardless of fault. I would like to quote a couple of sentences from his article, as follows:

The problem on the doorstep of our existing modern economy caused by the mammoth growth of modern transport is one that prompts steps being taken. Somehow the damage, injury and death must be compensated for. The fact that other sections of the social and economic order are alleged not to have acted prudently, not to have taken advantage of the doctrine of last chance to avoid the occurrence, to have been guilty of negligence are all really side issues.

That I think is the crux of the matter. With that I will leave this particular point, but this whole question of trying to divide up fault according to some mathematical formula which is indeterminable in any case is really a side issue. The real issue is that someone has been hurt, or has suffered damage, or families have been left without a breadwinner, and need help.

That is the principle to which we should address ourselves. If we address ourselves to that principle in an intelligent way, as was done many years ago in the province of Saskatchewan, a great many of the difficulties

of which the hon. member for Sudbury has been complaining would disappear.

Now, then, to look at this question from a slightly different point of view, although it is all related to what I have said, I noted that the hon. Minister in his introductory remarks said that the insurance industry in this province is flourishing. I would have no doubt that that is true, certainly as regards the automobile insurance section of the industry.

On December 9, 1962, the *Toronto Globe and Mail* carried a story which has the following headline, "Automobile Insurance Cost Raised", and in the first paragraph of the story it is stated: "Increases will average 8 per cent". That was December 9, 1961.

Now, I have here a clipping from the *Toronto Globe and Mail* for December 5, 1962, and unless one noted the dates very carefully one would think it was almost the same story that I just read to you. The headline is "Auto Insurance Rates Up 8 Per Cent in Ontario". December 9, 1962, up 8 per cent; December 5, 1962, up 8 per cent.

Apparently these fellows are developing a pattern of up 8 per cent every year, and of course we are the people who pay.

Last year I protested this matter to the hon. Minister who was then in charge of The Department of Insurance and asked him if his department was doing anything about it, if they were going to inquire into the situation to see if these rate increases were justified.

The then Minister took a completely "laissez faire" attitude. His attitude was that his department had no control over the situation, they had taken a look at it and had no comments to make and that was that. I do not know if the current Minister will take the same attitude, but in case he may not I would like to ask him: Has his department inquired into the reason for these rate increases and is it of the opinion that they are justified or necessary? I believe a study of the figures will indicate that they are not.

Last year when I was dealing with this matter I put on the record certain figures as to the loss ratios of auto insurance companies in this province. I pointed out the fact that in 1956, 66.5 cents out of every dollar in premiums was paid out to compensate for losses. In 1957 that amount went up to 68.7 cents. But then in 1958 it dropped to 60.7 cents. In 1959, to 57.2 cents. And then in 1960 it went up fractionally to 58 cents.

So on the last figures I have available the insurance companies were only paying out 58 cents in claims for every dollar they were

taking in in premiums. They were keeping 42 cents for administration and profits and swank head offices and oriental rugs in the president's office and that sort of thing, as compared with Saskatchewan which was paying 18 cents out of every dollar for that purpose.

There was absolutely no indication in the figures that the insurance companies were starving to death, and yet they jacked up the rates last year 8 per cent. Now they jack them up another 8 per cent.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he can bring me up to date on the figures I have. I must confess that I could have phoned his department and I am sure they would have given me the latest figures available. They are usually very co-operative in matters of this kind. But I did not get a chance to do so, so I do not have the 1961 figures. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, if they are available and if he can tell me what the loss ratio with regard to auto insurance premiums was in 1961. My impression is that the ratio is going down steadily.

It did reach what to the insurance companies must have been an alarmingly high figure in 1957, although it was actually only 68.7 per cent, but they have been making sure that it goes down steadily since then. I believe that what they have in mind is that they are going to get it down to 50 cents and they are going to squeeze us year after year with rate increases until they get it down to 50 cents.

That is their idea of Utopia, 50 cents for the victim of automobile accidents and 50 cents for them. I submit that is not good enough for the victims of automobile accidents and we should have something more closely resembling the Saskatchewan picture, where it is 82 cents for automobile accident victims and 18 cents for administration.

At any rate, I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister, either now or at what he considers to be an appropriate opportunity, would advise the House if his department has looked into these most recent increases, and also if he happens to have available the most up-to-date figures on loss ratios.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I think it might be a good time right now to set the record straight about these rates. I just happen to have a sheet of paper here with comparable rates for Toronto on it, when my hon. friend is talking about the high rate here in Toronto.

Now these figures are supplied by the All Canada Insurance Federation as of October

1962 and it is interesting, Mr. Chairman, to see some of these automobile rates. They are based on 10, 20 and 5—they are not on the \$35,000 all-inclusive rate that we have in Ontario. Boston—there the average driver pays \$193.75. Here's Buffalo—about the same size as Toronto—\$96 annual premium. Chicago—\$110 annually. Cleveland—\$88. Detroit—\$60. Los Angeles—\$95. Minneapolis—\$69. Montreal—\$66. New York—where of course they have compulsory insurance as they have in Boston, \$178. Philadelphia—another large place comparable to our own city, \$115. St. Louis is \$129.45. San Francisco—\$116. Toronto—\$36. Vancouver—\$44.

Now they do not have any of the towns in Saskatchewan listed, Mr. Chairman. I think it should be noted too that the vehicle registrations in the province of Saskatchewan are very small as compared to those in Ontario and that they are not bothered with the same accident ratio that we have in the larger metropolitan areas. But those are some of the rates which would indicate that in the city of Toronto the insurance people are endeavouring to keep the rates at a nominal charge—

Mr. Bryden: To the hon. gentleman's comments, if he is trying to persuade me that insurance companies in the United States have achieved a greater degree of skill in the fine art of gouging than the insurance companies in Canada, he does not need to bother. I am quite prepared to agree with him, and the figures I quoted from Consumers' Report indicate that.

I am suggesting, however, that the insurance companies in Canada are working hard to achieve the same happy situation, for them, as the insurance companies have achieved in the United States.

There is one other comment I would like to make, Mr. Chairman. I would not purport to compare rates in Ontario and Saskatchewan because, as the hon. member for High Park has pointed out, the traffic conditions are totally different and comparisons are not fair. What I was comparing were not insurance rates, they were loss ratios; and surely the rates have nothing to do with that. The point is that the Saskatchewan plan paid out 82 cents for every dollar it collected, whereas Ontario insurance companies pay out less than 60 cents out of every dollar they collect. I think that is a valid comparison between the two jurisdictions.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the government being in any business to begin with. I am for free enterprise—private

enterprise—and I feel that private business can do a better job than government can in most cases. Insurance is the case typical of that.

Now my hon. friends are going to talk about what I said before: the health plan. That is perfectly all right. You can talk about it, if you like. I still maintain—and even though I voted for it in the House—I still maintain that the private insurers will do a better job than the government in the long run. I am saying that now. The very fact that in a great metropolitan area like Toronto, Mr. Chairman, we are able to keep the rate at \$36 as compared with the many rural sections of the province of Saskatchewan, is an indication that they do. I feel, too, that with our new set-up, which took effect on October 1 of this year—and we now have the motor vehicle accident claims fund replacing the unsatisfied judgment fund—that we are not going to have the load of unsettled automobile claims, that we will have them right up to date as has been indicated to the select committee now studying this problem.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, to make one last comment. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got this figure of \$36 for insurance in the city of Toronto—I would like to take a look at it. I do not know where you would get insurance here for \$36. I would like to point out to him that, according to the Canadian underwriters' association, last year auto insurance rates in Toronto were increased by 15 per cent and this year they were increased in Toronto by 4 per cent, making a total increase of 19 per cent in the last two years. The average increase for the province was 8 per cent last year and 8 per cent this year, making a total increase of 16 per cent throughout the province in the two years.

Mr. Cowling: I would say, Mr. Chairman, to my hon. friend that those increases were in certain categories, not in all categories.

Mr. Bryden: This was presented as the average increase.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Could I ask the hon. member a question? Is that the rate that was charged this year—the 8 per cent for 1962 reports. Is that the actual amount of the increase for the year 1962?

Mr. Bryden: It was announced as the average increase for all categories throughout the province both last year and this year—that 8 per cent figure. The average figures for

Toronto were, as I said, 15 per cent and 4 per cent.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would my hon. friend know whether or not that was the actual rates that were charged by the companies in 1962?

Mr. Bryden: I have no doubt that the companies did not announce an increase in rates unless they intended to charge it on the average. I will accept their figures as to what they were doing. I am sure that there were some companies, especially non-board companies, that did not make these increases or did not make them to that extent, but these were the increases officially announced by representatives of the underwriters.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, if I might just pursue this a moment. My hon. friend simply just does not know what he is talking about. The simple fact of the matter is that a great number of people in Ontario received their insurance this year at a cheaper price than last year. Now the only reason I put that in there is that I am sure my hon. friend would want to be accurate in the representations that he makes in this House—

Mr. Bryden: The underwriters' association is accurate.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I suggest to you, sir, that it would be improper to build a straw man and then proceed to knock him down, particularly if the information to start with was not correct. The simple fact of the matter is that there are a great number—I would not like to quote the percentage—but I would suggest, sir, that possibly it would be in the vicinity of 40 per cent of the people of Ontario, bought their insurance cheaper this year than they did last year. So I just put that on for the sake of the record, sir.

Mr. Bryden: You mean this is the gospel according to you? Not according to the official figure.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, that is the reason I asked my hon. friend if he knew what the actual rates were. He is quoting from a report, I believe it was sometime in December or November of 1961.

Mr. Bryden: And another one was in 1962.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The simple fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is that after that was made, there was a change in policy and it just was not carried out that way.

I merely put it on record, sir, for the same reason my hon. friend says he does not know where in Toronto you can buy insurance for \$36. I have not got the rate book in front of me, but I am very certain that if he would take the trouble to find out what \$35,000 would cost a preferred driver in Toronto, he would find that it is somewhere in the vicinity of \$36. It might even be a little bit less. So I am sure that when we are debating this matter, we do want to keep all the facts right. We want to be accurate in what we say, and I suggest that, perhaps, if he would check the rates that were charged they would be a better indication than some editorial write-up in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I found the paper to be a little bit biased and maybe this report might have subsequently turned out to be a little bit inaccurate, however well intended it was at the time the report was made.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the underwriters' association, not the paper.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I do not wish to blame the paper. I just want to get on the record the truth of the matter. I want to get the facts on record, Mr. Chairman. My hon. friend is quoting from a newspaper report and I just wondered if he knew anything about the rates as they actually were charged or whether he was carrying on with one newspaper report that simply was not factual. My hon. friend seems to be getting quite concerned about the facts and I hope that he will not get too excited.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might make a few remarks with respect to The Insurance Act. I brought a matter to the attention of the hon. Attorney-General some time ago, Mr. Chairman. It seems that our Act might be somewhat antiquated in certain sections. I am referring now in particular to a matter which was brought to my attention concerning The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act. At the present time the province of Ontario, through The Department of Economics and Development, is spending a great deal of money sending trade missions to other countries, sending representatives there, to encourage people to purchase in Ontario products made in Ontario. I have no quarrel with this at all. I think it is a good idea.

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute. What does this have to do with vote 901?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, I understood The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act came under The Department of Insurance, Mr. Chairman. But if you feel it does not, I will be pleased to bring it up when you say I can.

Hon. Mr. Cass: That is quite correct.

Mr. Chairman: Proceed.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Thank you, sir. At the same time, the Act, which deals with real estate brokers, prohibits the appointment of any representative outside the province, by a real estate broker. A firm which has been instrumental in inducing a great amount of capital into Ontario in one form or another brought this to my attention. I know of no business enterprise in the province which is prohibited from appointing representatives outside of the province, other than by The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

The purpose of this when it was drawn up, I understand, was to control the people who operate in the province of Ontario and to protect the public. I have no quarrel with this. I simply point out to the hon. Minister that here is a case where, on one hand, one department of government appears to be somewhat, perhaps not intentionally but inadvertently, at cross purposes with The Department of Insurance. This prohibits private enterprise from doing the same thing that the province appears to be doing, through The Department of Economics and Development.

I bring this to the attention of the hon. Minister because I believe that the Act could be amended so as to provide some sort of a provision for the real estate broker in turn to appoint representatives out of the province. At the present time it is illegal and improper for a registered real estate broker to pay a commission to anybody outside of the province unless he is registered.

This is a little bit at cross purposes with what other jurisdictions are entitled to do. For instance, last year I asked the hon. Minister in charge of this department if it would be legal for an insurance representative, for example, to transact business in the province of Ontario on behalf of his principal, even though the principal did not live in Ontario, but the property was insured in Ontario.

I was told, sir, this was perfectly legal; so it would appear that people can appoint representatives in Ontario or transact business here without being licensed, yet on the

other hand registered real estate brokers are not permitted to engage or to put anybody on their payroll as a representative if they live outside the province. I bring that to the attention of the hon. Minister.

I did write a letter to the hon. Attorney-General. I understand he took it up with the superintendent of The Department of Insurance, but I point out that this is not a matter which the superintendent of insurance can deal with under the statute unless the statute itself is changed. I suggest to the hon. Minister that perhaps some thought should be given to amending that statute so that we leave no stone unturned in the matter of encouraging capital investment to be made in the province. I think here is a case where private enterprise can do something about it and yet they are prohibited from so doing by our own statutes. They must either operate outside of the statute illegally or they are not permitted to do it. I bring that to the hon. Minister's attention.

I should like to ask the hon. Minister a question with respect to insurance companies who collect premiums in the province of Ontario. Are there any regulations or statutes which indicate when a premium can be collected? In other words, can they collect a premium, say, one year in advance? Is it legal or are they in any way restricted in the collection of those premiums?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that either my advisor or myself are certain as to the import of that question. I am advised the policy can be written for up to 3 years and the 3 years premium collected in advance. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if that is what the hon. member is getting at.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Yes. I was just wondering—I will tell you what I am really getting at. I understand that the Ontario hospital services commission is in some way affected by The Department of Insurance. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Not according to my understanding or that of my advisor, the superintendent.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, I understand that in their case that the premiums are collected as much as 3 or 4 months in advance of when they are really due. I wanted to find out whether or not there are any regulations which apply to all insurance companies.

It seems to me that this is improper. It seems to me that this is a matter which

might concern The Department of Insurance because I have talked to many people who lost their rights under the Ontario hospital services commission because they did not pay their premiums as much as 3 months before the due date. It seems to me that this is a matter of insurance, the same as any other type. I wonder if The Department of Insurance is concerned with this fact.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we are all aware of the problem the hon. member for Wentworth has mentioned. I think every one of us here on the floor of the House has had a similar experience. Of course, the question is whether the due date as understood by us and the due date as understood by the person being insured and the due date as understood by the commission are the same. If the due date happens to be 4 months in advance of when that particular insurance starts to run, then I would think that there would be nothing whatsoever wrong. I am advised that the terms of reference and powers of The Department of Insurance at the present time do not extend to this particular matter.

However, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if at this time—I know that the hon. member for York Centre wishes to say something, Mr. Chairman, and I will not go any further, but I would merely like to say, with reference to what both hon. members from the Opposition have spoken on, I at no time said and I do not say now that I am satisfied with the legislation under which many things administered by The Department of Insurance operate. I do not say now and I have not said that I am satisfied it was a flourishing industry. I am glad if it is because our economy must have flourishing industry if it is going to operate.

I will say that I am very grateful to the hon. members who have spoken so far today—perhaps there will be more—and to those, including the hon. member for Sudbury, who have written me with suggestions because I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that both the officials in The Department of Insurance and myself are very anxious to see that our people in Ontario have the best possible deal, consistent with good business practices, which will ensure that the premiums which they pay will be sufficient to make up the losses which are incurred.

Mr. Chairman, I may wish to speak, with your indulgence, a little later after the other hon. members have spoken. I do wish to say that I am very pleased to have these suggestions. They will be given consideration by the people in the department and by myself.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be either as dogmatic as the hon. member for High Park or as hidebound as the hon. member for Woodbine in either defending private enterprise or urging socialism just for the sake of socialism.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Well, here they go, the mumble five. Mumble on if you want to. Mumble out loud. I will sit down until you are through. If you would like to keep quiet, we can talk for a while.

Mr. Bryden: You do more than anyone else in the House.

Mr. Singer: Mumble, mumble, grumble, grumble. If you would keep quiet for a bit you could soon get a little education.

An hon. member: He does not want the facts.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to know that in that Utopia called Saskatchewan, where the government runs insurance, that the benefits they provide only extend to the sum of \$5,000. Over and above that if you want to be covered by insurance you have to go out and buy your own.

An hon. member: Is that right?

Mr. Singer: I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I should necessarily anticipate what the report of the select committee is going to say. We have had certain meetings where in principle it has been decided what we are going to say but I do not think it would be out of the way, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that when this report is made public there will be made available within the province of Ontario, in the report of the committee and I hope the government will see fit to adopt it, a system that will have at least all of the benefits of the province of Saskatchewan, and more, and will be able to keep the benefits of private enterprise.

Mr. MacDonald: That's a good Liberal position.

Mr. Singer: Yes, it is a good Liberal position, and a good position for the people of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: That is where you were in health insurance.

Mr. Singer: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that no member of this party at least wants to suggest that we immediately put

out of business those many thousands, perhaps 5,000 or 6,000 people, who carry on business as insurance agents and all the people who are dependent on the insurance business just because our hon. friend believes in socialism for socialism's sake.

An hon. member: It would put everybody out of business.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, there is one point that I do think should be made again. I made it last year to the hon. Attorney-General's predecessor, and that was in connection with the control of insurance rates. Now, the hon. Attorney-General, I am sure, is as aware, as we all are, that there is a section in The Insurance Act, section 339, which has stood on the statute books for almost 30 years—perhaps my figures are not correct, it may be longer, but it has been a long, long time. This section has not been proclaimed nor does it come into effect until it is proclaimed. It was the unanimous recommendation of the select committee on automobile insurance, a committee made up of members of all parties in this House, that some action be taken to overcome this difficulty and the recommendation, Mr. Chairman, if I may read it into the record once again was this:

The committee feels that the Legislature owes a duty to the public to provide a form of machinery which will guarantee that insurance rates are maintained at a reasonable level. This the committee recommends that the superintendent of insurance be given full power to investigate and order adjustments where he believes rates to be excessive, inadequate, unfairly discriminatory or otherwise unreasonable, subject to an appeal against his order to the court of appeal.

It should be noted that the All-Canada Insurance Federation has already recommended to the Attorney-General of Ontario and the superintendent of insurance that the latter be given great control powers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that was the unanimous recommendation of the select committee just a year ago. Almost all of the other recommendations in this report were adopted and made part of government policy. This one, strangely, was not, and I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we can find out perhaps today from the hon. Attorney-General why this has not been done.

This is logical and reasonable. I do not know—as does my hon. friend from Woodbine, Mr. Chairman, I am not as fully informed as he is on all known subjects—I do not know

that insurance premiums are wrong or exorbitant, but I believe it is a function of government to satisfy itself that they are reasonable, that they are fair and they are not discriminatory. We satisfied ourselves on this committee a year ago that there are not sufficient personnel in The Department of Insurance to check these matters properly, nor is there presently authority to do it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I again make this plea, that I made a year ago, to the new hon. Minister that this section be proclaimed, that the unanimous recommendation of the committee be adopted and made part of government policy, and then the people of Ontario will have the authority of its government that the insurance rates are reasonable and fair and not discriminatory.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed to the item-by-item consideration vote, there are one or two things I would like to say with respect to observations of the hon. members. I am sure that if we had the facts and figures, and unfortunately while I endeavoured to get them they have not come to hand, I think that we would find in talking about automobile insurance we have been doing a great deal of talking without having, as the hon. member for Wentworth said, Mr. Chairman, the exact figures in front of us. Had we had them, we would have found that the proportion of cases which fell into the category bemoaned by hon. members on the other side is very small.

The proportion of settlements, Mr. Chairman, I am advised is very high and I have every confidence, if I may say so—and particularly after hearing the hon. member for York Centre speak—I have every confidence in the select committee which is in due course to report further with respect to automobile insurance. I am quite sure that the government will deal with their report in a manner which we can expect.

I can only say with respect to the point made by the hon. member for York Centre about the unproclaimed section: I am aware of it, I have discussed it on occasion with the superintendent of insurance in my brief tenure of office and I am advised briefly this: that while the power is not there, the threat of that power is very salutary in its effect.

I may also advise the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, that the superintendent of insurance and his officials have checked over rather carefully, they advise me, the proposed rates for this coming year and they are satisfied that they are justified by the figures produced by the insurers. I would be most

pleased, because they are not available to me now, Mr. Chairman, to see that the hon. member for Woodbine is supplied, either from the floor of the House or direct to him as he may wish, with the figures as to loss ratio and the other matters that he mentioned.

I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman: I am not entirely in disagreement with a great many of the matters which have been mentioned on the floor of the House today. I want to assure the hon. members that most of these things are under review and have been, I know, before my time and since I became the Minister in charge of the department. Whether or not it will be possible at this session to produce all the legislation which may be indicated I do not know, but I say this to the hon. members that The Insurance Act—and particularly to the hon. member for Sudbury—The Insurance Act is not just what the insurance companies and people desire. I say this because I know from personal knowledge that I have had the opportunity of effecting changes, or having changes effected in legislation, which were requested and suggested by the association of insurance companies, agents and what-not. So I say to you, sir, that everything that comes in from the insurance companies, Mr. Chairman, is given very careful scrutiny and this government, acting through my department, produces for the consideration of the hon. members of this House only those things which we feel, and we know that the House will feel, are for the benefit of the ordinary citizens and inhabitants of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that I have missed in the way of answers to specific questions or any further information that is required or desired, I would say through you, sir, to the hon. members if they would let me know I will be most pleased to see that it is furnished. I assure the hon. members that I do answer my mail, but I do not answer it until I have had the opportunity of taking advice from those experienced officials in my department who know the situation and who can properly advise me.

I would say also to the hon. member for Sudbury, and I hope again that he will read it in *Hansard*, that he need not bemoan the fate of the little man before the legal bills committee because, Mr. Chairman, each one of us here is a speaker for the little man and there are something like 20 of us on the legal bills committee. It is up to each one of us representing the big fellow and the little fellow throughout Ontario to ensure, as I am sure we do, that the little man and the big man and the little woman

and the big woman are well and properly taken care of.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, since we have a new hon. Minister I wonder if I might readdress to him a question that I raised with his predecessor last year and see whether I can get any different reaction.

You will recall that I gave some details with regard to the practice of certain trust companies having preferred lists, and that when they loaned money for the purchase of a home, for example, that insurance on that home must be bought from an insurance company that is on the preferred list of the trust company and that the insurance company gets on the preferred list only by investing in the trust company's certificates.

Now, if I paraphrase accurately the reply of the then Attorney-General, it was to the effect that he knew this practice existed—he thought it was existing less and less—that there was some inclination for the situation to improve. There was implied in his comment that he did not approve of it but he certainly indicated that he was not willing to do anything positive about it.

My question to the hon. Attorney-General now in the position is, is he aware of this position; has it improved from last year, and is he willing to do anything about it?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, knowing the single-mindedness of many of my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister has read last year's *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I not only read last year's *Hansard*. I made certain inquiries. And I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, despite the innuendoes with respect to the actions and views of my predecessor in this office in regard to this matter, that he did take and saw taken certain steps which I am sure the hon. member for York South will be glad to know. Further, the one company which was quoted last year in *Hansard* by the hon. member does not now carry on the practice complained of—and which was properly complained about.

I am advised there are now but two companies that still, at some time, practise that reprehensible system of making loans with respect to their fire insurance, and I am advised that my department's Deputy Minister, the superintendent of insurance, is in touch with both of them; that before this House meets in session in another year—not

the first of the year but after this session—that by that time, at the very latest, this will be ironed out.

We have undertakings from them and they have to be implemented. It may not be within the next few weeks but it is coming. Then next year, Mr. Chairman, when this question is asked of myself, or whoever should be sitting here, I am sure we will be able to give the answer I think we would all like to hear: that there are no companies with this practice.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, we are all glad to know that with the direction of the then Attorney-General, the superintendent of insurance has been able to effect this change in the thinking of these companies, because in this private enterprise world of ours we feel that there must be some reasonable latitude for private enterprise.

In this case they have co-operated to the fullest; they understood the position as the then Minister and his deputy explained it to them. I am advised that the co-operation has been excellent and it did not take very long for the company that was named to get a change in their practice.

So, Mr. Chairman, good is very often done by having these matters discussed here on the floor of the House.

Mr. MacDonald: I guess publicity played its role.

Hon. Mr. Cass: It did, indeed; I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased the hon. Minister checked last year's *Hansard*. I wonder whether or not any changes are contemplated in The Department of Insurance with respect to the licensing of new agents. He may recall that last year we were advised by the then Minister that the department did not make any specific checks on their own. Is any change contemplated with respect to the licensing of new agents?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. member to state whether he is referring to life insurance agents, because that is what he was talking about last year, I think?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: No, I was not, I was talking about general agents.

Hon. Mr. Cass: General agents. Well, Mr. Chairman, the answer which was given to that question last year by the then Minister is substantially the answer which I would make.

I have given the matter careful consideration and I have discussed it with the superintendent and other officials. Although there is always a time when experience indicates it is too late for effective action, I am inclined to believe that this is not so in this case.

Experience has indicated that the agents who are produced by a company, or the people produced as their agents, who ask to be licensed, are people who have been found by the company to be proper risks. While the department does make a certain check it is not the same type of check that we would make if we did not have that reliance on those companies—who are responsible in the end to people who are buying insurance.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that the insurance company, in my experience at least, is behind the agent, and if a policy is written the insurance company is the one that must stand behind it. Then the agent, having collected his commission, usually fades out of the picture.

We have had no indication during the last year—I particularly inquired about this—we have had no indication that the calibre of agent being proposed by the companies, or applying for licensing, is generally speaking not good.

I would agree that there might be some further investigation, Mr. Chairman, of these applications, but we live in a province where we are inspected and regulated to almost the *nth* degree, and unless there is some good and useful purpose to be served by further inspections and regulations—and in this case I cannot see it—then I think we would not be serving any useful end. We would only be interfering with the personal liberties of a large section of our people, some 6,000 or 7,000, by going further into their applications for licences.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that on a renewal of application for these licences, I am advised—and I see no reason why it should not be so—that if there has been no complaint and that if there is nothing on the file to indicate the man or woman should be checked, that the renewal of the licence is automatic.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the hon. Minister that it is about time he changed his policy.

In a city such as the city of Hamilton this department charges a fee of \$25 to every prospective new agent, ostensibly to cover the cost of regulating the business and protecting the public. I suggest that if the hon. Minister does not intend to do anything about screening these people, it is about time

he took another look at the fee and made it a little bit more realistic in terms of what the department does.

As nearly as I can understand, as long as it is possible for an agent to get a company to recommend him then he has no trouble getting a licence through this department. I suggest to you, sir, that the present method is nothing more or less than a farce. It is not practical, and I suggest that it is time it was reviewed.

Contrast this, if you will, Mr. Chairman, with the position where an agent applies through the very same department for a licence to sell real estate. He is thoroughly investigated; he is bonded; several investigations are carried out by the department itself, and the fee is the same \$25.

It has reached the point now, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, where these licence fees have no relation whatsoever with the work that is done in the department. It is just a matter of what this government can gouge out of the public, regardless of whether or not they are doing anything for it. I think the very fact that the hon. Minister has indicated he has no intention of screening these applicants is all the more reason why this licence fee should be reviewed and made a bit more practical.

I could tell you, Mr. Chairman, of one instance. I am told that a certain individual was turned down by several insurance companies and finally found one who would sponsor him. He immediately was given a licence by this department, notwithstanding the fact that the department had knowledge from those companies of the fact that this agent would not be sponsored and the reason why he would not be sponsored.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the new hon. Minister for the department should see it did the job for which it was created or quit gouging \$25 from every agent who wants to go into business. I suggest that if it is not serving the purpose for which it was intended then it should be either abolished or made a little bit more realistic.

Again I state the case of the real estate salesman as contrasted with the broker. The real estate salesman in the province of Ontario must pay a fee of \$10 because he is sponsored by a broker; he is bonded and the government has some protection. Yet, on the other hand, simply because it can get it and it has always secured it, the government apparently takes \$25 from every new agent. And it now appears that it takes it

for nothing, Mr. Chairman, because all it does is take the recommendation of the company, as stated by the hon. Minister this afternoon, and send out a licence.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the hon. Attorney-General why the estimates in this department have gone up just about 10 per cent in each one of the figures. There does not seem to be any justification for it on the basis of the expenditures of a year ago as compared with the estimates. It looks as though somebody just took a pencil, added 10 per cent on to the first two items, and said: "Let us come to a total"—and there we are.

The department spent \$434,000 for the year ended March 31, 1962; that is the estimate. They are now asking for \$473,000—about a 10 per cent increase. They were voted \$449,000 and they underspent that amount by \$15,000 or approximately that. Why is it going up 10 per cent? Why is the department unable to effect the continued reduction it did a year ago? I think we should have some answers on that.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, that is a very interesting question. Before I attempt to reply to that I would like to say one further word, through you, sir, to the hon. member for Wentworth.

I am advised and, I think, quite correctly that every application for appointment or licensing as an insurance agent must also bear qualifications for having passed a qualifying examination. That, with the company's sponsorship, we consider as pretty good evidence that the person is capable and able to handle the business; reliable and well instructed.

With respect to the question as to the increase in the estimates this year, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if I were able to accept the advice tendered me by the hon. member opposite I would be in with a 40 per cent increase because the big item in any department these days is the item of salaries. Salaries, of course, depend on the personnel. The number of personnel that we have limits or circumscribes the amount of examining, inspecting, licensing and all the rest of it which is done.

If one would look at the public accounts which were given to the hon. members yesterday with respect to this department one would see that in each case the estimates for the preceding year were really very close, indicating very good estimating. For that I have nothing to say, because it was not my responsibility. Perhaps they were a little underestimated. This year, in making out the

estimates, Mr. Chairman, we endeavoured to come as close as we could to reality, as close as we could to providing the increases in salaries which are necessary. We provided in round figures—it could easily be 10 per cent or more—for travelling expenses to enable our examiners and inspectors to increase the tempo of the inspections which they make in all sorts of agents' affairs. This is the check we make on behalf of the government, the people of Ontario.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) has pointed out to me that the increase—and if I had looked at my own little sheet here I would notice it—was \$7,000. On four hundred and some-odd thousand dollars that is not 10 per cent!

However, the main increase is in travelling expenses as you will note, and the only way that this department can function effectively is to have its people travelling through the province, making the necessary inspections. I very much doubt if we have been realistic in this particular increase, but I hope it will do. In salaries, if I am correct, there is an increase of only \$2,000 and that for a staff of 70, because that is the staff in the department—

Mr. Singer: It has gone from \$315,000 to \$349,000.

Hon. Mr. Cass: That is two years!

Mr. Singer: Well, the last figures we have—

Hon. Mr. Cass: That is last year's, though. The estimates for 1962-63, Mr. Chairman, were \$347,000 for salaries, \$40,000 for travelling expenses, \$78,650 for maintenance, \$350 for the grants to the Association of Superintendents of Insurance, making a total of \$466,000. Now that was our estimates for the year that we are in now.

Mr. Singer: For the year ending March 31, 1962! The hon. Minister is quoting from 1962-63 estimates.

Hon. Mr. Cass: That is right, that is the increase over—Mr. Chairman, what I am speaking about is the increase over the moneys provided by this House, sir, for the current year, the increase over that as shown in the estimates which I am now producing for the fiscal year beginning next April 1, 1963 and running to March 31, 1964. I think what the hon. member is speaking of is either the actual expenditures, or the estimates for the year 1961-62.

Now I may be wrong. In that event, I would call to his attention the fact there was

an increase in staff, as well as quite an increase in travelling expenses, back in the first year and some increase last year.

But in any event, to come back to where I was, Mr. Chairman, now that we have that straightened out, there is a \$2,000 increase in salaries which, for a staff of 70 and in the current atmosphere in the economy of this country, is very small. There is an increase of \$4,000 in travelling expenses and I have no other explanation for that, sir, except it is necessary and it may not be enough. In maintenance we have added a \$1,000 increase there, making a total now of \$473,000, or \$7,000 more.

Mr. Singer: Could the hon. Minister tell us what we are maintaining for \$70,000-odd? Or \$80,000?

Hon. Mr. Cass: With pleasure. I asked that same question, Mr. Chairman, because I wondered what we were maintaining.

The breakdown, if I might give it to the hon. member—and again I would refer him to the public accounts for the department which were distributed the other day—and under it the second last item, there is maintenance, \$77,929, which is a figure very close to the figure we are discussing now. He will notice that in that—and if I may pick them not in order—is Queen's Printer, \$35,000, and that covers forms and the annual reports which the statute requires we put out, and the estimates as now presented include an item of \$35,700 for this in the ensuing year.

We have the National Cash Register Company, a year ago for \$5,000—that is equipment—and in this year's estimates we have \$3,500 there. Then we have maintenance and rental, \$1,000. We have communications, which of course are necessary things, such as telephone and, I presume, postage, and what-not, \$2,200. And then we have other, \$37,250. That makes a total of \$79,650.

I was intrigued by this item "other" in my estimates, Mr. Chairman, and I inquired what it was. It was pointed out to me that this includes the examination fees, which you will see in the public accounts before you, of \$11,000; it includes all the sundry accounts for small items of office equipment and maintenance and so on, which is \$16,000. If you add those two together you will come very close to the total figure of \$37,000.

So that the maintenance is made up, Mr. Chairman, in this year's estimates, of \$3,500 for equipment, \$35,700 for printing and stationery of which the greater portion goes

out through the Queen's Printer, as the public accounts show, maintenance and rental \$1,000, communications \$2,200, and other, which are the items I have just mentioned, \$37,250, a total of \$79,650.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, as I understand, sir, one of the objectives of The Department of Insurance is to maintain a close contact with the business of insurance across the province, to be aware of all the facets of insurance across the province and to see that an integrity has been maintained by this business. I think I am correct in this, am I, sir?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I would say that was very well stated.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you. Therefore, sir, I was interested in that because to achieve this objective you would have knowledge—I appreciate that this may be a question that will require more detail—but certainly in your department you would have knowledge of the insurance business that is transacted across the province. I would think that in maintaining integrity there is one question that would be before our minds, particularly we who are in the Legislature, and that is that in respect to government business we would be constantly alert to see that there was no sense any insurance company taking advantage of having government business when it might be suggested it was being given to them because of any type of favouritism.

I had wondered, therefore, sir, with Hydro, for example, how was insurance business given out with respect to the Hydro commission?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, that is a perennial question that I have heard in this House, and I have been here long enough, and also been in my present portfolio long enough, to know that that is certainly not one of the responsibilities of this department. I know that if I went through the books of the department and all the inspections that were made I would find nothing about who placed insurance where, whether it was government insurance, whether it was Hydro insurance, or whether it was insurance for the hon. member for Dovercourt. So not only do I have no information with respect to that, Mr. Chairman, I have no means of acquiring it through The Department of Insurance.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, would there not, in view of our opening remarks and our agreement on the objective of The Depart-

ment of Insurance, would there not be a responsibility on the part of The Department of Insurance to see that integrity was maintained in connection with government business? I would feel that you might have an interest in ensuring that with government business there was not in any way a sense that there could be certain companies who might be getting preference in connection with the commission, that you would be assuring that it was open to competitive tender across the province?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has just repeated what he has said 3 times. As far as I am concerned, I am sure, speaking as a member of the House and the Minister in charge of The Department of Insurance, that integrity is observed and very highly observed by this government in the placing of insurance, and by any organization connected with this government. I assure you that if there were any doubts in my mind, not as the Minister in charge of The Department of Insurance, but as a member of this House, I would be most unhappy and unsatisfied. But certainly it does not fall within the purview of my official position as the Minister of The Department of Insurance.

From my personal knowledge I can only add, Mr. Chairman, that what I have said from my knowledge as the Minister in charge of this department is true: that is, that I have no doubts whatsoever about the propriety, the integrity, and any other words the hon. member wishes to use, with respect to the placing of insurance by government or by any agency of the government. I understand, and I am quite sure, it is carried on in accordance with the best business practices whereby the people of Ontario receive for their premium money the best insurance protection.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would still like to pursue this matter and I would like to clarify first that in connection with the hon. Minister personally I certainly impute no suggestion of lack of integrity, I have a very high regard for him.

But I would like to know where the hon. Minister would, or where I could, obtain the facts to have the same confidence with respect to the government business, such as handling insurance. Where would I go? To each individual commission? How would I get these facts?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I am sure, after listening to the hon. member, that the facts and figures which would satisfy me

would never satisfy him; and that with the prejudiced approach which obviously he is taking to this subject—

Mr. Singer: Oh, shame! The hon. Minister is imputing motives.

Hon. Mr. Cass: With the approach the hon. member has taken, he never would be satisfied with those facts and figures with which I am satisfied.

I will tell him through you, Mr. Chairman, how to get them. He can get them either, Mr. Chairman, when the committee on commissions is sitting, or he can apply to the departments of government or to the Crown corporations. I am quite sure that they will furnish him, as they have done on occasion to me, with all the information he needs to make his judgment.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister was referring to the public accounts. I notice that there is one item in public accounts that is before us—payment of some \$5,176 to Eckler & Company Limited. This firm is a firm of actuaries. I was wondering if the hon. Minister could tell us what the occasion was to call in these actuaries, what sort of service they did for the department, whether there are not actuaries in government service that could be used, and if it is a regular practice to call in actuaries every year to do certain work in the department.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, on this again I have no personal knowledge. I asked the same question earlier as the hon. member has asked, and I have just asked again my chief advisor. I am advised that this was not any particular work which was done by the actuaries. It was not any particular investigation. But from time to time, in the course of their duties, examiners and inspectors from the department have run across things with which they themselves are not competent to deal from an actuarial viewpoint. The superintendent then arranges for actuarial assistance from experts.

I am advised that that was the case with respect to this item; and that in future years similar items could arise. It could be this or some other company of actuaries, depending on the circumstances and the availability of the firms with particular knowledge in the area that was being investigated.

I might go one step further, Mr. Chairman, and say that it is my experience also—and I am sure the superintendent has had to do it although he has not told me—that on occa-

sion there are matters which come up, such as some we have discussed here today, upon which only expert actuarial information could be of assistance to us. On occasions like that I am quite sure that I would want, and I am sure the superintendent would want, Mr. Chairman, the very best actuarial advice. Whether this would be the company or not I do not know, but certainly we would have no hesitation in engaging the very best people in the field for advice.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think what the hon. Minister says is most reasonable. This, to my own knowledge, is a very excellent firm of actuaries. I was just wondering if, perhaps, in the year in which they were engaged and paid they did look into insurance rates, insurance premiums?

The other question that occurs to me is this. Is there not actuarial help in The Department of Economics and Development? I thought that there was at least one actuary employed in the department headed by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) and if an actuary is needed and there is one already in government employ, why is it necessary to hire an outside one no matter how expert he might be?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, just to answer the hon. member about one part of his inquiry: One of the matters on which these actuaries were working last year was the matter of life insurance rates, not casualty and automobile rates. That was the first thing.

Secondly, I regret to say, Mr. Chairman, that none of the departments, so far as I know, except our own, has an actuary or actuaries on their staff. I could apply to The Department of Economics and Development, but I would get an economist, probably a very good one, but I would not get an actuary. There are no facilities within the government. I believe that the policy in the past has been that it is not only cheaper to hire experts from outside when we need them, but also possible to get perhaps a more—unprejudiced is not the word I wish—a more impartial view of any situation by getting someone from the outside to look it over and advise us.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, this again is very reasonable, but I wonder if the department does hire actuaries. If the reason is, as the hon. Minister says, to investigate in this instance life insurance premiums, why then do you not proclaim the section which

will let you do something in a positive way in case you find something is wrong?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I have already answered that question some time ago.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister about this matter of purchase of insurance. I understand that the hon. Minister made a very prolonged and very academic reply to my earlier comments, which I unfortunately had to miss. I further understand, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister put in *Hansard* about four times the fact that I was out of my seat. *Hansard* will record that I am now back by virtue of the fact that I got up. I shall look forward with great pleasure to reading the hon. gentleman's comments.

It just so happens, and I do not think there is anything sinister about it all, but I was called out of the House because one of the solicitors of the hon. Minister's department was on the telephone to me. I do not think that is anything more than a coincidence, it is a sheer coincidence.

I wanted to ask, in reference to this rate business, I think I am correct in saying that each company must file their rates with the superintendent, even though the superintendent has not seen fit to regulate them because that section has not been proclaimed. I think I am correct in saying that—that section has not been proclaimed.

This government has a great habit of not proclaiming statutes that we wrangle about for a long while. They have never proclaimed The Proceedings Against the Crown Act, they never proclaimed the statute dealing with hoists and lifts in the construction industry until a person was killed at Sudbury and then it was proclaimed about three days later. Let *Hansard* record that, too!

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the member that we are dealing with insurance at the present time.

Mr. Sopha: I just wanted to make that comment in the interstices.

An hon. member: Which interstices?

Mr. Sopha: In reference to this business of rates; when the government buys insurance from private carriers, as the government does in large quantities, does the government have resort to the rates that are filed with the superintendent in order to determine from information before it where it can buy the

insurance the cheapest? Because it has, if they have to file them, it has before it the rate of every company carrying on business in Ontario, of which there are a multiplicity.

For example, the government buys insurance to cover itself for its liability for non-repaired highways; yes, it buys insurance for that. And the lawyers that defend it, incidentally, for that, is the firm of the hon. Donald Fleming, the Attorney-General for Canada and Minister of Justice, that is the firm which acts for that insurance company. I observed them in Sault Ste. Marie yesterday, where I was, defending a case on behalf of The Department of Highways for non-repair of a highway. The government buys all kinds of insurance, this is just one aspect.

Does the government, when it buys insurance, attempt to get the cheapest rate from the information on file with the superintendent of insurance? It is not an idle question and if it does not—I do not know if the hon. gentleman is even going to reply to this—if it does not, this is a tremendous economic method of determining where to get the insurance cheapest.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. Sopha: Yes, because it has all that information. If I were in the government, as I expect to be in the not too distant future—

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: You see we are worried about these things, Mr. Chairman, we are worried about them because it will only be next year when we will have to worry about them first-hand.

This session, if it can be called anything, is a sort of preparatory session, is it not?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: Where we get the final answers before we make the leap!

Mr. Chairman: Order! If you have anything further to say, keep on the subject of the vote.

Mr. Sopha: Your comments, Mr. Chairman, are very germane and I harken to them with the greatest degree of seriousness.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: What is that you said about a statement?

An hon. member: You are getting bothered again.

Mr. Sopha: As I was saying, I think this would be, if the government has not thought of this, this is a tremendous way of saving money. All they have to do—

Mr. Chairman: This is a repetition.

Mr. Sopha: Pardon?

Mr. Chairman: If you have anything further to add, please continue. This is a repetition of what you have said.

Mr. Sopha: I never said this before, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. member: It sounded like it to me.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, you do not know what I am going to say.

Mr. Chairman: No, but I know what you have said.

Mr. Sopha: Well, let me underline it this way. I would merely say from the economic point of good business, good business, that the government has all the rates as they have under the statutes supplied them, then all they have to do is look through those rates and the government can determine where to buy its insurance the cheapest. If they need to buy it! And let me say this finally: they have no more business buying insurance for that liability under The Highway Improvement Act than a company like International Nickel has in insuring the Frood open pit against earthquake.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): You are opposed to free enterprise?

Mr. Sopha: No more business buying insurance; but they do it. They pay it into private enterprise when The Department of Highways takes in a revenue of something in the neighbourhood of what—\$250 million a year, that they take in from gasoline taxes, and the maximum they would pay out under their liability—

Mr. MacDonald: Two voices of liberalism.

Mr. Thomas: What about the insurance agent?

Mr. Sopha: —under that would be about \$10,000 a year.

Mr. Thomas: You are going to put the insurance agents out of employment.

Mr. Chairman: Order! We are dealing with The Department of Insurance and what The Department of Highways does is a matter for The Department of Highways. We have certainly no right to discuss the policy of The Department of Highways while we are dealing with The Department of Insurance of this government.

Mr. Sopha: That is correct, Mr. Chairman, and we will return to The Department of Highways when it comes before the House.

Mr. Bryden: May I inquire, Mr. Chairman, if the supervision of credit unions comes under this vote?

I would like to ask the hon. Minister what the policy of the department is with regard to the chartering of credit unions. Perhaps to make myself a little more explicit, I should state that, as I understand it, such groups as, for example, church groups can get charters for credit unions. Groups of employees in plants can also get them. In those cases the credit union usually has the name of the employer or some form of it worked into its name.

Now, is there any wider scope permitted? Could, for example, a group of people, who happened to have in common a membership in a certain trade union, receive a charter for a credit union?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I have very little knowledge of these things myself except that I know my farmer friends who are very fond of co-operatives and credit unions, operating in their manner in the semi-private enterprise way, can have their credit unions.

Mr. MacDonald: Private enterprise, co-operatives, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Cass: That is right. One of the troubles, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. member for York South does not believe that in certain parts of the province of Ontario we can do those things, and we do. But I am advised, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is quite reasonable, that if there is some common bond, some common interest which is clearly demonstrable to the superintendent of insurance, that a credit union may be registered or licensed under the provisions of the Act, but they do not have to be members of a union or members of a church.

Mr. Bryden: But can they get a credit union charter on the basis of being members

of a union? The reason I am raising this question, Mr. Chairman, is that I was advised by some individuals of a situation that has arisen recently with regard to a credit union that has among its members employees of certain trade unions in Toronto. I am not just quite sure which ones. Also included, I think, are people who are members of a directly chartered local of the Canadian Labour Congress.

That directly chartered local has gone out of existence for all practical purposes, I believe, and the people who are members of the credit union who are still employed by the Canadian Labour Congress and certain other unions, would like to retain their credit union and would like to extend it by bringing in other employees in union offices and other members of Canadian Labour Congress locals.

From what they tell me—I can only go on what they tell me—they have been receiving a most unsympathetic reception from The Department of Insurance. The impression they have got is that The Department of Insurance would be tickled to death if they went out of business. This is their impression as they report it to me. It may or may not be fair, but I really cannot understand why this group has been having all this difficulty. Perhaps the hon. Minister will not have before him the details of the situation now. If not, I perhaps could discuss it with him privately on some occasion; but if he could make any general comments, I would appreciate it.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I do not know and neither does the superintendent know of this particular instance personally. The advice I have is that the considered opinion of the official dealing with it was that these people had lost the common bond and therefore would not qualify. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, that he either direct or, through me if he wishes, arrange it himself to discuss the matter with the superintendent of insurance. But beforehand, if he would give us particulars so that we could look it up, we would be delighted to see him and decide under the terms of the Act, if these people still have a common bond which will allow them to continue. If they have not, then, of course, the present ruling would be correct.

.. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have found that the department has been accused rather of encouraging credit unions at the expense of certain other branches of similar activities in Ontario. I want to say

to the hon. member that in the department we have done, I am advised, everything possible to facilitate and to encourage and to assist the development of the credit union movement and to ensure that it is supervised both by their own people and by the people from our department so that those small investors in it—because they are mostly small people—have full protection. We think it is a good movement. It is doing a very fine work.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if I could, in discussing the credit union movement, mention the co-operatives. I asked this question last year in connection with the movement of co-operatives into the housing field. I am thinking of co-operative apartments.

I had been asked by a group of people who, as individuals, could not afford to buy homes and had gone together in a co-operative apartment. They found that as a co-operative they were not considered in connection with The Housing Act. They had to form a limited company and therefore were considered as a profit-making organization. There was some confusion in this. The previous Minister had been kind enough to look into this for me to some extent but I never really did get an answer. Could you give me a reply?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, this is merely a reply off the cuff because we are not sure what the hon. member is getting at. If it is co-operatives, then it has nothing to do with The Department of Insurance. The Department of Insurance handles credit unions. If it is housing, then unquestionably there will not only be this government and the many departments concerned, but the senior government at the federal level would be responsible for laying down the rules. Certainly our Department of Insurance would have nothing to do with it whatsoever.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry. I stand corrected. I think it comes under another estimate.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I see the maintenance is \$79,000 this year as compared to \$77,000 last year. But the thing that intrigues me is this \$35,000 to the Queen's Printer. What would The Department of Insurance purchase that would come to that much money?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the bulk of that amount is caused by the cost of printing the reports for The Department of Insurance. I will get figures

here if I can in a minute. The cost of the superintendent's report last time was \$9,000; and the loan and trust report—\$3,000; forms—\$14,000; at that time the total was a little less—yes, \$27,000. This is in anticipation of having similar expenses revised upwards. As someone was suggesting today, we must every year.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Why would we require \$9,000 to print a superintendent's report? Are there quite a quantity of these forms printed? What is the major cost of this? That seems like a lot of money just for an annual report of a superintendent.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, it probably supplies some of the information that the hon. member for Sudbury was talking about a little while ago. I am advised that the reason it is so expensive and costly to produce—and it is—because it is a maze of figures and has to be type-set. It has to be carefully proofread afterwards. That is my advice as to the rather extreme cost of that report.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Minister advise how many copies are printed?

Hon. Mr. Cass: We can let you know that, but we do not have that information.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, then, perhaps the hon. Minister would advise the distribution of the report? Once this estimate is passed, my opportunity to inquire is gone.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned—just one moment. The distribution is what one would normally expect. It goes to all the insurance companies and those whose figures are included in the report. It goes to reference libraries, public libraries, and—I don't have the list here now, neither has my advisor.

I would be delighted, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member has any remarks to make with respect to it being excessive or otherwise, to have him make them and to undertake to send him a copy of the distribution of the number of copies printed for the last 3 years so that he will have an idea how it has been going.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, the reason I am inquiring into it is that I notice in going through all of the estimates that this word "maintenance" seems to be a cover-up for a lot of things in all of the estimates. I have just made some quick computations, while the hon. Minister was speaking, and if \$9,000 is the cost of printing

the reports and the distribution is to insurance companies and the like, and I understand that there are approximately 300 insurance companies, is this report distributed to members? I do not think it is, is it?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, if the hon. member had made the few notes when I was speaking first, he would have noted that there are 596 insurers licensed by the department; and 35 trust companies and so on. So there are some 600 companies. I would not know how many libraries there would be in Ontario, but I imagine that the libraries on the list amount to several hundred. So I do not think it would be very hard to get up to a large number of copies. If the hon. member wishes to suggest to me now, Mr. Chairman, either how the circulation should be cut down or how it could be spread better, I certainly will be pleased to have that information and advice.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to suggest to the hon. Minister how he should cut down—that is his responsibility, certainly not mine. It is just that I was trying to find out what the purpose was in spending this much money for a superintendent's report. I suggest that perhaps it could be cut down. It is only a small matter in the budget, but I do not know that it is necessary to send one of these to every company. If they are the department figures, perhaps they should charge the companies for them if they are that costly. It is only \$9,000 or \$10,000 in a \$1 billion budget, but I think the very fact that the hon. Minister is vague in the distribution of them indicates that there really is not too much policy. It is something we have always done; just part of the overall programme of this government, of spending money without any thought of where it is going, or whether or not it serves any purpose. It certainly seems like a lot of money to print a superintendent's report.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the hon. member is now taking the same attitude as he accused the hon. member for Woodbine of taking a little while ago; that is, making speeches without knowing the facts upon which he is basing them. I, unfortunately, do not have the facts here to give him. I certainly will provide them to him and will be glad to discuss it with him.

I will say this: I am advised, and I think there is a great deal of truth in the advice, that first of all the Act requires a report to be made up and printed in the form in which it is, which is rather expensive because of

the kind of contents. I am advised further that the distribution list has, like everything else, grown over the years and grown as each succeeding superintendent of insurance and his officials have decided that the information would be of assistance and value to those placed on the distribution list. I would hesitate to think that there were any dead addresses on that list but, having it brought to my attention now, Mr. Chairman, I certainly am going to make sure that there are none.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, before I leave the subject, I would just point out to the hon. Minister that if an agent requires any service from this government it will cost him \$25 a year. Apparently the reports are published for the insurance companies free of charge. The hon. Minister accuses me of not knowing what I am talking about. He is perfectly right; that is the reason I ask the hon. Minister the question, and apparently he does not know what he is talking about either, because he does not have the information.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister's reference to 36 trust companies—he tells me to ask him, I do so respectfully—does he say that trust companies are, for all their purposes, under The Department of Insurance, or for just a portion of their enterprise?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, that would take quite a bit of explaining, because we would have to go over the Act. In accordance with the provisions of the Act they must register, and then the Act provides wherein this government or this department exercises any scrutiny or supervision. If the hon. member wishes the House to, we certainly would be prepared to do that, but it seems rather unnecessary at the moment.

Mr. Sopha: Well, this I do not understand. I do not see why these financial institutions should be under the jurisdiction of two or three government departments. It would seem in the public interest that they be supervised by one department.

The hon. Minister is aware of my interest in the mutual funds. I have indicated it to him, I have indicated to the hon. Prime Minister my interest in the mutual funds, so more is going to be said in this House about the mutual funds. But so far as those companies handling vast assets—the savings of the people of this province—so far as they are engaged in the business as I understand it of selling investment contracts, called

certificates, savings certificates, then they are under The Ontario Department of Insurance.

I sent for the statute and there is a section of The Insurance Act that covers them, or The Investment Contracts Act. It is administered by The Department of Insurance, but so far as the same companies are engaged in the business of being mutual investment companies in the United States called open end companies, so far as they are engaged in that business, they appear to be under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Securities Commission. Sections 40 following of the Securities Act.

Now, to get back to what I said earlier. You cannot designate savings and look at a person's savings of \$4 a week and see any difference in its character whether it goes into an investment contract on the one hand or goes into a mutual fund on the other; it looks the same. So if companies are engaged in both, why should they not be under the one department? Why should not one government department supervise all their operations?

There are a lot of people in this country that cannot understand why these large financial institutions are not under the control of the Ottawa government, but the reason for that is historical. It is because the Privy Council was on a bent at one time under the aegis of Lords Haldane and Watson, when provincial rights were pre-eminent in this country. There was a great emphasis on provincial rights, and they said trust companies and all these big institutions should be governed by 9 different provinces.

We are moving back to a centralist interpretation now—and if that is the case—if they are to be supervised by provincial governments—then I say through you, Mr. Chairman, why, in your government, do you not bring the company under one department instead of splitting up its operation—for example, taking the selling of investment contracts and supervising that under your statute for which your advisor is responsible to you. And if they sell a pension plan, the mutual fund pension plan, then they are under Mr. Lennox down on Queen Street.

Why? Common sense would seem to say that you get it all under one roof and supervise them under one agency, one arm of the government. That is only one of the things I do not understand. I say to the hon. Minister that we, over on this side, we know a little bit too. He should not be so flippant and off-the-cuff and smart in his answers with us.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to question the hon. Minister and I know that you, Mr. Chairman, will have an interest in this. Last year I went through the procedure in The Department of Insurance of applying for an insurance licence. The procedure you go through, Mr. Chairman, is that you get a book and you study this conscientiously and carefully and then you apply to some home, you are asked to go to some home, and you sit down and you write an examination. When I was writing this examination, frankly I was very curious to know how the examiner was appointed, what his qualifications were. But I must be quite honest that I was keen to pass the examination and I thought in this case it would be somewhat of an affront on my part to ask him.

So I wrote the examination and then I was curious to know if I had passed, and I was curious to know who marked the papers. Now that I have passed the examination, I would ask if the hon. Minister could enlighten me how he does select these examiners, not only in the insurance field but also in the real estate. Is it a common basis? And also, who does mark the papers?

I should say I was informed that my mark was fairly high, so I think it was a discerning person. I would be interested in knowing the procedure, sir.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I do congratulate the hon. member in passing an exam. Most of us left those days long ago.

When the hon. member speaks of an examiner, I presume he means the person or persons who set and mark the exam, and not the person who supervises the room at the time the candidate is writing, because those latter people are people who are qualified only by the honesty of their reputation and the fact they have good eyes and can watch what is written on the cuffs of the candidate and other things such as that. But the papers themselves, in both cases mentioned by the hon. member, are set in the department by the qualified personnel of the department and marked there.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, before you carry vote 901, may I ask if this same principle would apply to real estate examinations? Are they marked by the department as well?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am advised that that is correct, except that the former registrar of that Act is also used in setting and marking papers with present departmental officials.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The reason I asked the question, Mr. Chairman, I understand that recently certain individuals did take this real estate examination and were told by the examiner, who was out of town—it was not a Toronto man, it was in the Hamilton area—that he had passed and was given a percentage. Now I wonder how that individual could mark the examination. That is why I asked the question, whether or not these were marked by the registrar here in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that what I said originally is correct, and that the information would go back to the person who sat over the exams. In this particular instance, in order that there may be no further question in the hon. member's mind, if he will let us know the time and place I will ascertain what actually happened to the marks, who marked them and how the—not the examiner, because the man who sits in the examination room is really not the examiner—how that person came to give the results to the applicant.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: So I understand from the hon. Minister that these are marked by the department and by the registrar or his deputy, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Not necessarily by the registrar or his deputy, they are marked by personnel in the department and since there are very few in that particular branch, the former registrar has been used as an examiner in setting and marking papers. He is no longer a member of the staff.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would advise how many times a candidate is permitted to write this real estate and business brokers' exam.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, it appears that there is a very good rule down at the department with respect to that, and that is the candidate without any question is given two opportunities of writing the exam, and if he has not been fortunate enough to do his homework for the second time then he has a waiting period, which I believe is six months, before he can try a subsequent time. I think that that is reasonable, because these examinations cost money and they use up all these \$25 fees that the hon. member for Wentworth is worrying about.

Vote 901 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come

to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, we will proceed with the estimates

of The Department of Reform Institutions and we will sit tomorrow night.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Will we be sitting until 10.00?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, it all depends on how long the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions occupy the time of the Chamber.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, December 12, 1962

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 12, 1962

First report, standing committee on legal bills, Mr. Lawrence	223
Interpretation of an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario with respect to the collection of income taxes, bill respecting, Mr. Allan, first reading	223
Disposition of bodies and parts thereof of deceased persons for therapeutic and other purposes, bill to provide for, Mr. Dymond, first reading	223
Statement re re-opening of tobacco auctions, Mr. Stewart	223
Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	225
Statement re the Ontario Police College, Mr. Cass	225
Statement re 150th birth date of John Sandfield Macdonald, Mr. Robarts	225
Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Haskett	227
Recess, 6 o'clock	252

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1962

The House met at 3:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence, from the standing committee on legal bills, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Investigation of Titles Act.

Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Custody of Documents Act.

Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

COLLECTION OF INCOME TAXES

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the interpretation of an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario with respect to the collection of income taxes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, this bill is purely technical, it is necessary pursuant to the collection agreement whereby Canada collects tax under The Income Tax Act, 1961-62, from Ontario residents for the account of Ontario.

DISPOSITION OF BODIES

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the disposition of bodies and parts thereof of deceased persons for therapeutic and other purposes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I am very pleased to inform the hon. members of this House that following discussions this morning with Mr. George Demeyere, chairman of the Ontario flue-cured tobacco growers marketing board, and Mr. Ernie Duckett, the vice-chairman, the decision has been reached to reopen the tobacco auctions at Delhi, Aylmer and Tillsonburg at 9 a.m. on Monday, December 17.

Hon. members will recall that the auctions were closed on November 23 by the flue-cured tobacco growers marketing board because of what they considered to be excessive amounts of no-sale tobacco. Since November 23 continuous study has been given to the tobacco situation by the Ontario farm products marketing board and meetings have been held between this board and the growers and buyers. Discussions have also been held with officials of the federal Department of Agriculture relative to the inspection and grading of tobacco, as grading and inspection comes under the jurisdiction of the federal department.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to report real progress in the formation of policies which members of the flue-cured tobacco board believe, as we do, will result in an orderly marketing of the 1962 tobacco crop. A regulation has been passed under The Ontario Farm Products Grades and Sales Act which provides that M.H.30 maleic hydrazide treated tobacco must be identified. This policy has been extremely well received by buyers and the vast majority of growers. It might be of interest to the House to know that the use of this chemical is of extreme concern to agricultural administrators in the United States, and that

Rhodesia is reported as giving serious consideration to the banning of the use of this chemical so that the international reputation of their tobacco is not in jeopardy.

Through discussions with the federal administrators and the farm products marketing board, steps are being taken to ensure that the supervision given to tobacco grading will be such as to make certain that tobacco presented for sale will be uniform within any one particular lot. It is now apparent as well there are improved grower-buyer relations and a very marked solidarity of effort and desire among the members of the flue-cured tobacco growers marketing board to do everything possible to market the 1962 tobacco crop in an orderly manner.

On December 6, 7 and 8 several area meetings were held of tobacco growers. Fifty-four per cent of the eligible tobacco growers turned out to these meetings. Mr. Speaker, you will recall the weather in southwestern Ontario was most inclement on these days. I understand that many of these growers walked to the meetings. Such a turnout under such weather conditions is an indication of the growers' interest and concern. At these meetings 84.7 per cent voted in favour of a two cent levy to be deducted from all graded tobacco to be used as a fund to enable the flue-cured tobacco growers marketing board to remove no-sale tobacco from the market.

The levy would not be deducted from non-descript or factored tobacco such as that effected by hail, frost or other like damage. Following the recommendation of the flue-cured tobacco growers' marketing board to the farm products marketing board of Ontario, that the two cent per pound levy be instituted, proceedings are now underway to bring the necessary regulations into force.

Following discussions with Mr. Demeyere and his vice-chairman Mr. Duckett this morning, it was agreed that the Ontario government would supplement the two cent levy by a bank guarantee which would enable the growers' board to obtain the necessary additional finances to remove no-sale tobacco from the market. Mr. Demeyere advises me that it is the board's intention to allow the tobacco to be offered twice in the auctions and if not purchased then it would be taken off by the flue-cured tobacco growers' marketing board and the producer paid immediately in the regular way, the minimum grade price less the two cent levy.

Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out to this House recently, a flue-cured tobacco industry inquiry committee under the chair-

manship of Dr. Ford Stinson will study and report on all aspects of the flue-cured tobacco industry and I must say this move has been welcomed by the tobacco growers of this province. Thank you.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister of Agriculture inform the House whether or not the government at this session intends to bring in legislation enforcing the acreage bans that have in fact been in effect for some years?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think if the hon. member will await the deliberations of the House he will have the answer to his question.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question, or will the hon. Minister answer a question in regards to the flue-cured tobacco?

Is there any change in the grades of the flue-cured tobacco since an agreement has been reached?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I have to apologize to the hon. member, I did not hear his question because of the din from the opposite side.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. Minister puts far too much importance on himself. He is only the Minister of Agriculture, and that is all.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I would ask the members not to carry on conversations across the floor but direct all remarks to the Speaker.

Mr. Sopha: Well, ask him not to be so impolite and surly.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, my question is: has any change in The Grades and Sales Act regarding flue-cured tobacco taken place since the hon. Minister has had these meetings?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I would say that to my knowledge the only change is in the regulations that were brought in and announced a few weeks ago, when the hon. member will recall the regulation dealing with the M.H. factor in tobacco was dealt with. This to my knowledge is the only change that has been made in The Grades and Sales Act.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. Minister; how much is the bank loan that the government is guaranteeing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, there is no limit placed on the government guarantee, I think for very obvious reasons.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following:

The annual report of The Department of Reform Institutions, Province of Ontario, for the year ending March 31, 1962.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to advise the hon. members of the progress with respect to the Ontario Police College.

The Ontario Police College at Aylmer will go into operation on January 7, 1963 with two classes of 32 men each. On January 14, a further class of 32 men will commence, making a total of 96 receiving instruction. Of the 96, 64 will come from municipal police forces and 32 from the Ontario Provincial Police Force. The men from the municipal police forces represent some 38 municipalities extending from Kenora to Cornwall and from Timmins to Sandwich, the length and breadth of the province.

With respect to future training, questionnaires have been sent to the various municipalities in the province requesting a statement of intention with regards to their future training requirements. To date, more than 90 per cent have replied indicating their desire to send for training 300 recruits and almost 700 full time police officers during 1963. The Ontario Provincial Police Force will require training for 365 men.

The college which is under the administration of the Attorney-General's department is located in buildings formerly occupied as a training centre for RCAF personnel.

It operates under the guidance of Mr. J. L. Mennill, director, and Mr. A. R. Knight, assistant director.

The primary purpose of the college is to provide training at all levels for police personnel employed by police departments within the province.

The courses when completely projected will provide for instruction of an academic, physical and practical nature, adequate to meet the needs for police training.

In the initial stages, training will be confined to recruit and refresher courses with advanced training to follow.

Recruit courses will be 12 weeks in duration. Refresher courses will be of varying length depending on the training and experience of the group for which the course is designed. It is anticipated that they will vary from 4 to 12 weeks.

Examinations will be held during and at the completion of each course and these, together with an appraisal made by instructors, will determine the success achieved by the student.

Students who have complied with all requirements of the course will be granted a graduation diploma.

The Ontario Police College will accept for enrolment any person employed as a police constable by a police department within the province of Ontario providing the application for enrolment is endorsed by the chief constable or other executive officer of the department making application.

Applications for enrolment must be submitted on the form provided, complete in detail, and filed with the director of the college at least 4 weeks prior to the commencing date of the course requested. A certificate from a qualified medical practitioner stating whether or not the applicant is physically able to engage in foot drill and physical exercise must accompany each application.

Application forms may be obtained from the college upon request.

A registration fee of \$10 will be charged for each student and must be paid on or before the date of course commencement.

All other expenses will be borne by the province of Ontario.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. Minister relative to his statement? Will that magistrate, Mr. Stewart Mitchell of Guelph, who has made a fine contribution to the conduct of justice in Ontario, be able to assume his position as a member of the staff?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer that question in its entirety. I will find out and let the hon. member know. I believe that Magistrate Mitchell is involved in the set-up.

Mr. Troy: He is in the hospital at the present time and I am just wondering if he will be sufficiently recovered.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a few remarks concerning

this particular day. As was mentioned when the House opened, the year 1812 had some significance. I spoke about the disputes at that time between ourselves and our neighbours to the south. It is not of that I wish to speak today, but today is the 150th birth date of a very great Canadian statesman who was born in 1812, on December 12, in the great community, the Glengarry community, of Saint Raphael and who became one of the outstanding figures in the events which led to the establishment of the Canadian nation, and indeed who became the first Prime Minister of this province. I am referring to John Sandfield Macdonald.

It is interesting to note that just over 50 years ago on this date there assembled in this very Chamber a group of men to honour him. At that time there was present His Honour John Morison Gibson, who was the Lieutenant-Governor at that time, Sir James Whitney who was the Prime Minister of the day and the leader of the Liberal Opposition, Mr. A. G. MacKay.

It was on that date that the monument which stands outside the east wing of this building was unveiled in tribute to Mr. Macdonald.

It is interesting to look at some of the events of his political career. Perhaps some of them, by analogy, can have some application in our affairs today. He was a lawyer, he studied law under a Mr. Archibald McLean, who subsequently became the Chief Justice of Upper Canada. He entered the Legislature, representing Glengarry, when he was less than 30 years of age, and he held that seat until 1857. Thereafter, until 1867 he represented Cornwall.

He was a reformer in 1844 and became Solicitor-General in the Baldwin-Lafontaine administration. He served as Prime Minister in two very short administrations, from 1862 until 1864, and it was his defeat that brought on the eventual deadlock which had a great deal to do with the events leading to confederation, which he vigorously opposed in those days. When it became an accomplished fact, he worked equally as hard for it—once the die had been cast and the decision had been taken.

As a result, he was persuaded by Sir John A. Macdonald to become the first Prime Minister of Ontario and he formed a coalition ministry which was known in those days as the "Patent Combination". Undoubtedly, it aroused a great deal of enmity and did not increase his personal popularity with some of his fellow reformers, but, as we can see,

he probably recognized there are times when perhaps one must accept compromise in order to secure accord. In the life of a people in the state of development, sometimes accord becomes imperative.

He was accused by his political opponents of being a puppet of Sir John A. Macdonald. But history does not substantiate these charges, and in fact he was of such an independent frame of mind, at one time it is recorded that Sir John A. Macdonald considered coming into this Legislature himself in order to attempt to control this man.

In any event, it is interesting to note that, over the years in the development of our political institutions and our country sometimes we have achieved progress. Some men have achieved it by fighting mightily for what they believed in, other men have achieved it by fighting equally hard in opposing those things in which they did not believe; and some men have made a large contribution to the life of our country by adopting a compromise between those two positions when it appeared to be necessary and right for the good of the country. The ideas of those days of long ago are, in my opinion, equally applicable to some of the problems we face in this Legislature today.

In going back to that first Parliament—that first legislative assembly that convened 95 years ago on the 27th day of this month—we will not be here on December 27 to record and to mark that date—but it will be 95 years ago on the 27th of this month that the first meeting of the assembly took place—it is very interesting to note that of the 82 members who assembled at that time, 72 had never served in any previous Parliament or Legislature. There were, of course, many very complex questions which gave rise to many very violent debates from that date until Macdonald was defeated in 1871 by the Blake Liberals.

In looking over the reason why he was defeated, he did accumulate a surplus of several million dollars in the treasury and this surplus he had accumulated entered the political field. In the 1872 session the Provincial Treasurer—Alexander MacKenzie—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, we will not take any chances on history repeating itself.

In any event, the Provincial Treasurer in the succeeding administration brought in a national development budget, as it was called, and this resulted in an even larger

surplus in due course, even though the election battle was fought on the existence of the surplus in the Macdonald administration, which also has its own connotations in political argument and political life.

There is one rather interesting remark Macdonald made in that campaign, and it also has its modern parallel. He said during that campaign: "What has Strathroy ever done for me?" This remark was used in the campaign, and I must admit that its modern parallel could be those famous words: "What's a million?" used by a very prominent Canadian in the 1950's and not long before the defeat of that administration.

In going back over those days it is obvious that the battles were fought in not too different a fashion than they are now. So I think it is proper that we should mark at least the 150th anniversary of the birth of this great Canadian who did so much of the original spadework which led to confederation. He incurred the enmity of many close friends and associates in following the course and pursuing the policies that he did. Like other public figures past and present, he was greatly maligned in his lifetime and criticized perhaps unjustly, but it was his successor and one of his colleagues at the time, George Brown, who was indeed one of his most vigorous critics, who said about him: "John Sandfield Macdonald was a man who would neither do wrong himself nor allow those around him to do wrong." This is a high tribute from a political opponent to a great man.

I just wanted to make these few remarks and bring these matters to the attention of hon. members. Perhaps we can get some perspective in our disputes and realize that there have been many very important issues settled in heated and less heated ways in this House through the long period of the 95 years in which it has been here looking after people of this province.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, in introducing the estimates for The Department of Reform Institutions for the fiscal year 1963-64, I come forward with a broader understanding of the work and problems of the department

than I had a year ago, and I hope the hon. members will find that I am in a better position now to describe the various facets of its wide field of operation. Since assuming this portfolio, I have applied myself to learning the manifold operations of this unusual department of corrections—unique in that none other such department is to be found in any province of Canada. I have visited a wide variety of establishments within its framework, inquiring into and studying their problems.

When the overall programme of this department—with its complete system of classification with emphasis on treatment and training—is compared with those in other jurisdictions, I am satisfied that this province holds a place among the leaders in correctional work. Here we have a system, particularly designed to meet the needs of Ontario. It is a good one, embodying many features that are the envy of correctional workers in many parts of the world. Visitors from other lands, experienced in the correctional fields, praise our enlightened and progressive programme.

I have here a letter that was addressed to Mr. Sanderson, superintendent of the Ontario Reformatory at Guelph, from Mr. John Marsh, director of the Industrial Welfare Society of the United Kingdom whose patron is H.R.H. Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh. He writes Mr. Sanderson:

I much enjoyed the visit to the reformatory. The impressions I took away will help the government mission on which I serve. I must say the general impression is that it pays better to be a criminal in Canada than it does here. I do not mean this unkindly but I think you are more thorough in your efforts to train and rehabilitate people than we are.

Our overall plan must be a balanced plan, taking into consideration the numbers and types of inmates with whom we have to deal. We know only too well the difficulties of rehabilitating men under restrictive conditions. Equally, we appreciate fully that some men, by their actions and conduct must, for the protection of society and themselves, be placed in maximum security. But we have progressed so far along the line that relatively few of the inmates in Ontario are so segregated. We have, perhaps, the highest percentage of inmates under minimum conditions of security, of any jurisdiction on this continent. Our training centres, industrial farms, clinics, forestry camps, guidance centres—all have programmes specifically designed to enable us to maintain the minimum degree of supervision necessary for us to fulfill our legal custodial obligations.

Exactly one year ago this month a new

prison was opened at Hindley in Britain for the training of youths of the Brampton type and age group. Its governor, describing the 24-ft. concrete wall surrounding it, said: "The wall may not be beyond human ingenuity to climb, but it would be very, very difficult." The living accommodation, with its sealed-off block is completely secure after dark. Each cell is secure, each corridor is fitted with a security gate and the entrance to each block is securely guarded.

Within six months of its opening, this maximum security institution was converted to a Borstal, because of overcrowding and other problems confronting the British prison officials. Incidentally, 8,000 prisoners were living 3 to a cell in that institution last year. When we consider our own problems, it is small comfort to know that others throughout the world have these problems in greater measure, but we do take some pride in a system that is dealing with these many problems as efficiently as any other correctional system.

This ability to adjust and progress is due mainly to our variety of treatment and training centres and our highly developed classification system. Working with inmates as a full-time occupation, produces much more in practical progress than any theoretical suggestions can ever do at long range. In this way we have developed industry, forestry camps, guidance and training centres and clinics, that are unique and unquestionably in the forefront of correctional progress.

Starting with a small unit at Mimico just over 10 years ago for the clinical treatment of some 20 offenders with severe alcohol problems—the first of its kind on this continent—the clinical services of the department have been expanded and enlarged in a positive and purposeful manner.

The first extension was the neuropsychiatric clinic at Guelph, for the treatment and investigation of psychiatric and behaviour disorders, with in-patient and out-patient facilities.

The next extension was the drug addiction clinic at Mimico, followed by a great expansion in the facilities for the treatment of alcoholics, increasing the number of patients, who could be treated at any time, to 150.

Co-existent with this was the establishment of a milieu therapy unit at the Mercer Reformatory for the treatment of female drug addicts. The success of this work has been such that we are now establishing a separate clinic for the intensive treatment of these victims. The new establishment, located near the women's guidance centre at Brampton,

will be ready for occupancy in the very near future.

The development of this vigorous clinical system reflects the initiative, planning and steady progress by this department.

I would like to read to the House some excerpts from a letter to Mr. Flint, who is the chaplain at Mercer, and who is now completing his work on a doctorate in psychology. He is in charge of our drug addiction treatment team at Mercer. This letter is written to him by a doctor:

I am sure it will be of interest to you that this week I saw one of your girls from Mercer, Mrs. ———. She is now remarried, sober, off drugs and has made a tremendous come-back. Asked what the most significant occurrence since her sentence to Mercer in 1957 was, she said something like this: "It all really began when Mr. Flint first offered me communion. I hadn't ever taken communion in my life, but he said that if I wished to take this act of faith, I should. That was the beginning. When I first reached out for the cup, I knew that I was reaching out for God's help, and that this was the only direction left for me to go. Since that moment, I've never looked back; I've never taken another fix."

Our forest camps have been built up and expanded. The problems of running these camps efficiently—whilst providing purposeful employment, and integrating into the local community, without creating labour difficulties—were first solved in the two camps at Hillsdale and McCreight's Dam. The activities were then extended to Camp Hendrie, for the training of Guelph-type inmates and we are now completing the buildings at Camp Cold Springs, where boys from Bowmanville, under skilled direction, have been building their own forestry camp.

This will bring our total of forest camps to 4, programmed for different age groups, and for different kinds of offenders, but each essentially providing the beneficial, out-door work, on community-centred projects, that has proved to be a useful and positive force in our rehabilitative programme.

Work of this sort and, indeed, a wide variety of purposeful labour is necessary in a modern correctional system. In this aspect of our programme Ontario compares very favourably with any other jurisdiction. An essential of industrial work in a total rehabilitation programme is to maintain a proper balance between the part played by industry, and the need for a stabilized or guaranteed output, to meet the requirements of the departments whose needs we supply.

Work must be positive and productive; it must keep a man's mind and body active; it must approximate civilian industrial conditions; it must provide training. Flexibility is a must. The labour force increases or decreases daily, and the annual turn-over may be over 100 per cent of the work force. We need

flexibility to minimize interference with other aspects of our work, to allow for family visits.

All our products are for use in our own or other Ontario government departments, in no way competing with outside production, and we are fortunate that even with these limitations we are able to provide sufficient employment to keep all inmates constantly occupied, and in sufficient variety to provide facilities for basic industrial training, over a wide field.

It is, perhaps, our industrial set-up that is most envied by correctional visitors from other countries. Sufficient employment is one of the basic problems throughout all correctional agencies, and it is one that few ever expect to solve satisfactorily. In one aspect alone—our industrial compensation set-up, wherein we utilize the Ontario workmen's compensation board in making awards—indicates we are the leader on this continent.

At a recent convention of the American correctional association at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, our director of industries gave a paper which discussed compensation. Amongst representatives from all jurisdictions in America, only three had any scheme of compensation and not one of these three admitted that they were comparable to the Ontario scheme.

Training and treatment are integral parts of our rehabilitation programme. They are aspects which receive a great deal of interest and attention; they are most important, but they are not cure-alls. Even if we were to teach every man a trade and give him guidance continually during his incarceration, finally placing him in employment, we would still have repeaters.

Effective trade training needs to meet many and varied conditions. Only limited selections of the population have the aptitude for training and in many cases educational standards need to be raised to meet the requirements of entry into a trade. Co-operation on the part of the trainee is most necessary; so too is his careful selection, to ensure that lack of interest, absence of ability, scarcity of employment do not negate the efforts put into training.

Both poor application and a desire for easy living are commonplace factors which must be cured before trade training can become effective. These weaknesses reduce the numbers which are able to benefit from training; but for those who fit into the scheme and those whose difficulties can be overcome, in the time at our disposal we are able to provide a high level of training. About 50 per cent of our inmate population, at any given time, are receiving academic, industrial, trade or vocational training.

Difficulties still exist—such as having recognition of time spent at our training centres applied towards apprenticeship; the granting of certificates; and in the laying down of standards acceptable to some trade unions.

When a man leaves prison and seeks to rebuild his life in society, he encounters difficulties. All the efforts we make towards his rehabilitation can so easily be negated by adverse circumstances at this point. Consequently, we have strengthened our rehabilitation services over the last few years and are continuing to extend them, in accordance with our plan of reorganization started two years ago.

As from April last year, all supervisory staff in the after-care services of the department, parole and rehabilitation officers, and placement officers, were transferred from institutions and placed under the direction of the main office in Toronto. The province has now been divided into 4 areas, each under the direction of a supervising rehabilitation officer.

The duties of a rehabilitation officer, within his own area, are all directed towards the rehabilitation of a man, or a ward, into society. Families are visited, the assistance of the local church may be sought, employment opportunities are investigated, financial difficulties are dealt with, often by gift or loan. A man is visited, counselled, encouraged and assisted to overcome the many pitfalls that he may at this time encounter.

Regrettably, public attention and public attitudes can be among the greatest difficulties a man may face. Therefore we feel it is most important to keep the public informed on the extent of our programme.

This we do constantly throughout the year by supplying interesting material to press, radio and TV, by participating in national and local exhibitions and by the encouragement of small groups to visit the institutions themselves.

Though it is not practical to have large numbers of the public inspect our various institutions, 10,000 people took advantage of our special invitations this year and visited our new schools at Lindsay and Simcoe on the occasion of their official opening ceremonies.

The public was given a panorama of all facets of the programme at the Ontario Reformatory, Guelph, by means of a monster exhibition. It was set up in the gymnasium and visited by over 10,000 members of the public. It was truly an impressive display of the work that was being carried on

there. Inmates and staff worked together in setting it up and all were given an opportunity to view it. Volunteer inmates from each section helped to staff their own particular display and on no occasion was it suggested that the exhibition was other than a factual picture of the programme.

The response was most encouraging. Newspapers, television and radio stations gave it wide coverage and unstinted praise. Unfortunately, a disturbance by a few disgruntled inmates occurred two days later. Newspapers tended to overstate the case, when they praised us so highly for our efficient handling of a riot. Actually, the disturbance lasted about 12 minutes and caused about \$50 worth of damage.

This department is alive to all aspects of rehabilitation and efficiency in all aspects of administration. Every part of the programme has been carefully considered and raised to as high a level as possible.

On our farms we have some of the finest cattle in the province, winning production championships year after year. Our food services provide a varied balanced diet, our recreation programmes train men in the wise use of leisure time, and our library services provide free access to a wide variety of books for recreation and study.

All institutions have the guidance of chaplains, representing many denominations, and arrangements have been made for theological students to take field training in our institutions as part of their regular training for the ministry. This is the first time to my knowledge that such training has been given in any correctional institution in Canada. It must be looked upon as a very important step, not only in the general training of these young theological students, but it will ensure that an adequate number will eventually be qualified to contribute their services to this field.

This is one instance among many where our co-operation with outside bodies is helping us, and them, to overcome mutual problems. We have a high level of co-operation with magistrates, judges, family courts and children's aid societies of all areas. Our co-operation and assistance to universities in the field of research is most beneficial and has resulted in over 25 per cent of the research done in this field in Canada originating, or being directly concerned and financed, in our department.

In covering those aspects of our programme in which we take understandable pride, I have given you a survey of a humanitarian programme of rehabilitation in a custodial

setting that gives a high level of rehabilitation.

Let me tell you of some of the highlights of this last year and some of our plans for the future.

I was especially pleased during the year to be able to preside at the official opening ceremonies of the two new training schools. This brought the number of training schools in the province to 11. Three of these are private schools, operated with the department's assistance. Of the remaining 8, which are operated directly by our department, the opening of Lindsay brought the number for girls up to 4, and Simcoe—which was opened in November and will receive its first students after the Christmas leave—increases the number of boys' schools to 4.

The extension of the training schools into forestry camp operation at Cold Springs, north of Bowmanville, should provide a most useful facility. A selected group of older boys from Bowmanville, who are helping to build the camp themselves, will spend half a day in school and a half day doing forestry work, a vocational training which is much in demand by boys from the northern areas of the province. This camp will be in full operation within a few weeks.

Each of our training schools has developed a programme designed to meet the needs of its particular type of child and the opening of the two new schools enables this system of classification to be further improved and accelerated.

We already have a reception and diagnostic centre for girls and are now actively planning a similar centre for boys. A team of clinical specialists will study the needs of each boy admitted to our training schools and recommend his transfer to the particular school best able to provide him with the programme and treatment necessary for his rehabilitation. I share with my predecessor deep concern for these youngsters committed to our schools, many of them long deprived of the care, guidance, and training that is their right. And so I am particularly pleased that with the strengthening of our rehabilitation services, not only will the boy or girl be helped by our schools and guided during his or her wardship, but we will be able to intensify our work with the families, both before and after the child returns home. It is here in the family setting that the fault lies in so many cases and it is here that we often find our greatest difficulties.

As a tribute to the work of one of our rehabilitation officers I would like to read

to the House some passages from this letter from a father and mother in grateful acknowledgment of the help that was given them and their boy. It is addressed to Mr. Tremblay, who was transferred from the Toronto rehabilitation office to the new Simcoe Boys' School. He says:

Dear Mr. Tremblay:

Just a note to express our gratitude for everything you have done on Eric's behalf. We feel that he would not be at home with us now had it not been for your interest, time and efforts and we are most grateful for all of it. We are very much saddened to learn of your transfer and although we realize that troubled boys elsewhere will benefit, we are shamelessly selfish concerning our own. We deeply regret that Simcoe's gain must be our loss.

The chapel at Burwash is now nearing completion. It is being built by inmates mostly constructed from wood felled and processed at the Burwash industrial farm and will certainly be a great improvement over the chapel facilities that were inside one of the buildings.

At the Burtch industrial farm, a splendid cattle barn has been built by the inmates and now they are planning to start on the building of a chapel there.

Almost 100 of our staff members are now on the first and second year of their university extension courses organized by McMaster and Queen's universities. The high percentage of passes obtained by members of the department was most gratifying and we appreciate the training facilities afforded by these universities. As a departmental extension of this training, we have appointed one of our most experienced and able psychologists to be director of staff training and development. He will originate and co-ordinate courses outside the department and be responsible for staff training both at institutions and the staff training school.

As I have reviewed for you some of the many phases of the work of this department that is responsible primarily for the custody of a never-ending stream of offenders sentenced by the courts, I hope I have indicated to you how training and treatment are receiving constantly increasing emphasis in both adult and juvenile institutions.

The growing number of wayward youngsters committed to us as wards of the Crown is one of the most disturbing situations that our society faces. These unfortunate boys and girls, for the most part, are not so much delinquent children, as they are the unfortunate products of delinquent parents, and broken homes and sordid surroundings.

Our Woodlawn Camp for boys, the two new training schools opened this year, and the reception and diagnostic centre for boys

on which we are now working, will augment and strengthen our whole training school programme. But no amount of good work at this end can make amends or substitute for good parents and good homes.

The Department of Reform Institutions is proud of the place of pre-eminence in correction work that it has attained. Its progress and successes over the years do not give it a stopping place, but serve rather as a spur to greater effort and new accomplishments. Its very place of leadership creates problems in that further advances must be made into untried and uncharted areas and this calls increasingly for undertakings on a trial-and-error basis.

The elected representatives of the people of Ontario have been generous in voting supply for the support of this important work. But today, as I ask this House for approval of our estimates to give the department the financial means to carry on its programme in the year ahead, I would feel a certain deficiency in the discharge of my responsibility were I not to draw your attention to the road block that stands as a barrier to greater progress.

Crime is one of mankind's oldest and most stubborn problems. Crime is costing Canadians millions and millions of dollars annually, whilst the wastage in human life and happiness is beyond computing. No adequate effort has been made to pool our brains and resources in tackling this problem. The efforts in research are minimal, the facilities for study inadequate, and the need for trained personnel grows greater. Where does the answer lie?

This department feels that the goal is a university-centred institute of criminology that could have a three-fold function: to conduct research, to teach and to act as consultant to legislators and administrators, thereby providing a supply of highly skilled professional personnel from various disciplines—education, law, sociology, medicine—to serve in many fields, aiding in eradicating social problems, formulating laws, dealing with offenders and making more effective the rehabilitative work in which this department is engaged.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would take this opportunity, as is customary and which I do so very freely and enthusiastically, in complimenting the hon. Minister on his presentation.

Understandably, Mr. Chairman, you will appreciate that I cannot agree with all the

observations that have been made. I can agree with the enthusiasm with which they have been made and the phraseology that has been used to express what is the goal, I am sure, of all of us. But the acid test, surely, is in the determination of whether or not these goals that have been outlined for us today are in fact being pursued as aggressively and determinedly as should be.

Now if I may begin where the hon. Minister left off. I presume that everybody in this House would support the hon. Minister's observation that one of the things that could and should be done is to conduct research into criminology in this province. And, Mr. Chairman, on examination of the estimates I cannot find a nickel that is being identified by this department for the creation of any university bursaries for the type of imaginative programme that the hon. Minister referred to.

Mr. Chairman, it was but a year ago that I detailed criticisms of this department and I might use this opportunity to summarize, Mr. Chairman, some of those criticisms. I pointed out at that time that the philosophy of the department had been the discarded concept that custodial care is the essence of prison care. This is contrasted with the progressive positions of other governments that reformatories are places to reform a person, an inmate, in spirit and in body. Mr. Chairman, it is all right to refer to England and other jurisdictions and talk about 24-foot walls. The simple fact is that England, Mr. Chairman, is a country with one central government and they are required to take charge of the inmates who are under their care for all periods of time. We are responsible, Mr. Chairman—I must emphasize this—for the care and custody and treatment of people up to two years less one day.

Now let us examine these people as I detailed them last week. We are talking about jails in Ontario and we are talking about Ontario reformatories. The jails in Ontario house approximately 56,000 people. I pointed out last year, Mr. Chairman, that 30,000 of those 56,000 who were housed in the last year for which we have figures—and surely no one can complain that we do not have more up-to-date figures when today, the date on which we are to debate, the report of this department is made available to us for study.

But, taking the last figures that we have available, Mr. Chairman, of the 56,000 inmates in our jails, 30,000 were there because of liquor and intoxication. In other words, Mr. Chairman, surely one of the character-

istics that come to the fore immediately in respect of jails is the simple fact that liquor plays a dominant part in the incarceration of the great majority of the people who are housed there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the second characteristic in our jails is that the average age is 24 years. The average person—in fact, 60 per cent, more than the average—60 per cent of the inmates have not proceeded to grade 8 education. The great majority of those people have no education, have no job, have no home, have no place to go when they are released.

Mr. Chairman, this is not frivolous talk. This is not criticism for the sake of criticism. This is the crux of the problem.

We have a group of people who are going in and out of our jails as on a treadmill. They go in for up to 3 months, that is the maximum for which we house people in the county or city jails. The great majority of those people are repeaters—not for the first time, the second time or the third time—but the great majority are there for more than 3 separate occasions.

This is another dramatic characteristic of the inmate population in our jails. Certainly it is nothing to be proud of. If we have a progressive and forward attitude with respect to these poor unfortunates, then I certainly feel that what we should hear from the hon. Minister today is something more than the enunciation of a platitude that he hopes to establish something in the university at some time in the future but for which he is not prepared to commit money today to begin the study of this problem.

Coincidentally, with this report we have the report of the liquor commission. We note that more money has been spent on liquor than in any other time in our history. Presumably, therefore, more revenue has been derived.

I am not opposed to the consumption of liquor and I have spoken very freely about it, but I personally believe that we have to use a portion of that revenue to take care of people who are characterized in our jails as alcoholics, who are repeaters time and time again.

Now it will not do any longer, Mr. Chairman, to talk platitudinously about this. We are all against sin, but what in the dickens are we doing? Sixty per cent of the people in jail at the county and city level are there as repeaters for the third, fourth, and upward of that number of times.

Mr. Chairman, they are youngsters, they

are young people, whose vitality, whose life has been basically destroyed. Surely our position must be to do something about reclaiming that life and making it worthwhile. I personally think that a lot of other jurisdictions have given good consideration and real consideration to the advisability of imposing indefinite sentences and taking these people and giving them treatment over a period of time in and out of jail—at home and in jail—re-educating them, giving them the opportunity to pursue an academic course.

You can talk as you will, Mr. Chairman, about trade, about treatment and all, but of all our population in our reformatories, only 64 or 61 persons—of all the population about 4 per cent—are actually engaged in correctivism. In other words, of all the employees that there are, the gardeners, the caretakers, the maintenance people, and all the management and administrative offices, only 4 per cent are actually engaged in this vital, essential work.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the things we have got to meet. The estimates that have been handed to us, the estimates that the hon. Minister asked us to approve wholeheartedly and with enthusiasm, in my opinion differ not a whit from what the case has been in the last 10 years.

Today we are asked to pass on 3 votes; vote 2001, vote 2002 and vote 2003. Now 2001 relates to headquarters, if you will; 2002 relates to parole; and 2003 relates to the reformatories.

In respect of 2001, there is not a bit of change in respect to this vote, except in two significant factors. First, \$450,000 is being given by way of grant to the county and local jails, and we will certainly ask for an explanation of this, and I note that about \$160,000 more is being given to private reform institutions than has been given last year.

Mr. Chairman, in respect to the other increases, in respect to salary and the like, there is the normal type of increase that has occurred, year after year. The increase in vote was about \$1 million less than it is here. Next year, it will be \$600,000 more the past indefinite number of years. I took the public accounts, the last public accounts that were available, and two years ago that vote was about a million dollars less than it is here. Next year, it will be \$600,000 more than it was last year. In other words, it becomes quite apparent that there is a trend to increase that vote by about \$1 million per year. But to think that something extraordinary is happening this year, to think that the hon. Minister has taken this particu-

lar department by the forelock and actually done the things that he enunciates this afternoon—things that are commendable—I doubt.

I think that it will be the responsibility of all hon. members opposite and on this side of the House, to examine and to ask the hon. Minister, in the fashion that we are responsible for asking, exactly where these great and extraordinary improvements in the administration of this department have actually been effected. I can see none.

I think our jails are still characterized, as I said a few moments ago, by young people, by people with alcoholic problems, by repeaters, by people, unfortunately, who do not have the advantage of even a grade 8 education.

Mr. Chairman, when in the world are we going to do something about this; when are we going to treat this problem and translate it into reform and development of the individual; and the opportunity for the individual that is required?

You can talk about capital punishment; I know that it is the dramatic issue today. But I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the real thing we have to do in this province is to do something about the people who are incarcerated for two or less years; and we have to do something about juvenile delinquency. We have got to give some, not only leadership, but some corrective force in this province.

I recall in my own home constituency, there is a policeman who inaugurated a hockey league for youngsters—the PeeWee's he called them. He assembled 1,000 youngsters in this particular league and it is financed by the city and by donations. On one occasion this man in charge, a very good policeman, told me that really what he is doing in this league is taking young juvenile delinquents, not segregating and not isolating them, but spreading them and infiltrating, if you will, that group in a general, young population of the community. They play sports together and they have the opportunity to see how other people live and act. The correctivism that he has effected is phenomenal. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is the type of thing that we should be thinking about.

I am not adverse to spending money, but I do not think the expenditure of money for buildings or facilities is going to answer our problem. When we go to the reformatories of the province, the same old pattern I outlined last year prevails again.

Mr. Chairman, I took the opportunity to pick up the chart that I detailed last year.

Therein, you will recall, Mr. Chairman, our population in the reformatories is in the neighbourhood of 10,000 inmates. Forty-two per cent of that group are third or more-time repeaters. In other words, the same old characteristic. Seven per cent are there for the first time, 9 per cent for the second and about 8 per cent for the third. The great bulk, a large percentage of persons in our reformatories, are there as repeaters for more than 3 occasions.

Mr. Chairman, another characteristic of the reformatories is the matter that I referred to a moment ago. Of our total staff of 1,432 people in 1960, 914 were guards. I would remind you what I said before: this government has given as its standard for a guard the following qualifications; that he have grade 8 education and be able to defend himself physically.

Mr. Chairman, we need more. What we need are people—guards—who are going to be prepared and be given the opportunity to take advanced training, to understand something more about correction and our reformatories than to protect themselves against physical violence. We have 36 doctors and 61 on the correction staff. One hundred and twenty-four in administration and 297 in maintenance. I can see no allotment here today that would suggest that the corrective staff is to be dramatically increased. How many more psychiatrists, psychologists and other persons, schooled in the art of helping people to find themselves again and correct themselves, are actually to be added to this staff? I think this is the significant fact.

Again in our reformatories the characteristic comes through. Sixty-one point two per cent of the total inmate population has less than grade 8 educations. Of all the people who are in our reformatories, this total population, only 15 per cent, actually I have in 1961 only 13 per cent, are actually in training. Of that group in training, about 10 per cent of the total population is in trade and the other in academic training.

Now I do not think it is good enough just to tell people how to spend leisure time that they happen to have during the period of time that they are incarcerated. I think what we must do with these people, who we know will leave the institutions with \$20 in their pocket, no trade, no family, often no opportunity for employment, no education, and hope that they go right after leaving. These men must somehow be salvaged, Mr. Chairman. I think they are going to be salvaged by doing 3 or 4 things.

First, their academic training must be

upped; their occupational training must be upped. They must be given, or the follow-through on these men must be such that they are not destitute the first day after release. Some follow-through with respect to psychiatric help and guidance must be provided.

Mr. Chairman, from a purely economic point of view we are wasting money. What we are doing is housing people, knowing these people are not being corrected in our institutions but are simply being housed for a period of time to be released, only to be rehoused again after a subsequent conviction. From a purely economic point of view, a purely dollars-and-cents point of view, this is not good administration. But from a human point of view, from a spiritual point of view, these are human beings who must be salvaged, as I said a moment ago.

Mr. Chairman, the point I make is this. I am not interested in comparing our system here with the English system in the sense that, in England, they are dealing with people who are convicted for anything up to life imprisonment. We are dealing with people who are convicted for two years less a day. We are not dealing with the people who are convicted of capital punishment or other more serious crimes, but we are concerned about people who are convicted of petty crimes, crimes basically related to alcoholism, and crimes by youngsters, particularly young people who have not had an opportunity in this life, who just have not been trained sufficiently.

How can you expect, Mr. Chairman, a man with less than grade 8 education, no trade, no home, no foundation, to go right? Mr. Chairman, this is the simple fact, and I appeal to you today to take charge of this particular meeting. This is an opportunity that we have in this Legislature to do something about it. I commend the hon. Minister for his suggestion that research is necessary. Of course it is necessary and I would vote money for it if I had the opportunity, sir, but for the life of me I can see no specific vote that will provide me or my hon. member the opportunity to earmark money for research in this particular estimate.

I thoroughly agree that it is a difficult job to find psychologists today, to find doctors, to find others who are willing to make a livelihood of helping to reclaim these unfortunates. I do not belittle that problem; it is a big one, and any money that is used to set up scholarships—in fact to pay the board, lodging and tuition of people who will undertake that type of treatment—I would be all for it, but I think this is just

an enunciation of a goal without the practical implementation of the tools and the machinery to accomplish it.

Mr. Chairman, by way of introductory remarks I simply want to reiterate what I said last year. I am of the mind that this is a very difficult problem. I do not think this is a great political problem. I do not think we are going to win a lot of votes one way or the other, because, as I said, the public at large may be interested in such things as capital punishment and the like right now. But if we honestly want to do a job for human beings in this Legislature, I do not think there is any more effective attention that we can give than to give concentrated thought to what we can do to help a group in our population, that is characterized, as I said at the outset, by youth, by lack of education, by alcoholism and by a tendency to repeat—as on a treadmill—their appearances and reappearances and housing in our jails and reformatories. Certainly this is something that commands and demands our attention, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps the hon. leader of the Opposition misunderstood me when I referred to the new prison that was opened in the U.K. a year ago last month. It was for the training of youths of the type that we accommodate at Brampton, which I was using as comparison, because at Brampton—where we have the same class of boys who were going to this Hindley place—there are no bars on the windows and no locks on the doors and no walls around the place. I received this letter, if I may just interject it, from a person I never heard of, in Brampton. It came in today. He says:

The barracks-like buildings of the boys' training school at Brampton do not do much for the west side of the town. However, they probably serve as well as costly new buildings of more beauty.

I am just writing to suggest that it would be a healthy outdoor work if ambitious gardening and landscaping work were done as at the Guelph Reformatory where it stops people in admiration.

But he concludes by saying:

A school of this sort, near a big city like Toronto, is bound to be permanent and your broad plans for the future should include beautifying the area. The boys are popular with townspeople and behave themselves extremely well. We go over to watch ball games and other athletic

events and we feel you are doing a swell job with your programme.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I am baffled by the introductory remarks of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. I am very glad that the hon. leader of the Opposition had to speak first for I confess to him that for a time he left me speechless and this is not the condition I would like to be in, in trying to cope with the kind of estimates we have had presented to us today.

I would like to be fair with the hon. Minister, but the hon. Minister has come in here today with an introductory speech of self-congratulation and self-delusion. He is not even within reaching distance of reality. He comes in here and states, for example, that a year ago he was a newly appointed Minister and he was not in a position to speak knowledgeably for the department. I tell the hon. Minister that somebody has been kidding him, he still does not know what is going on in the department. He is not within miles of the facts. Come down off the clouds and come within reaching distance of the reality of the situation at the present time. He will not do it by a benign smile and a dapper appearance and that is about all we have had up until now.

For example, the hon. Minister says at the end that there is a road block and something should be done about this road block. He thinks we should establish an institute of penology in the universities so that we can train a professional staff. Mr. Chairman, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has quite rightly pointed out, what sort of a comment is this from an hon. Minister who claims that this is a road block? If it is a road block, why in heaven's name is the hon. Minister not coming in with something to remove the road block? But he has nothing. He has nothing at all.

Mr. Chairman, this is not our real problem. I grant you it is part of the real problem—that we have not got the professional staff. The real problem is that this department is so anti-professional in terms of the people you need for correction. Its philosophy is so foreign to the modern approach to penal reform that when you do get professional staff they, too, are on the treadmill—if I may use the term of the hon. leader of the Opposition—they are coming and they are going like the boys going into the jail. You are losing far more staff than you can get, so I grant you we need an institute of penology to train more staff. But even more basically,

we need a department that will come within reaching distance in the year 1962 of a philosophy that might hold and encourage and maintain staff once you get it.

While I am on this point, Mr. Chairman, let me refer to another one. A year or so ago there was an announcement with something of a flourish that this government was finally going to come to grips with the study of what I think is a very real problem. The hon. leader of the Opposition has pointed out the number of people in our institutions who are young people, juveniles. There has been growing recognition of the fact that some of these patterns of delinquency emerge while they are in school. The suggestion had been made—and apparently this idea had dropped and for a moment had captivated the attention of the people in the department—that perhaps we should make a study of this, perhaps we could find out what is the reason for these patterns of delinquency, perhaps we could do something corrective and thereby stop this shocking shameful flow of young people out of the schools, or right after the schools, into our jails and our reform institutions.

But what has happened to this proposal, Mr. Chairman? It died like every bright idea. It died because this government, this department, is not awake, first, to what is necessary to stop this problem; and, second, to the basic philosophy that will equip them to come to grips with it.

I was interested, Mr. Chairman, in the hon. Minister's comment that one of the great problems is public attention and public attitudes. I grant you this is a problem. But I want to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that our greatest problem is not the attitude of the public with regard to the offender when he gets out and is getting re-established and everything else. Even more basic, once again, is the essential 19th century attitude of this department. It is no good for the hon. Minister to come in here and read the usual routine "thank-you" letters from visitors who have come and visited departments and visited institutions. All he convinces me of with this is that he abused the time of people in these institutions to roll out the red carpet and mislead these people on what we are doing, so they went home with the self-delusions that the hon. Minister has displayed in the House this afternoon.

This is our basic problem. It is right back in the department.

Now I am not going to cover the whole field which the hon. leader of the Opposition

has touched today. I would say "amen" to most of what he has presented to the House. Incidentally, I would say I am glad to see that the Liberal party has stuck to it for one year, because for 10 years they were silent. Now, at least, apparently they are alive to the needs of reform institutions.

Mr. Chairman, last Monday I asked a question of the hon. Minister regarding Mimico. I want to take this case; I want to analyze it, because this is illustrative of the basic problem, if we come to grips with this problem and solve it, the solution to much else will flow from it.

I questioned the hon. Minister with regard to the situation at Mimico and what was his reply? It was summed up in this incredibly self-satisfied, smug comment: "I am informed that the situation at Mimico is working out satisfactorily."

Well, Mr. Chairman, what are the facts at Mimico? All of the full-time staff have resigned.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: The professional staff have all resigned. And at least one member of the part-time staff has resigned since, because he apparently does not want to waste his time being attached to an organization whose objectives are being fouled up in the fashion they are at the moment.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the department has deliberately broken up and has now lost a treatment team which it has taken 7 years to build up; and the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars of public funds—

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. MacDonald: —since the drug clinic was opened in 1955.

And thirdly, Mr. Chairman, the top replacements who have been brought in—the rest of the staff there, will be leaving early in the new year and where you are going to get replacements for those will be interesting to watch for advertisements in the UK—but the top replacements are relatively unqualified and inexperienced in the field so we are right back, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning in building this vital treatment team; right back where we started in the year 1955! With a callousness and an apparent indifference that really shocks me, Mr. Chairman, the department has moved arbitrarily to destroy this team that had been built up over those 7 years.

In the face of all this the hon. Minister

blithely states he is informed that the situation is working out satisfactorily in Mimico. This cautious wording of the hon. Minister—that he is informed—it seems to me, reveals that despite this crisis in Mimico the hon. Minister has not taken the trouble to investigate the situation personally; otherwise he would not have to be informed by somebody else. I suggest that he should have investigated it personally. His actions and statements come very close to being irresponsible as a Minister of the Crown in this House; he simply does not know what is going on. Despite his own claims to the contrary he is still not on top of the situation after being a year in the department.

Furthermore, to suggest in face of this situation that everything is working out satisfactorily reveals a smug unconcern and a failure to realize the full tragedy and loss of what has happened. It reveals once again that the basic crisis that this department has faced for years, of not being able to resolve the conflict between custodial needs and the treatment objectives of any modern penal reform institution, has flared up anew—right in this show piece of the government, the clinics that he is boasting about along with the woods farms.

And if there was any doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, I put a supplementary question to the hon. Minister on this. I wanted to make very sure that I was not going to be unfair to him. I asked him a question with relation to the drug clinic, as to whether treatment or custodial needs were going to have predominance? Which was going to be given first consideration in their treatment clinic? And what was his reply? "In the clinics at Mimico there are custodial institutions." He has repeated the same today. You see, he wallows in his mistaken concepts.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat—I want to be fair about this. I recognize the difficulties of reconciling custodial and treatment programmes. I recognize that every time there is an escape or there is a riot, it creates public relations problems, but the trouble with this department is that it is so unsure of its objectives that every time that this kind of thing happens, they panic. They are fearful that there will be a riot. The hon. Minister even said he was fearful there was going to be a riot out in the drug clinic, with 25 men in it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege.

The Minister did not say anything of the sort. He had no fear of a riot. A "riot" was not his word, even if the hon. member

read it from a paper. A report must have been made before the Minister ever spoke. I never have complained before that I was misquoted. The passage in the paper, I am sure, was written by an enthusiastic reporter before the Minister had even spoken. We had no expectation whatever of a riot or anything of the sort.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, all I will say is that I want to congratulate that newspaper man because his perspicacity is worthy of a medal. If he misquoted the hon. Minister in doing so he accurately reflected the philosophy and the attitude of the department. You are paralyzed with fear that if you do the right thing—if you do the right thing in building a treatment programme—you may cut down on the custodial needs to the point that you are going to get into some sort of difficulty. You always put that as the top consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I was saying, before the hon. Minister interrupted me, that I recognize that this is a problem in all institutions—to balance out the necessary custodial needs, to maintain discipline with these people who are offenders before the law and yet to get an effective treatment programme integrated with it.

But I want to say that if one moves from the general reform institution into the clinics surely there is no doubt in the wide world what the purpose of these institutions is. Surely when the hon. Minister comes and says the clinics in Mimico are custodial institutions, he just does not know what he is talking about. And if he thinks he knows what he is talking about, the department does not know what he is talking about because the clinics in Mimico are surely treatment institutions! Ninety-eight per cent treatment and 2 per cent maybe for custodial! And yet you are running those institutions, Mr. Chairman, you are running them about 96 per cent custodial and 4 per cent treatment!

I am not going to stick with the figures; I only picked them out of thin air; but the custodial needs are the predominant consideration and that is why you have got the problem that you are now attempting to solve in this arbitrary, ruthless fashion, by dismissing the whole team that you have built up in the last 7 years. Do not shake your head. You are only indicating once again that you cannot face reality when it is right there in front of you, staring you in the face. This is your problem.

I want to go back and put this into perspective for a moment. I came into this House

in 1955. For the first 3 or 4 years I was in it I was in tumultuous battles every year when we considered the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions. I was proud to take up that battle, because in doing so I was only picking up on what had been done by other people in my party for years—people like Agnes Macphail, who achieved such a position that no Tory could criticize and challenge her contribution in this field.

I took up the fight because we had a government that was arid in its Victorian concepts, that looked upon the offender as some sort of lesser breed who deserved all he got in an institution, that thought the punitive approach was the whole thing. We had people in the Cabinet, from the then Prime Minister down, boasting and glorying in the fact that this province had the worst record in terms of corporal punishments in its institutions of any country in the world—except South Africa with its treatment of the black people. This went on for 3 or 4 years, and when I got up and tried to present it, I had vilification heaped on me in the true Tory fashion of the day.

Then we had a new regime, the Wardrope regime, in which, at least, that man brought into the department's approach a sense of humanity. He recognized that offenders were human beings who had gone wrong; that they were human beings who had the capacity to reform; and that the purpose of this department, unless it was going to pour money down the drain by making certain that these people would not be on the treadmill and back into the institutions, was to seek to reform them instead of satisfying its own emotional feelings in a punitive programme.

So we have made some progress. I said to the Minister then, sir, and I repeat it now, that I had an undercurrent of misgivings as to how much progress we could make because I think that mixed with his humane approach was an excessive sentimentalism, perhaps typified by the comments of the then Minister that they were the "finest of the fine". That is going from one extreme to the other.

You can look down upon these as unclaimed and unclaimable human beings but to go to the other end and say they were the finest of the fine was characteristic of excessive sentimentalism. But at least, Mr. Chairman, there was hope—at least there was a spirit of humanity—in the approach of the Minister. I had hoped that that spirit of humanity would be communicated and would be translated into a treatment pro-

gramme within the department. But that Minister left and we got a new Minister.

We got a new Minister, sir, who started out very early in his career by giving almost incontrovertible proof that he did not recognize what had to be done at the present time in terms of reform institutions. Not only have we all of these continuing problems, but we have a new challenging situation.

We have the Fauteux commission report opening up the prospect that within a short time we are going to be relieved of sentences—not only under two years, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has emphasized, but all sentences except those up to 6 months—and since we have tens of thousands of people in the district and the county jails, which are the funnels bringing people into our institutions, surely anybody who sat down and spent only 5 minutes of thought would have recognized the absolute necessity, the common sense, the logic of integrating the county jails and the district jails into our system so that we could develop some sort of corrective and effective approach.

But what was the decision of the hon. Minister? I do not know whether it was his or the Scrooges on the Treasury Board benches, or whose; it was the government's decision—they are not going to integrate the jails. So here we are, with county jails and district jails on one hand—something of a rump of a penal reform system which the Fauteux commission has put into effect involving only those up to 6 months—and we are going to be playing around with this.

Well, I can assure you it is a perfect set-up for the hon. Minister, because he is playing around with everything; he is going to have a perfect situation to continue to play around with. He refuses to make that basic integration which will give this province an opportunity to do, within the field left to them, a really constructive and positive kind of job.

I must say that I just lost confidence. I lost faith that he was going to tackle this job very early in the game. But now, what has happened out at Mimico is an illustration that when I lost confidence and lost faith I had good reason to do so. What has happened out there, Mr. Chairman, is this: Almost a year or so ago at Mimico the professional staff became unhappy with the situation. They made representations to the department, to sit down and to talk with them. Essentially, the problem, Mr. Chairman, was the problem of trying to resolve

this conflict between the custodial and the treatment approach.

What happened? Well, my information is that they got no reaction from the department, no coming to grips with the thing, they had fleeting visits from people from the department, they again had Victorian admonitions from the people of the department. The net result was that the situation went from bad to worse. The government, in its lack of wisdom on the point, decided that the way to deal with this is: Here are one or two troublemakers; and what you do with troublemakers? You disperse them. So of their own volition the government decided that they would break up this treatment team. They took the two top people and transferred them to other institutions.

Now let me emphasize one point here, Mr. Chairman, which has been confused in the news stories. These people have not resigned because they had been transferred, they had resigned because the department refused to come to grips with the problem which they presented to the department. And if the hon. Minister thinks that I am misrepresenting the situation, I challenge him to table in this House the letters of resignation that he has from these people and the reasons they gave for resigning.

Once they had been transferred and had tendered their resignation, we discover that the rest of the treatment team—6 other people who had been working with them—have decided that they do not want to have any more of it, so they have resigned, too. So here you have a treatment team, built up over 7 years, at the expenditure of tens of thousands of dollars of public money, hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money, and this government has deliberately dispersed it because they could not cope with it. And they could not cope with it because they have not a clue as to what that treatment team was attempting to do out there. This is our problem. Well, what are we going to do about it, Mr. Chairman?

I want to say that this department policy—and this Mimico situation just illustrates it—has collapsed in failure in the very institution which has been the showpiece of the reform institution programme. It has done so in part because of the mismanagement of this developing situation, mismanagement born of the weakness and vacillation in the departmental leadership and a willingness to seek a solution by destroying the treatment team which had been built up. But it collapsed, Mr. Chairman, mainly because of the basic conflict in policy which must be resolved if

we are ever going to build a more effective reform team, or reform programme.

As it is, our reform institutions still boast of a record number of persons who are more likely to become recidivists than to fit back into society as law-abiding, constructive members of the community.

This year we are being asked, Mr. Chairman, to increase the estimates from \$15 million to \$19 million. We cannot do this without assuring ourselves that this money is going to be effectively spent. It cannot be effectively spent if we do not resolve this conflict in policy. Nothing is more important. And for that reason, what happened at the Mimico clinic should not be hidden from the public. Its seriousness should not be dismissed or minimized by Pollyanna statements that all is going satisfactorily. And obviously, such cannot be the case except on the basis of conceding that we have lost much of the achievement of the past 7 years.

I would urge the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman—indeed, I urge the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), who has often displayed a commendable willingness to grasp the nettle in this kind of situation—that we should have a public hearing before a special committee of the Legislature, if it cannot be referred to one of the standing committees. We should invite the testimony of the staff members who have resigned. Let them present to us the problems which they sought in vain to present, and get the solution from the department.

We should invite experts in this field from the school of social work—organizations interested in rehabilitation such as the John Howard and the Elizabeth Fry. And we should provide an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, for men who have been through the clinic at Mimico to express their views, some of whom are not only willing to do so but are anxious to do so. To sweep this whole issue under the rug would be irresponsible on our part. My proposal would provide an opportunity for the full airing that is needed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a specific proposal that I wanted to make, but I want to go back a bit to underline another factor. On Monday I had a visit in my office from a recent graduate, if I may describe him as such, from the drug clinic at Mimico. This is a man who has been an addict for something over 15 years. He has had a number of narcotic charges. The charge from which he is just now about to be released—in fact it was for the latter part of his term that he was transferred to Mimico for treatment there—was the charge of possession of stolen goods.

Once again, all in the familiar pattern for a person who is an addict is driven compulsively to get the wherewithal to buy the drugs, and so he becomes involved in stealing and the possession of stolen goods.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that was exciting—and I sometimes wonder whether anybody in this department at the head level can really capture the excitement of this—this man sat in front of my desk in room 249 in this building and with a quiet confidence said that “for the first time in 15 years I can walk the street free of drugs. I am not the victim of the needle and the eye-dropper.”

Now I recognize that, perhaps, behind that front of quiet confidence there was a battle going on that he is going to lose tomorrow. And do you know why he might well lose it, Mr. Chairman? Because when this man came out of Mimico, on parole, having had his treatment, what happened? Well, he was given \$20, he was taken to a room on a street in the central part of the city here which is right in the well-known drug trafficking area, a \$6 a week room. And he went out to start to look for a job. He had \$6 to pay for his rent for the first week and he had \$14 to live on. Now I invite you all to consider how long \$14 for food would keep you going.

He got some sort of a job or, to be completely accurate on this, a week or so later he was able to get a loan or hand-out—I do not know which it was—of \$15 more. He got a job, but before he could get his first wage, which was going to be two weeks later, he completely ran out of money and he was given a loan of \$10. And with that \$10 he paid \$6 in rent and he had \$4 left for another five days before he would get his first pay cheque. He made this comment to me: “Under these circumstances if the authorities wanted to prove conclusively that parole of a drug addict would not work, they could not have done it better.” And, I submit, this is the case.

I know that here you get back to public attitudes again. I know that public attitude is, “Here is a man who has been an offender before the law for 15 years, he has been a drug addict—he is this, he is that, and the next thing—let him go out and fend for himself.” But we have got to make up our minds in this conflict of Victorian principles and approaches.

If we are willing to spend tens of thousands of dollars to build the institution to treat this man, why be penny wise and pound foolish and turn him out into a centre of the city

in a \$6 dingy room—invite him to go out and look for a job when there are 200,000 people unemployed in the community? The only people he is likely to meet out in the street, whom he will know, are the people in the drug business, or the prostitutes whom he has known in the past; and we think this is going to save him, this is going to rehabilitate him.

This happened within the past month. Now I say this to the hon. Minister: This man says, “I am cured,” and I know there are other people who would hope to God that a week from today he still will be cured, because he said 3 out of 7 who came out at the same time are now back. They have been charged and are back in the institutions. When will his time come? How long can he win the battle against odds which are almost impossible—odds which our rehabilitation programme sets up?

This man says, “I am grateful for the fact that I got successful treatment there. I am free for the first time in 15 years.” But then he began to tell me of how he won with the co-operation of the professional staff and what they did, and some of the problems and tasks the professional staff had, working in a custodial atmosphere.

A custodial atmosphere, Mr. Chairman, that has gone this far: The department in its panic at the present time has sent letters out to the staff, in effect instructing them that they cannot have personal contact with people who have graduated from the clinic. If they do, presumably they will risk the appearance of having violated their “official secrets Act” and get themselves into difficulty.

In other words, the confidence and trust that is built up between the professional people and this man, this government deliberately wants to cut off. Once they have gone out—maybe the staff person is the only one in the area, the only one he can go back to as he feels that he is losing the battle and is going to relapse to his old addiction, the only man he can go back to and trust as he seeks to bolster his determination not to relapse.

This man said to me: “I am grateful for the cure, but I am distressed.” That was not his word—I cannot think of how powerful the word was, but it was powerful. “I would like to testify to what is going on. I would like to come before the committee and tell my side of the story,” he said.

Incidentally, he said that he thought there were others who were willing to do the same thing, too. It is within that context

that I think we have got to come to grips with the resolving of this conflict in The Department of Reform Institutions by a public hearing in which we will analyze what happened in Mimico, because what happened in Mimico is the continuing and basic problem of this department.

Let us listen to the professional staff. Not have them blocked off—the road block is the government itself. Let us not disperse them and then come up with this fatuous proposal that we will establish an institute of penology to meet the problem. Without money, right? Listen to the staff.

Listen to people from the school of social work and Elizabeth Fry and the John Howard societies; indeed, listen to the people who have graduated from these institutions and who can perhaps give the most meaningful kind of testimony. And if we do that, it is conceivable that this government and this department will get some grasp of the reality, will solve the basic problem, and then we can vote \$19 million that will be used effectively instead of perpetuating the treadmill to get more of our citizens back into the institutions.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2001.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Could I make a few general remarks?

Mr. Chairman, I was amazed, as the other two hon. speakers were, at the self-satisfaction that the hon. Minister has in his department. You only have to examine the records of the department, and I would like, with my hon. leader, to emphasize the fact that the latest records we have on this department are dated March 31, 1961. I think that in future the department should see to it—and we hope that by next year there is a new administration here—that we have the records of this department so that we can keep up to date.

But even the records as they are, show that for this government to say that their means of—for example—classifying prisoners is up to date and is something worthwhile, certainly means that they have no idea of the modern means of classifying prisoners. Not only that, but they have completely ignored the recommendations of a committee set up by this government.

The committee, chaired by W. J. Stewart, who, in March, 1954, went into detail as to how prisoners should be classified. For example, the committee recommended that a full-scale reception centre be established to receive, study, diagnose and recommend

treatment for all first offenders, aged 16 to 25, male and female, sentenced to our institutions; that the length of stay be 6 weeks to two months except for short-term prisoners. That facilities be extended in the future to receive all first-offenders and all repeaters.

Well now, this has continued to be ignored, and the present set-up is still that in our jails the experienced criminal is mingled with the first offender. That same committee also said this: "The committee recommends that segregation be based on thorough study and classification carried out in a reception centre, that particular care be taken in the segregation for proper treatment of sex deviates, the mentally defective, and the mentally retarded; alcoholics and drug addicts"—and I might say in here, Mr. Chairman, we have seen how the care of the drug addicts is certainly falling behind—"that psychopaths be segregated from the general inmate population and that reformable inmates be kept separate from those not likely to reform." And the committee goes on, "that segregation within institutions be complete with no intermingling of different groups."

Well, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that essentially this government has continued to carry out the policies that they have had as of old, and they seem to have no intention of going ahead and making the changes. Just to give you an example of what is needed, and could be done: The hon. Minister talked about a letter he had from a man in England, saying what a wonderful set-up we had here.

I would suggest that if, in Ontario, we used the Borstal system that they have in England, we might be better off if the hon. Minister took a trip to England so he would be able to write a letter to the Englishman saying what a fine system they have.

As far as inmates aged 16 to 24 are concerned in the Borstal system, the hon. Minister is in need of advice, and I suggest he listen to this. A number of features of the Borstal system, which might be applied to Ontario institutions with great advantages, are these: A greater number and variety of training schools so that the correctional programme will have flexibility and the capacity to permit experimentation; emphasis on smallness in the individual institutions so that the inmates can receive personalized attention and treatment; and emphasis on the staffing of institutions with professional personnel and trained instructors whose chief function is treatment and rehabilitation, not custody.

Now I might interject here, emphasizing the professional personnel, because last year

when the hon. Minister was speaking to this House he said he was seeking 15 teachers and 13 rehabilitation officers and 7 social workers and 7 psychologists, 2 psychiatrists. Well, I do not know how many of these people he has hired or how many have resigned, but I would rather suspect that he has not hired too many, because he did not make one mention of them in his speech. If he could say anything good about himself I am sure he would have done so.

Continuing from a need of professional personnel, is this, that there should be more consideration of lengthening sentences so that a training programme can take effect. Now there again, Mr. Chairman, I am reading what is done in the Borstal system in England. A separation of offenders according to their needs so that cross-fertilization of crime does not take place and junior institutions do not become schools of crime. A minimum of one year's parole supervision after release to assure continuity of interest in the boy—that boy will be from 16 to 24—to judge the effectiveness of the institution's programmes of reform and to assist the inmate to adjust to the community.

This type of thing is very important, Mr. Chairman. The average age of an inmate of our institutions, as our hon. leader has said, is 24 years. How the hon. Minister can say that their correctional system is improving when we bear this in mind that in 1950, 29 per cent of the inmates of our reform institutions had been sentenced three times or more, and that in 1960 it went up to 43 per cent. This situation is getting worse, not better, and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the essential reason for it is that the government is giving no leadership and not seeking to do anything.

Now, in 1960, the hon. Minister, I believe, had appointed a minister's advisory committee on the treatment of the offender. We have not heard a word about that group, and perhaps it is another of those committees that have been formed by this government to give the pretence that they are doing something. I suggest that it is nothing more than a pretence that this department is doing something, for we have not heard a word and I would like to hear from the hon. Minister if that committee is meeting, if it is going to bring in a report, or if it has brought in a report.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer some of the points made by the hon. member for Parkdale. With respect first of all to the implementing of some of

the recommendations of that select committee of the House that suggested we should have the classification of first offenders I would say to him that all young first offenders who go to Guelph are interviewed by psychologists and social workers and other professional teams and all are divided on a systematic basis, which we call classification.

We go further in a classification of our prisoners directly in line with the proposals of that select committee, and we segregate the psychopaths or the serious behaviour problem cases; we segregate the sex offenders; we segregate the dope addicts. They all go to Millbrook and each is kept in his own group. There is no cross-fertilization of these groups, just as he suggests.

He spoke of the opportunities for training afforded under the Borstal system, and I would suggest to him again that he visit the industrial training centre at Brampton, through which a flow of these selected or classified young men pass. About two-thirds of them all go out on parole before their sentences are up and our records show that 60 per cent of them have never reappeared during the 15 years the school has been operating there.

Mr. Trotter: How many are in Brampton? I think you have about 9,000 altogether in the institutions, but how many of the 9,000 are in Brampton?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The flow through Brampton is between 200 and 300. There is another training centre for the same class of young man who has a lower I.Q., because we divide that group on their I.Q. basis. Those with the lower I.Q. are processed similarly through the training centre at Burch, but because of their lack of basic training the emphasis is on satisfying their educational needs to bring them up to the place where they can take more of this training. At Brampton I think we have 11 different trade classes and academic training, and at Burch we have academic training as the basic course, and 3 trade classes.

There was one other point the hon. member for Parkdale advanced, and that was with regard to the size of the institutions. I think last year it was he who suggested we should combine the many units we have in what might be an uneconomical operation at Cobourg. I pointed out to him then that I did not particularly favour large institutions; that I thought that better work, especially with the young people, can be done in the smaller institutions. These two new schools that we opened this year, one for boys and

one for girls, of maximum capacities of 125 each, I think are the kind of set-ups which will commend themselves to the hon. member.

As regards the size of our institutions generally, Burwash for the long-time repeaters is a big institution. Guelph is a big institution though it houses a number of different, separated units; and while the bulk number might be as high as 800, and I guess it has been higher than that at times, it really comprises a number of separate units. Other than those, we have tried to develop smaller units for the very reason I think the hon. member has in mind. Better work can be done in a smaller, rather than a larger, unit. Yet these compare with units in the United States where they have, as he suggested, thousands of prisoners; or, as I mentioned from the statistics, in England where they have very large populations crowded together. I think these mitigate against the best work being done.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, the remarks I made about classification certainly apply to 8,700 to 8,800 of the inmates. Whatever you do at Brampton that is an improvement; but I am thinking of the vast majority which is about 8,700 or 8,800. Again I want to emphasize about your classification because last year I asked the hon. Minister this question on classification and this is the answer I got back:

"Every sentenced prisoner upon admission to all institutions in the province appears individually before a classification committee at which time a decision is made regarding the programme of training he can follow and it is outlined to him at that time." Then the hon. Minister also stated "that only after a careful study is made of the prisoner's case history, and he is personally interviewed by the classification committee, is a final decision made."

Certainly this classification committee does not follow the recommendation that was made by the report in 1954. It certainly does not follow the Fauteux report. It does not follow the way it has been done in outstanding institutions in British Columbia and California, because your classification committee consists of the superintendents from the Ontario training centres of Burtch and Brampton plus a psychologist from Guelph.

Again I think it was pointed out to the hon. Minister last year: How can these two superintendents, together with their other duties, look after properly the 9,000 inmates that come under his control? It just cannot be done properly.

Again I commend to the hon. Minister the recommendation of a committee of this government made 8 years ago—that I think it is time he did something.

This other question I asked before and it is: What has happened to the hon. Minister's advisory committee on the treatment of the offender? That was back in 1960, over two years ago. What has happened to it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I have explained to the hon. member that classification is very thorough and very complete, I think. When a man is sentenced, if he is a long time recidivist, he goes automatically to Burwash. If he is a short time repeater he goes to one of the many smaller industrial farms. If he is a first time offender of any age, or a young man under 21, he goes initially to Guelph and there the classification is further done; the sifting is carried on further at Guelph.

If, as I say, he is one of the serious cases like a pathological case, or a behaviour problem, or a sex offender, or a dope addict, who requires close custody, he goes to a particular wing or section of our maximum security institution at Millbrook. Then out of Guelph this further classification ensues; those who have possibilities for making good use of the kind of training that goes on in Brampton or Burtch are selected, and then are further screened and divided on an I.Q. basis.

At Guelph we may have yet another group of young men of comparable desire for reform but lacking the educational qualifications, even lacking the ambition or the initiative or the motivation to take advantage of either of the courses. They are sent to one of our wood camp operations. I give the hon. member that further explanation of the breakdown into the many different sections. We do not have a lot of mixup in our institutions, but keep confining various types of prisoner in yet smaller and smaller divisions.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): In connection with this, sir, it seems to me that you have suggested the basis of classification is on being a short term repeater. I think that was the term you used.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Repeaters, or short term repeaters, those groups are taken out. All repeaters, as I say, are taken out.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, well just on that point, sir, surely you are basing the classification on the record or on the crime. I would hope that our philosophy would be based

on the individual; first on his psychological classification. As you say, it would take a short time to classify if your basis is simply on the crime record. But I would hope that we would get more to the root of the problem, we would be looking at the people from the point of rehabilitation and that you therefore would want to have a very intensive social study done on the background if it was first offenders. I noticed where the Rotary Club, sir, of which you are probably a member, appearing, I think, in Ottawa, suggested that there should be mandatory pre-sentence reports for all first offenders.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It was at the Toronto Rotary Club, before the committee on juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you very much. I would feel again that on first offenders in many cases you do not have a complete social study. The way that you are presenting your process of classification I would think that with first offenders, often you would not have a social study of them.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: On all first offenders—

Mr. Thompson: Well, when I went out to one of the institutions with the deputy Minister, an honourable gentleman, I remember when I went there—and I do not want it disclosed whom I was talking to—but on talking to one of the chief people in charge of the treatment of inmates, I asked this person: "Do you study social background reports on your incoming inmates?" And she said: "No, I like to keep an open mind. I do not want to know the background on them."

I would suggest there is real confusion. I suggest, sir, as the hon. member for Parkdale suggested, that you are not getting deeply into the background study. The previous Minister of Reform Institutions at the United Nations congress had emphasized, as you yourself did, when I asked you last year about the aims of the department, that one of the aims with which you concurred, was to have a complete screening process. And yet, when you suggest this process on the record of crime, on the record of recidivism, then I do not think that there is really any depth to your screening; rather it is most superficial.

An hon. member: More of a sieve than a screen.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member will appreciate that at this point, in this classification, we do use the

criminal record of the prisoner. I think that is so. I do not think that we could operate the way we do and carry on our programme as we do, unless that were taken into consideration.

If we are to make the best use of these training schools, training centres we call them, like Brampton and Burtch, we find that they operate best, and the hon. gentleman opposite will agree with this, under minimum security conditions. If we have repeaters, we cannot have minimum security. We are doing the best work with the largest number by segregating those who have had previous records and reserving this type of training to the group of selected first offenders.

That does not mean that we do not do anything with those who are repeaters and those who are short term on industrial farms, or with the long-term repeaters that go to Burwash. It is simply a part of the overall breakdown that occurs during our wide programme of classification.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I am just thinking, for example, of the large number which, the hon. leader of my party has pointed out, the large number of young people who have an alcoholic problem. This has started their downfall, and I am sure unless there is something done on a therapeutic basis they will have this alcoholic problem for many years. There will continue the tradition that they will be in and out of jail steadily, but—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would not disagree with my hon. friend, but what he is speaking about are the short sentences that have the prisoners held in jail while they discharge their sentence of from 1 to 30 days. I think they are the ones to which the hon. leader of the Opposition was referring mostly.

Mr. Thompson: I am also thinking of the person who has come up before the court. For example, he might have been up before the Lindsay court, if I could take that constituency, after getting drunk on some occasion. He received a record there. And then he got a couple of other sentences, but just because he has had 3 records—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: If he has been committed to our institutions 2 or 3 times, but not just to jail—

Mr. Thompson: It has to be through your institutions. You do not keep a record if he has gone to a jail.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That would not mitigate against his being sent to one of these training centres. Indeed, we have prisoners who have been with us before, and are with us as second offenders, or even third offenders that in exceptional cases have been sent to Brampton. But this screening is designed to transfer to Brampton those whom we feel can make the most use of that kind of training under the minimum security we feel it is desirable to maintain in an institution of that kind.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, as I listened this afternoon to the very able criticisms that are addressed to this hon. Minister and to this department by my hon. colleagues and the hon. member for York South, Mr. Chairman, I began to wonder what had happened to this great new government we have been hearing about. The new, young, enlightened group.

Surely, I would say to the hon. Prime Minister, among all this sea of faces that you have here at the moment—they perhaps will not be here too long, Mr. Chairman, but they are here at the moment—you could have found a bright young man to take over this department and catch some of the imagination and challenge that it needs.

Mr. Chairman: We are now on vote 2001.

Mr. Singer: Yes, we are still on the main office. This is a logical and reasonable criticism of the conduct of this department and the hon. Minister running it.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Such as the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer).

Mr. Singer: I was coming to the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe. One of the speakers in this debate mentioned that the hon. Minister's predecessor had some compassion. The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe has impressed me in the same manner and I wonder if he had been given the opportunity, would he not have done a wonderful job in this department.

But he made a mistake. He ran for the leadership and said some things that people did not like to hear.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wonder why this hon. Minister, who has had a series of tragedies throughout his whole supervision of this department, has not begun to see the light. You recall, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning there was the question of whether or not the jails should be within the juris-

diction of the province or the municipalities. Against all the advice that was proffered, against the advice of the select committee that my hon. friend referred to, against the advice of all of the authorities, the hon. Minister took the easy course out and threw the jails and their staffs back to the municipalities. It was his first big mistake and it caused essential confusion since that time on.

My hon. colleague from Parkdale asked about the hon. Minister's advisory committee on the treatment of the offenders, the one that his predecessor talked about in 1960. In 1961 it was supposed to study a correctional programme. I notice in the public accounts that certain moneys have been expended on behalf of the personnel who make up that committee. We have asked for a report. My hon. colleague asked for it just a few moments ago. We have not heard one word from you in well over a year about what this committee has been doing. Is it working? Is it functioning? Is it reporting? Or is it just taking a portion of the public accounts and spending some of the money to advise somebody who is not listening or who has not received a report; or if he has received a report, he has not got the courage to bring it into the House and show it to us, or does not want to do anything with it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think I answered in part the same kind of question last year from the hon. leader of the Opposition, that the advisory committee is the Minister's advisory counsel, that I considered their reports privileged and that I think the hon. leader of the Opposition agreed that they were probably more useful if they were so treated. At least, that is my attitude toward it and that is the way I intend it should be.

Mr. Singer: Well, is this not a fascinating thing? Can the hon. Minister point to one thing that this advisory committee has recommended that he has acted upon? Just one!

Shall I pause while you stand up and do it or have you an answer? Tell us one—the hon. Minister cannot or he will not. This is typical of the attitude of the hon. Minister.

In 1961, the hon. Minister will recall, my hon. leader advised you that the department did still not employ one full-time psychiatrist. Two or three times this afternoon you have been asked the same question. You have not advised us yet. Surely, in this \$19 million that you are asking for this afternoon, one would have thought that there would be provision for this kind of official to be employed, if you could find one who would work for this department as it is presently constituted.

The obvious answer, Mr. Chairman, is that there are not people of this calibre and this training who want to work with this hon. Minister and want to work with this department.

And then we hear about a road block, the bleating and wailing that there is a road block created.

The Fauteux commission, and I am sure the hon. Minister is familiar with it, said this:

We believe that a university education peculiar to work in the correction field has not been satisfactorily developed, despite recommendations for such courses of study in the Archambault report of 1938. In-service programmes in the penitentiary branch, and in provincial and municipal agencies, are not adequate substitutes for pre-service training at a university level.

What do we get from the hon. Minister in the face of all these reports? We get talk about a road block.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Arrant nonsense! The hon. member I am sure understands that the Archambault and the Fauteux reports to which he is referring were reports to the federal government and that the federal government, under an administration of his party, accepted these for long years and did nothing.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Well, that is no excuse.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would have expected, even from this hon. Minister, a more intelligent reply than that. These two reports, prepared by able and capable commissions, set out principles that the hon. Minister should have made his bible when he took on this new department. Instead he says they were prepared by another jurisdiction.

If the hon. Minister has not the intelligence or the knowledge or the ability to understand that if learned information is available to him he should take advantage of it, then what I said at the beginning of my remarks applies even more than I thought it did. He has no business being Minister of anything.

Then, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend, my colleague from Parkdale, was talking about classification officers. We got the double-talk this afternoon that we had last year—the department has a classification committee. To elaborate again on what my hon. leader said just a year ago, and I think these words bear repetition, the hon. Minister's statement

a year ago on how this committee operates was this:

Every sentenced prisoner, upon admission to all institutions—

and this substantially is what he said this afternoon:

—appears individually before the classification committee at which time a decision is made regarding the programme of training that he has to follow and it is outlined to him at that time.

The hon. Minister also stated a year ago, and again this afternoon:

Only after careful study is made of the prisoner's case history and he is personally interviewed by the classification committee is a final decision made. The classification committee consists of the superintendents from Ontario training centres at Burch and Brampton, plus the psychologist at Guelph.

As my hon. colleague from Parkdale pointed out, 9,000 men were committed to Ontario institutions in 1960. If you remove the 200 who were in Brampton, it is still unbelievable, Mr. Chairman, that such a committee as this could possibly provide anything remotely resembling adequate classification. It is difficult to understand how such a committee, composed of these superintendents, could make a careful study of the prisoner's case history when, in addition, they have the responsibility of administering their own institutions.

The Fauteux commission again, and I suppose in the hon. Minister's life this is a nasty word to mention, but the Fauteux commission did say, and I hope he pays a little attention, that in classification in every prison there should be one senior classification officer with one assistant for every 150 inmates. The chief classification officer should be a person with thorough professional qualifications, including a knowledge of psychology and social work. The report goes on to say: "A survey of the situation in Canadian prisons both federal and provincial"—I trust the hon. Minister heard that—"showed classification procedures completely inadequate to the task involved."

It is painfully obvious, Mr. Chairman, that The Department of Reform Institutions still, in the middle of December in 1962, just does not have adequate personnel or a programme or imagination or realization or understanding of the challenge, to operate a modern system of correction.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: May I interrupt while the hon. member is looking at his reference?

I suggest with regard to the classification that they made reference to in the report, I can understand the view of the commission thinking in terms primarily of federal penitentiaries and provincial prisons other than Ontario, for these are great big prisons with hundreds, if not thousands, of prisoners, for which there are no adequate classifications. It is very different in all other jurisdictions in Canada from what it is in Ontario. I endeavoured to make that clear to my hon. friend in the House on several occasions, that the classification stems from the very time the man is sentenced, that he goes any one of more than half a dozen different ways, and that for those who do go to Guelph there is the further screening or sifting for classification. This is a secondary classification, that follows the original classification, and I do not suppose that there is anything—there is nothing, I am sure—to approximate that in the federal system or in any other province in the country.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the hon. Minister and I and the hon. gentlemen who spoke earlier today just are not talking the same language. In the report I read from the Fauteux commission, it has talked about federal and provincial institutions and it did not say "except Ontario". I would presume, since there are only 10 provinces in Canada, if the Fauteux commission had intended to exempt Ontario, it would have taken the trouble in that quotation to exempt Ontario. But it did not. Now I presume the hon. Minister does not agree with what the Fauteux reports says, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The hon. member might upgrade himself too, because the Fauteux report is about 7 or 8 years old.

Mr. Singer: Do you agree with it or not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It does not apply to Ontario today.

Mr. Singer: It is wonderful the way the hon. Minister just passes these matters off and just ignores the recommendations of these learned groups set up to study the very problems that he has been asked to administer, the way the hon. Minister can ignore completely the reasonable and intelligent criticism that has been offered to him in this House for well over the year that he has had this office, and say that everything is fine and all is right with the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am saying that everything is not fine in the penal institutions in the province of Ontario and the hon. Minister is

the man responsible for this state of affairs. The hon. Minister's predecessor, in an article published in the *Canadian Journal of Corrections* in July of 1961 had this to say:

We are in the process of setting up a research department. Only by scientific appraisal of the value of our projects, of the effectiveness of the current of planned programmes can we progress. We need to know what is useful, what could be useful, what is proving effective, what more could be done.

These are the right words; but the record of the department in translating these words into deeds is so dismal that it is difficult to have any confidence at all in this sort of pronouncement. We heard more of the same nonsense this afternoon.

The only funds set aside by the department to date that could be even remotely connected with research was a grant in the estimates a year ago for \$9,000 to Ontario universities for psychology and social work; and this, Mr. Chairman, is \$9,000 from a budget of over \$19 million.

The Junior League of Toronto, by comparison, has for several years made an annual grant of \$15,000 to the University of Toronto to support the work of a full-time criminologist. Are we to conclude, or must we conclude, I suggest we have no other choice, that the women of the Junior League are more concerned about a scientific approach than the department itself? Because all we get from the hon. Minister is talk about a road block.

It has been rumoured that a department research officer will be appointed. My hon. leader said it a year ago. If it had happened it would have been a small step forward. But we did not hear about it this afternoon, so we presume there has not been very much in the rumour.

It is recognized by those who have made study of crime a lifetime profession, that its intensive analysis is beyond the scope of any one scientific discipline. What we desperately need is an independent interdisciplinary institute for applied studies in criminology. This may be the roadblock that the hon. Minister was talking about, but surely it is up to him to do something about it and not to make silly speeches.

The University of Montreal has already taken steps in this direction. Other institutes are being established by the United Nations organization and one is presently operating at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Such

an institute should be set up in Ontario. We are fortunate in already having in this province some of the scholars who could help to start it. But it is the responsibility of this department and this hon. Minister to do something more about it than to tell us about road blocks.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister a couple of questions with respect to inmates in our institutions? Would the hon. Minister tell me how many of our first offenders do not repeat?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I just could not answer the question.

Mr. Singer: No, naturally.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: How do you know that an offender is not going to repeat tomorrow?

I was able to say to the House that of the men who go through Brampton, two-thirds—I think 67 per cent—go out on parole before their time is up. Over the 15 years that it has been in operation more than 60 per cent have never reappeared.

I think the hon. member will appreciate that there is no end to this, that we do not know how many are in now who, when they are just released, will repeat or not. But those are the records we have been keeping carefully over 15 years as regards the institution at Brampton. I could not say how many come back to us or how many have not repeated in that time.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I asked the question for a particular purpose, because I noted one of the publications which comes to our desk, and which came to our desk during the period when we were not in session, would indicate that in England 80 per cent of the first offenders do not repeat. It would seem to me from the answer of the hon. Minister that this percentage would differ considerably with that in this country. Brampton would be one of our better prisons, and certainly if 60 per cent of the inmates there are first offenders—and 40 per cent are repeaters, then we are a long way short of other jurisdictions.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if it is not reasonable to conclude that if this percentage is much less in this country then perhaps our whole system is not as good as it could be. I am wondering if the hon. Minister could tell me, for instance, whether or not we have sufficient psychologists, psychoanalysts, psychiatrists and social workers today. In 1961,

the then Minister advised this House that we did not have sufficient. I wonder if that situation has been corrected.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: First may I say to the hon. member that it would be difficult to equate the British figures and ours since, as the hon. member's leader pointed out when he was speaking, the British prison system would include all the jail prisoners, and short- and long-term prisoners, generally. I do not think our figures could be harmonized on any reasonable basis. I would not represent that our percentage of repeaters was higher or lower; we just have not got figures that would be comparable.

With regard to the professional staff he was asking about, we have some 135 full-time professionals and 78 on the part-time professional staff. I think one of the hon. members asked about psychiatrists. We have no full-time psychiatrists on the staff, we have 11 part-time psychiatrists.

Did the hon. member want all the figures?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: This 135 full-time personnel; how would this compare with the number we had on our staff in 1961?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would say it would be considerably larger. I have not the figures that might have been in the record in 1960 or 1961, but our full-time staff would be increasing anyway; yet I would say to the hon. member I would not want him to be misled by this if he has in mind psychologists and psychiatrists or social workers, because a considerable part of the increase is in the nature of teachers who have been taken on, and who are classified as professional staff.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I wonder if the hon. Minister would be specific dealing with social workers?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There are 12 full-time social workers.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, does this deal with the entire department? Penal reform institutions would only have 12 social workers; am I correct?

Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps this is one of the problems. I do not profess to be a professional in this matter, but it seems that perhaps this is one of the failings in the department. Perhaps we are prepared to deal with these people when they come to the prison and then turn them out loose as the hon. member for York South has suggested, without any thought at all.

The reason I ask the question is that I note that the Elizabeth Fry Society and the John Howard Society do some of this social work after the prisoner has been released. I note that there is very little provision in the estimates this year for an increase to these societies and it would appear to me that part of our problem and perhaps a great part of our expenditures for inmates are caused because we have failed to take the proper steps when they were there in the first place.

We apparently do not have a complete follow-up so that an inmate is properly counselled and advised from the day he enters the institution until after he has been released. And if I read correctly, I understand that it costs between \$1,700 and \$2,000 per year to retain an inmate in our institutions. I wonder what the policy of the department is with these—how can these 12 social workers do an adequate job with the great number of inmates who are in our institutions? Would the hon. Minister give us some information on that?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The social workers are all working in the institutions. They are not counted in the after-care or rehabilitation staff. That is, there is none of these 12 social workers working other than in the institutions; and none of them is included in the corps of after-care people who do the rehabilitation work from our district offices caring for the man after he has been released.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Then would the hon. Minister advise me whose responsibility it is to deal with them in the after-care he speaks of?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have rehabilitation offices, with rehabilitation officers staffing them. The whole corps of rehabilitation service has been revised in the last two years because the rehabilitation work used to be done from the institution from which the person was released. It seemed that there was an unnecessary amount of travelling back and forth trying to check up on one man who had been released, say, from Rideau to Windsor, and another to Sudbury, so we have divided the province now and set up district offices for rehabilitation work.

We have 3 of them open now—in Toronto, in London and in Ottawa; and one will soon be opened in Hamilton. We will have these various offices across the province dealing with released prisoners. Each rehabilitation district has a supervising officer, and

a corps of rehabilitation workers, to deal with the prisoners who have been released into that area to keep better contact with them, to know more of their living conditions and the opportunities for employment in that immediate area. It allows for much more frequent contact with these people than was possible when so much time and effort was expended in travelling back and forth.

In our rehabilitation offices we now have 51 rehabilitation officers.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Getting back to the social workers; while they are in prison, how many inmates do we have in the province of Ontario at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There are about 9,000 in the course of a year. At the moment I can give you the figures as of today or yesterday, because we get them daily.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Minister feel that 12 social workers, or one social worker for every 700 inmates, are adequate?

Mr. MacDonald: Of course not.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. I would not say that it was adequate. I would think that we could be using more if we could get the right kind; but it is difficult to get the personnel and it is difficult for some of them to work in custodial institutions. There is a great demand for these people.

An hon. member: Why?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Minister then advise the House what steps have been taken to increase the number of social workers during the past year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We still seek to enlist them and to upgrade those we have. Twelve of our staff are at university taking courses and, as you know, I announced that about 100 of our staff are taking first- and second-year extension courses from McMaster and Queen's.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: As I stated, Mr. Chairman, I do not claim to be a professional here but it would seem to any layman that there is a serious deficiency in this particular department. This would seem to be the one place where we could definitely render some reform in our institutions, particularly in the case of first offenders.

I am not quite satisfied that the hon. Minister is not able to relate the number of first

offenders in this province to other jurisdictions. I would think that his department should have some information which would give us an indication as to the success of our reform institution programme in Ontario as compared to other jurisdictions.

I would say to him that unless he can give a better answer than he has given this afternoon with respect to the programme of recruiting and encouraging social workers into our institutions, that it must be perfectly obvious to everybody that we have failed miserably in this particular department because—

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: —because it stands to reason, Mr. Chairman, that one social worker for 750 people is hopelessly inadequate, in fact it is almost ridiculous to suggest that it is a reform institution, it seems that rather it is a place of incarceration where we put these people and forget about them.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: And I suggest that perhaps the hon. Minister, if this department is as efficient as we have been led to believe, should be able to give us some figures relating to other jurisdictions which would indicate that we are actually doing a reform job with the inmates.

I would like to know, for instance, if we have pre-release camps in Ontario? Is there any provision for inmates to leave the institution under any condition?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have a system of parole that is working very well. There is also the Dominion National Parole Board that grants parole as regards the definite portion of a man's sentence, and our parole and rehabilitation system works as regards the indefinite sentence, and then follows up and keeps in contact with the man after his sentence is completed.

You wanted the actual number of prisoners in our institutions as of today. The report which came in last night, and was typed today, gives 3,265, so that would bring it down to something around less than 250-300 in the course of one man's work. In some cases it would seem a heavy case load, in other places it would not necessarily be a heavy case load.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister in his first estimate was out by about some 6,500 people or some 300 per cent?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, could I say a word on this subject? I would like to say something.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, before the hon.—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have listened with a great deal of interest. Do you want me to sit down?

Mr. Chairman: Sit down until the member has finished.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Repeat the question. I did not hear it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, do I understand from the hon. Minister that the estimate that he gave me of some 9,000 people in our institutions earlier, was incorrect by approximately 6,000?

An hon. member: No, no.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The hon. member misunderstands me. In the course of a year there are about 9,000 who come in and pass through our institutions. But as of any one day, and I gave him the count that came to my desk this morning and would be computed yesterday. There was an exact count of 3,265 in all our institutions as of yesterday. The larger total is the number of people whom we handle, or are processed through our institutions in the course of a whole year. You see, some of them may be in for 3 months. Indeed we are taking prisoners now from the jails despite the fact that I have been accused of having engaged in a very retrogressive movement. I think that it is working out exceptionally well because we are taking from the jails all those prisoners who have been sentenced to over 30 days, and not confining our drawing off only to those prisoners who are serving more than 90 days.

So we have moved in the course of the last 5 or 6 months since this new procedure got underway, we have taken out of the close confinement of the jail where there is no activity and no opportunity for a man for exercise—where he does not have anything to do but chew his fingernails and smoke and play cards in a cell or a corridor—almost 2,500 short-term prisoners and moved them into the open atmosphere of our farms and our camps where they live normal lives and in their daily work and living move back and forth among their fellows. They live and work and exercise in a normal way and when the time comes for their release they are in a far better position to re-establish themselves in the community and resume work in the

kind of employment in which so many of them will eventually find occupation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I could have a minute, please.

Having some knowledge of this particular department—and I might say that my heart is still in it in a very humanitarian way because I have always felt that way toward offenders—I want to thank the hon. Opposition members for their criticism and questions because I think that is all to the good and tends to bring improvement to the department. I appreciate that and always did when I was Minister. But we have this criticism, Mr. Chairman, constantly.

My mind goes back to one of the most outstanding men that we ever had as Minister of this department, who was ruthlessly criticized. I am speaking of the Rev. John Foote, who was not only a reverend gentleman but had won the Victoria Cross overseas fighting for his country. When he took this position, he was wrongly criticized in this House. That might be all to the good, as I say, because it probably tends to make this very, very difficult department better. However, I just want to tell you something of what these employees in this department have to contend with.

We talk about psychologists, psychiatrists and so on. The night before last when the event that occurred in the Don jail was to be consummated, how do you think the governor of that institution feels at a time like that, or the men who are given the responsibility of carrying out a sentence like that?

We have here with us this afternoon a gentleman who has had that experience. Can you think, hon. gentlemen, that in their minds there is a punitive thought toward the condemned at such a time? These duties leave their scars on these custodial guards. These men have had years of experience and they become very much humanitarian-minded toward the offender. Do not forget that. I want to compliment the hon. Minister on his presentation this afternoon; he has done a good job. I want to thank the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) for the kind things he has said about me because I know that he and his wife are very close to this work. They gave evidence of that when I was Minister and I imagine the present hon. Minister would say that today. I want to compliment his wife on the great job she has done.

I wish to mention that the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry societies which were mentioned are supported by this department, financially, and every other way, in the problems they have helped solve.

Somebody mentioned the sentences of these prisoners. Do not forget that the judiciary does the sentencing, not Reform Institutions. They are told what they are to do with an inmate when he comes to them, so that is a different part of the law in this province.

But you have dedicated servants in this department, a fact for which I can well vouch. You said we have, in our reform department of Ontario as good or better men than they have in England. We have outstanding penologists. Well, I will tell you of two.

Mr. McCulley, who is a member of the advisory council, was an architect of the Fauteux report, and he is probably one of the most outstanding penologists in the world. He is on the advisory council of this department. The other gentleman who comes to my mind was brought over from England and was one of the noted penologists in that country. He has been decorated with the OBE by Her Majesty the Queen for the work he has done in penology in England. I refer to the Rev. Martin Pinker, OBE. He heads the advisory council and is also chairman of our training schools for boys and girls in the province.

I point out those two things, because it has been said we have not enough psychologists, we have not enough psychiatrists, and so we are not doing any work. Those two leading men are trying, along with other members of the staff, to recruit psychologists and psychiatrists, and so on, and it is a most difficult thing to get this type of man. We have not many of them, I know.

When you mention the number of prisoners in this province, do not forget that there are 6.5 million people in this province—and I do not know whether this figure is correct or not, the 8,800 that was mentioned—but just figure out what percentage that amounts to. These institutions and the ones being built now are practically all open.

Go up to Hillsdale. There is not a lock or key there. It is the honour system. There are many more like it in this department—where they get up at 6 a.m. and everybody goes to bed at 11 p.m. and there is not a lock or key. But the honour system says that if they once escape from that type of institution they never have another opportunity of getting back to one again. True,

some of these institutions are total custodial units but that is a necessity for inmates who will not abide by regulations and are dangerous to society.

We have made mistakes. I made many mistakes when I was Minister, and we will continue making mistakes, but I want to make one point, Mr. Chairman. There is a programme in effect in this province that the hon. Minister is following out, which is improving the situation in penology. I am sure that under this government that will continue.

I know that the new institutions built in this province are given great acclaim by every other country in the world. I have been down in the United States and seen their institutions; I have been over in England and I have seen Wormwood Scrubs, a famous institution there, and Ley Hill a more open institution, and some others over there. I say there is nothing that I have seen that can outdo the institutions we have in the province of Ontario.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Buildings only? I think you are very much mistaken, sir, because you will find that the education given to our young people—when they come to us they cannot show anybody self-respect; they have never been shown any respect themselves. The first thing we have to do is to teach them the 3 anchors that are necessary in this life, which you hon. gentlemen have been fortunate enough to have. That is the love and guidance of a mother, the love and guidance of a father, and a Christian

education in the home. You will note that in 92 per cent of the committals to the training schools it is shown that either one or all of those anchors is missing, and it is up to Reform Institutions to instill those anchors into the hearts and lives of those young people. I think that we are doing a very worthwhile job in doing that and it is showing results.

Those are factual things, hon. gentlemen. I am not critical of the hon. members on the Opposition benches at all, because I think this criticism and these questions are all to the good. They help this department to carry on its great work of trying to rehabilitate the offender, so that I have no quarrel with you at all.

But I do want to compliment and congratulate the staff of Reform Institutions such as the Deputy Minister and these other hon. gentlemen here—for the work that I know they are doing, because I worked with them for 4 years day after day. They are trying at all times to improve conditions and to give full time and all their abilities to this great problem, in our province and to our nation. So I want to give my compliments to them, Mr. Minister, and to you, for the job that is being done today, and tell the Opposition again that although I do not agree with a lot they say, I do appreciate the criticism and the thought and the interest they have in this department, because, believe me, it takes the interest and thought and criticism of everybody in this province to try to keep down crime, which we hope will not continue to grow.

It being 6:00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, December 12, 1962

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 12, 1962

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Haskett, continued	255
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	292

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1962

The House resumed at 8.00 p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

(Continued)

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, at the time you recognized the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope), I was endeavouring to pursue this matter of social workers. I could not help but think this was an attempt to create a smoke screen. Certainly at no time in the questions I was putting to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Haskett), Mr. Chairman, did I intend to infer that those personnel on the staff were anything but conscientious and trying to do a good job. I was trying to find out from the hon. Minister how many workers we had, and found out that we had 12. I wanted to relate this to the situation and wanted to know whether or not we have improved the situation with respect to these social workers since 3 years ago.

In reading through some of the correspondence that came to our desks throughout the year, I was interested to see a couple of pamphlets on behalf of the John Howard Society. I was particularly concerned with the remarks of Mr. Braithwaite, warden of the Hainey correction institution, which I believe is in Western Canada. Some of his remarks which I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister are as follows:

The community-focused institution must have a well-organized, pre-release programme. Pre-release planning begins from the moment the man enters the institution and it increases in tempo until it reaches a peak, in a specialized, pre-release unit.

Mr. Chairman, if you compare that with the programme we have in Ontario, I think you would have to agree with me, sir, that our attitude in this matter is somewhat inadequate. I think this Legislature is entitled to some assurances that the situation will be improved. It is not a new situation. It goes back to 1961 when the then hon. Minister (Mr. Wardrope) admitted to this Legislature that we had insufficient staff in this direction.

It was pointed out this afternoon that we have 12 workers to take care of a population of approximately some 3,000 people; and, over a period of a year, some 9,000 people passed through our institutions. This means that one worker is responsible, throughout the course of a year, for 750 persons. Of course it is ridiculous to suggest that anything like an adequate programme can be completed when they are so understaffed.

As far as I can see, this Legislature does not have assurances that the situation will be corrected. The problem is recognized, and has been recognized, for a period of time, and yet the government and the department responsible for this particular phase of government has been inadequate in dealing with the situation.

Referring to another authority in this matter, again in the pamphlets from the John Howard Society, I find that some remarks were printed—and the authority for these is Mr. Hugh J. Clair, executive secretary of the Howard League for Penal Reform, London, England. You may recall, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I pointed out that he advised through this society pamphlet that, in England, 80 per cent of the first offenders do not repeat. We were unable to get the actual percentage, this afternoon, of Ontario offenders who do not repeat. Certainly, it would seem to be greater than that, since the hon. Minister told us that it was somewhere in the vicinity of 60 per cent in our model prisons; and I understand that Mr. Cogan, the chief probation officer, said that 65 per cent to 75 per cent of the personnel in our prisons are repeaters.

It seems to me that if we are short of personnel in the very department where we could improve the situation, it is not satisfactory to indicate to the Legislature that we just cannot get this type of worker. Perhaps the hon. Minister would tell us why we cannot get them? Certainly other jurisdictions seem to have been able to get sufficient workers to do a better job on this than we have been able to do in Ontario.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister without Portfolio): Name one!

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, I think the record speaks for itself. I have already stated that in the British Isles the situation is better.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What about the Children's Aid Society?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I do not know what the Children's Aid Society has to do with this, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): I can get a newspaper from the old country and read it to you.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The hon. Minister of Mines, Mr. Chairman, says he can get a paper from the old country and read it to me. I challenge the hon. Minister to prove that the record here is better than it is in England. I challenge him to prove it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: None of you guys has been out of this country to visit other institutions. What are you talking about? You are just reading the papers.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I will explain to the hon. Minister that I do not have the same access to public funds that he has to travel around the country and find out. I have to take it from the press. The point that I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that I think it is the responsibility of the hon. Minister at this time to assure this House that sufficient steps will be taken to procure adequate personnel to do this job.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: How many would you say?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A lot more than you have now.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: How many?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): A lot more than one for every 750.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I am interrupted by the hon. Minister of Mines who tells me it is adequate, and yet the same hon. Minister told us in 1961, that it was not adequate. He can turn to *Hansard* and find it on the record, because it is his statement.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I said, what is adequate?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister asks me what is adequate. I tell him, frankly, I do not know. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is the responsibility of the government to tell us how many are adequate and to assure this Legislature that

adequate personnel are available. But I would say to him that any logical, reasonable person, I am sure, would agree with me that no social worker, no matter how qualified he is, is capable of taking care of 750 inmates in a year. If the hon. Minister of Mines is suggesting to me that this is adequate, I think it is up to the government to prove it because the record of repeaters in Ontario certainly does not prove that we have had adequate personnel to do the job in the past.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Is that so? I am glad you have so much knowledge, but do you have any figures to prove it?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The hon. Minister says I do not have any figures to prove it. I repeat the challenge that I placed to the hon. Minister of Mines to refute the claim that in England, 80 per cent of the first offenders do not return. I challenge the hon. Minister to deny it if it is not so.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is a newspaper story. Can you tell me where? You say England; well, we can get the figures here, if you want them. What is the use of giving it to you? You won't believe it anyway.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister says this is a newspaper story. I think it is only fair to tell him that this is the remark of an authority on this matter. Perhaps just as much an authority as the hon. Minister, who apparently was removed from the department. I do not know why. This gentleman is the executive secretary of the Howard League for Penal Reform in London, England. Now, I would say that this gentleman knows what he is talking about and if the hon. Minister would take the trouble to read his correspondence he will have the same information that I have, because I understand this was sent to all hon. members. If I can redirect my question to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if he would advise the Legislature how many social workers are necessary to conduct this programme of reformation among the inmates in our institutions adequately in Ontario.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the hon. member with interest and attention. I appreciate his keen concern for the subject and we share it with him. He asks first of all how many social workers we had 3 years ago. We had 7.

May I point this out to the hon. members: we list a certain class of worker in the

institutions as social workers, but grouped with them I think it would only be fair to consider that our rehabilitation officers, 51 of them today, are doing in the main what he would consider social service work of a first-class order. They are working with the men on the after-care part of the programme.

We are perhaps the only jurisdiction that breaks down the programme of work with the prisoners in the way we do and have social workers in each of the institutions, that are labelled as social workers at that time, doing studies of the prisoners and giving them counselling. But when a man is released and is serviced by the rehabilitation service, we have 51 rehabilitation officers at the service of the released men.

I think my hon. friend will appreciate that those people are doing what is normally considered as a social work. They are visiting these released people, they are trying to integrate them back into society, they are helping them and their families. I think that we should group these together—the social workers and the rehabilitation officers—for the purposes of our discussion.

The hon. member posed another question. I dealt with it this afternoon and apparently not to his satisfaction. He asked, what percentage of those who are first offenders never repeat? Well, I say that you must have a given period of time in which you make your study; you start at a certain time and draw your line. You cannot otherwise have any very reliable statistics. We have no such complete records over the years except as regards our institution at Brampton, where we are doing a type of study that we should like to have analyzed carefully. I said over the 15 years, and it is about 15 years and 6 or 8 months now since that institution was opened, we have kept a perfect chart insofar as our records could be kept to show how many have repeated.

In our 15-year history some 60 per cent of the output of that training centre never came back, that is not to say that tomorrow or next month or next year some of those released may not fall into error and come back to us. So I say it is difficult to draw a line and say that a certain percentage of first offenders never repeat.

I would like to go further than that for the benefit of the hon. member's thinking and say this, that what records they might have in England do not apply. I think I pointed that out this afternoon. Because into the prison system in England would go all those sentenced to jail and you will appreciate that there are a great many

simple offenders that go into jails who do not repeat. Further up the scale of offenders you get a larger percentage of repeaters.

I am sure that in our institutions, now that we are taking short term prisoners off the jails from 30 to 90 days instead of leaving them there up to 90 days as we did formerly, our percentage of repeaters will drop on account of taking into our institutions an increasing number of short term simple offenders. By the same token I suggest to him that in the penal institutions of the federal government that are responsible for the custody of those who have been sentenced to two years and more, the percentage of repeaters would be proportionately higher, because you get a tougher group of persons.

We have, furthermore, in our institutions a large percentage of people who lack motivation, who have no ambition, who are to all intents and purposes derelicts. I think all must appreciate that a group of people like that are very difficult to deal with. We have had them in society from the dawn of creation and no answer has been found. You can do the most and the best you can with them and the results will be minimal. I think the system that we have evolved in this province, and of which I say that we, and that means the people of Ontario and all of us, can be proud, is one in which we have broken down the types of prisoners sentenced up to two years and have given them different kinds of treatment and training according to a wide range of classifications.

We are dealing here, sir, with a human element, with an inexact science, and we must approach it in that way. We realize that there is no easy way out, that there is no sure-fire programme. You can take all the alcoholics or all the derelicts and put them into an institution and give them all the conceivable treatments that medical science and social science today possess, and you would not have 100 per cent cures, you would have only a very small percentage of cures. That is the problem that we face and that is the kind of thing we must work with.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I have tried to follow the hon. Minister and I appreciate his sincerity. He indicated to me that the comparison with England would not be adequate since the inmates in our institutions would be under two years, whereas in England they are all grouped together. He went further and stated that if we took our federal institutions in Ontario we should find there were a greater number of repeaters.

Therefore, if we compared the percentages in Ontario it should look more favourable rather than less favourable when compared with the English system.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: May I interject? That would not, perhaps, follow because the big group of prisoners are the ones that are in the very, very short classification in their jails. For instance, I think that we had some 9,000 go through our institutions in a year, whereas that was only part of over 50,000 who were committed to the jails. So you have more than 41,000 in short-term sentences, being held in jails, compared to the number whom we have consigned to our institutions.

But, progressively, as you move up the scale you would probably find a smaller and smaller percentage of first offenders who do not return. That is, you would have a much larger percentage of first offenders who do not come back—who had only one appearance in jail on a simple offence—than you would of the more serious offenders being sentenced from 3 months to 2 years or, as we are now taking them, 30 days to 2 years, and a smaller percentage of them than in the group that have been committed to the federal penitentiaries on sentences of two years and more. Unless you bulk the whole thing together, as they do in the UK, you could not equate our percentages with theirs.

The hon. member may have a point in saying that perhaps we fall into the mean between the lowest and the highest.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to belabour it. What I am trying to do is to have assurances that the problem will be corrected insofar as inadequate staff is concerned. Now the hon. Minister will recall that I asked him the salary that is presently paid to social workers in Ontario. Would the hon. Minister tell me just what we do pay these social workers?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I can give you the salary scale on the social worker appointment in just a few minutes.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I will leave it. I merely suggest that this present scale is not attractive to social workers. I think any business executive if he found he could not attract the right type of personnel at the wage he was paying would very seriously consider increasing that salary. Certainly it would be good business. If we can keep a very small percentage of repeaters that are now coming back, if we can keep those

out of the prison, the amount of money we pay to social workers would be relatively small in comparison.

I think the problem is obvious, I think the problem has been with us since 1961, according to the department itself, and I think that something has to be done to correct the situation. Now, I think that an aggressive Minister should take the bull by the horns and should get these social workers, and I am pretty sure they can be obtained because I understand they are available in other jurisdictions. If I am incorrect in that assumption I wish the hon. Minister would correct me, but it would appear that they are successful in other jurisdictions because of the record.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: May I say I share the hon. member's feelings, that salary scales are low. We try to lift them and we are trying to find social workers and I can assure him that the Minister is quite as interested as he is in seeing that we have an adequate staff of social workers.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am very pleased to hear that from the hon. Minister because we were assured in previous years that the salary scale was not what was keeping these workers away, so I am pleased to hear that the hon. Minister is taking a different approach to this and that perhaps some action will be forthcoming.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions I would like to ask on 2001, but I would like to make two brief comments before I do that.

The first is on the question that is before us. I agree that the salary scale has got to be raised if you want to get social workers, but having got them, you will not hold them if you do not change the basic philosophy of the department. I am back to my basic point. You have got them before and they have left. They have left almost at your invitation. Money is not the main criterion there. These are dedicated people who will come and work for a lower wage than they can get elsewhere, because they are interested in this field.

The second general comment I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is with regard to the intervention to the former hon. Minister, prior to the dinner hour. I was almost a little sorry that I intervened, and I am glad that he has bolstered his self-discipline by absenting himself to the wings over there so he that he will not be able to intervene now. I said

a lot of nice things about him and I really meant it, because he is a man of compassion; but in addition to being a man of compassion, he is also an old smoothy and it was in that role that he was intervening before supper, trying to calm the troubled waters. But surely it must be obvious that even his Herculean efforts are not going to be able to rescue the situation we have before us at the moment.

Now the question I wanted to ask, Mr. Chairman, on the main office estimates is first in reference to grants. This afternoon, members on the Opposition side of the House spoke at some length on the problem of rehabilitation, and on the fact that we have been penny-wise and pound-foolish in spending great amounts of money in incarcerating people and maintaining them in custody, and then very little money when we turn them out, with the result that we were contributing to the tendency of recidivism.

In that context I am a little curious with regard to the grants to the John Howard and the Elizabeth Fry Societies. When I look at the public accounts that were supplied to us, I discover that—if I may just take the Toronto area, John Howard and Elizabeth Fry—that in the instance of John Howard they are still getting \$15,000.

The public accounts reveal that they got \$15,000 last year and the year before. In the instance of the Elizabeth Fry, they are down \$1,500. Last time they got \$10,500, now they are \$9,000. Now here we are, Mr. Chairman, with a department that is coming before us—I think everybody would acknowledge that this rehabilitation work by the voluntary organizations is an extremely important contribution in the field. We are asked that our estimates be increased by \$3 million. And yet in this important work, this important contribution of the voluntary societies, the John Howard is at the same level and the Elizabeth Fry is down \$1,500.

Now I am just a little bit curious. It baffles me, it escapes me completely. But would the hon. Minister explain to me the logic of reducing or maintaining grants to these bodies that are making such a contribution when this is such an important field of work?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: May I first of all just give the hon. member for Wentworth an answer to his previous question on the salary range of the social workers? Social workers are graded: social workers I, social workers II and social workers III. The overall salary range runs from \$5,000 to \$8,200.

With respect to the grants to the ancillary services of these very commendable associations—the John Howard Society working with men, and the Elizabeth Fry Society with women—I point out that there has been no reduction. If the hon. member will notice, the John Howard Society of Toronto is given an amount of \$15,000 in the estimates before us and the Elizabeth Fry Society in Toronto and Ottawa \$10,500, as they did before.

Mr. MacDonald: The Elizabeth Fry Society in Toronto alone, the public accounts said—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Then it was by way of a supplementary grant before the—

An hon. member: No, it combines the two of them. It just says the Elizabeth Fry Society, and that includes Toronto and Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Well, my first answer was correct then, that the two were bulked, Toronto and Ottawa, in the \$10,500.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I see. This Elizabeth Fry Society—

An hon. member: Bulks the two of them together.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: The other aspect of my question is: if this is such an important field of the work and you are increasing your estimates by \$3 million, is there not some justification for increase of grants to the organizations that are making such an important contribution? I mean it is all very fine for the hon. Minister to get up and call them commendable organizations and everything else, but these people are doing only a small proportion of the job that is there to be done. They are doing a small proportion because they have not got the funds.

In some instances they can do a better job than the department can because in some instances the offender, when he is released, has a very understandable, even if sometimes mistaken, attitude of antagonism towards the authorities. He is more willing and more receptive to work from an outside agency. Therefore they can perhaps do even a better job than the department's rehabilitation staff. Why do we not increase the grants to these bodies?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Over the last few years there has been an increase in the after-care services that the department itself has been providing and that may account in part for

the fact that we have not felt we were drawing more on the help of the John Howard and the Elizabeth Fry. Now I make no attempt to take any of the credit from them that is their due.

I would put it another way, though, to the hon. members, as I did to the executive people from both societies. And it was this: in your overall budget you receive grants from various agencies or departments or levels of government. Have you ever equated the grant that would be proportionate from the federal government or from the municipal government with what you get from the provincial government in comparison with the number of prisoners that have been released from the federal penitentiaries on the one hand or the municipal jail on the other, with the numbers that you treat that have been released from the provincial reformatories? On that basis I think I can say to you that neither of the other levels give grants comparable to the contribution that the province makes to these two agencies and that is not saying that we are doing too much or that we might not do more. I would like to leave it that way, if I may, because I have a very great sympathy for the work they do.

Mr. MacDonald: That is where the hon. Minister wants to leave it, but he still has not really dealt with the point. I do not care what the other governments are doing. This is his rationalization. The fact of the matter is that surely the municipal government, which has to survive either on grants from us or from a fixed real estate tax, is not the appropriate tax base for an agency doing this kind of a job. It is from this government or the federal government.

If we cannot get the Tories in Ottawa to do better, let us not use their failure to do a decent job as an excuse for you not to do a job. I submit to you that you cannot continue to say nice things about organizations that are doing an important job in the field of after-care, who are, for reasons that I explained a moment ago, in a better position to do a job than the department because they are an independent agency, and make grants like this.

This is a small percentage of one per cent of the increase in your budget, your estimate, let alone the total. I do not think that there is any justification for it at all. Any rationalization of the hon. Minister seems to me just does not meet the point.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: In answer to that, may I pose this question: where should we stand as between giving all the budget to these

organizations and making them, in effect, merely additions to our own after-care services on the one hand, or giving them nothing and letting them get all their support from the public on the other? I may say that there is merit on both sides.

I feel this about these things: the government can do its job; and my hon. friend makes the point that these people can do a job, in some instances, that may be better than the government agency can do. I will acknowledge that. But you could carry that to the other extreme and say, these people could do a better job if they had no connection with the government.

They could, in one sense, in that the more of their support they collect from private people, the greater will be the public support of their work, and that is one of the great values possessed by these private agencies for which I have a great regard. I may say that I have been engaged in works of this kind and have compared the one that was supported almost entirely by the government, on the one hand, with the one that was supported entirely by private subscription on the other. And I will admit that the quality of service provided by the one supported entirely by private support has much to commend it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, obviously we are going to get nowhere here, Mr. Chairman. We might as well leave that. We just had another set of rationalizations which do not really meet the point. These organizations have a job to do; there is much work they are not now doing because they have not the money. I think if we were to go through, for example—and I only pick this as one example—the estimates of The Department of Agriculture, we would find any number of grants, away beyond \$10,000 or \$15,000, to get after warble flies and heaven knows what, and you bequeath—

An hon. member: Racehorses.

Mr. MacDonald: Racehorses, yes. Take a look at the grant to look after the racehorses of the province in contrast to the \$20,000 or \$30,000 in total that is going to the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry societies.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. 52—bulking in the Salvation Army.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. 52, I think, bulking in the Salvation Army, which does the same kind of work.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let me go on to the other point I raised this afternoon but got no reaction from the hon. Minister on first try. Let me try again.

What happened to the study that the department was making on the pattern of delinquency as it first emerges among school children—in the hope that we can come to grips with and reduce the intake into our reform institutions?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not identify the study.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, a year or so ago there were announcements—I think I am right—which emerged from the department to the effect that studies were being made. I take it that the department is making no such study?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Studies among—

Mr. MacDonald: Studies of the emerging delinquency patterns in school children. If you ask any school teacher in grade 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11: "Where are the problem children in your class?" they will be able to point to two or three children and say: "There is great danger that from the conduct of this child now, he is going to become a juvenile delinquent and get into the old treadmill from the training schools up."

Among the professionals in the field there is a feeling that here is a preventive area on which we should do some research, some study, and decide what can be done at that level to try to minimize or reduce the incidence of juvenile delinquency.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I have no knowledge of the study, Mr. Chairman. I do not see just how it relates to our department. If it was put before the House by the department, then I will have to find an answer for the hon. member, but it does not seem to fall within the jurisdiction of this department. After all, probationary work of the juvenile courts would be the more logical place for a study of that kind to be made and that comes under The Department of the Attorney-General.

Mr. MacDonald: Here we are in another buck-passing game.

But if I may draw an analogy, it would be just as sensible for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) to say that preventive medicine had nothing to do with his department. What I am asking the hon. Minister is: When are we going to come to grips with what the professionals now feel is an area

worthy of study, so that the hon. Minister can correct and halt in advance the development of juvenile delinquency among the children at the school age?

If the hon. Minister took a look at the youngsters the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) referred to which represent such a large proportion of the people in our institutions apart from the training schools, he will find they are in the 16-24 age group.

If he went back to their teachers I bet him, in 80 to 90 per cent of the cases, teachers could have told him: "I knew that that child was headed in the wrong direction". Now perhaps some action at that level, some study, some preventive action, would reduce the necessity of the building of more and more schools.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): You should go out to all the parents in the province of Ontario and tell them to get out the old razor strap and belt these kids.

Mr. MacDonald: There is a good Tory rationalization now. That is the kind of comment we used to hear from The Department of Reform Institutions, including the Cabinet, including the former Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost).

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think that the matter raised by the hon. member first of all had to do with what I know about the study. I am not passing the buck, I say simply I do not know anything about it and I do not think it relates to our department. He raises a very serious sociological problem and I do not think that it falls within our jurisdiction. But that is not belittling the need or the magnitude of the problem.

Mr. MacDonald: I acknowledge that the hon. Minister said from the outset that he knew nothing of it in his department so let us move on to the next point.

Mr. Chairman, there are periodic references to treatment available for female alcoholics. I would like to know where a woman who has become the victim of alcoholism can get treatment? What treatment centre have we for women? If there is none, why not?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We are concerned with the treatment of those who have been committed to the institutions. Our treatment does not deal with those who would be self-committed. We have nothing to do with

that. But as regards those who are committed, they are dealt with and treated at the Mercer.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister has, in effect, treatment for women alcoholics at the Mercer?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, there is therapy treatment for the female alcoholics at the Mercer.

Mr. MacDonald: Is this of the same nature as the treatment, for example, that is available to the males at the alcoholic clinic out at Mimico?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, it is not separated from the other prisoners, it is not divided, it is a part of the overall programme treatment at the Mercer.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the hon. Minister any idea as to how many were treated for alcoholism at Mercer?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, I have not.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I want to submit this, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, that here is an area that I think we have to take a look at. We reached the stage a few years ago when, believing that alcoholism among males was an important enough matter, we established an alcoholic clinic and we are doing a great deal of studying. I want to suggest to the hon. Minister that the treatment that is available for female alcoholics in the Mercer is infinitely inferior to the treatment that is available in the alcoholic clinic.

Here is an area where there is continual talk of this being available, but this is sort of an ancillary activity at Mercer, rather than really coming to grips with it. I do not know why in this government, which I thought at least had ceased discriminating against the sexes, we do not come to grips with this problem of alcoholism on the female side.

My final question on this main estimate, Mr. Chairman, and I think this is the appropriate place to raise it; this afternoon I made a plea that we come to grips with this basic conflict in the philosophy of the department as reflected in what has happened at Mimico. I suggested that, instead of sweeping this all under the carpet and forgetting about it, let us have the public know nothing more about it, that we make a clean breast of this, we try to find out what could be done in these institutions instead of re-establishing the custodial approach which the department

thinks is necessary and the professional people think is unworkable.

Therefore I suggest that to try to come to grips with this, to get all the opinions from all of the various sources, we have some sort of a public inquiry. I know that there are people in all of the various areas who are willing to testify in a public inquiry. What is the hon. Minister's reaction to the suggestion of a public inquiry in the instance of Mimico?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think there is not much point in it. The situation at Mimico was this: that we had in charge there, as in all our institutions, a custodial officer, because his role is to carry out our primary function, which is custody under the law. Under the custodial situation that must exist, and we have reduced that to what we consider the minimum limits possible, we had increased our treatment services there to a place where out of a staff of 31 we have 11 custodial officers on duty at any one time.

In the transfers arranged recently, we endeavoured to still further harmonize the views between professional treatment staff—who were unable to operate in a custodial atmosphere, although they knew what the conditions were when they began that work—and one was transferred to another institution that would be even more open and perhaps more acceptable to the suggestions of a treatment worker who found it incompatible to operate under custodial situations.

The first move we made was to replace the custodial superintendent with a treatment officer superintendent in the person of the head social worker from the open institution at Brampton. And under that new officer we set up a revised team that might work together in greater compatibility.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to deal with this because I think we are at least within reaching distance of coming to grips with what I am convinced is the real problem. It is idle, I want to suggest to the hon. Minister, to be unrepentant in his misconceptions and that is exactly what he is. The professional people you have brought in there have left; they have left regularly; indeed it would be very interesting to go back to 1955 and to discover what has been the regular sequence of departures.

You had a psychiatrist there on one occasion and he left. Allegedly he left because he was appointed to work in another institution. I do not know the man personally but we have mutual friends and I am convinced there

are other reasons why he left, because these professional people are not interested in working in a custodial atmosphere which frustrates the treatment process.

It is all very well for you to say—and at least he is cautious in his reassurances to the hon. member for Wentworth, Mr. Chairman—that you were going to get more professional people, but you are not going to get more professional people, because if they come they will go, they will go in disillusionment. And there is no point in the hon. Minister trying to kid the public, for example, that you had a custodial man at the head of it and now you have brought in what you choose to describe as a treatment officer.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to cite individual cases and analyze them but the hon. Minister leaves me with no alternative. Let us take the case of Scott Keene. What are Scott Keene's qualifications? Is he a social worker?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: He has been doing social work at Brampton, which is our most open institution.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. Now let me inform the hon. Minister, Scott Keene is not a social worker. He is not a graduate of any school of social work.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I did not say he was.

Mr. MacDonald: I know you did not, you were evading the point and this is what I want to emphasize. Scott Keene's only qualification is a 6 months' probationary course in the UK.

Now, what has the hon. Minister done? He has destroyed a treatment team with top professionals who tried a year ago to get this government to face up to the fact that you could not carry a treatment programme in what the hon. Minister in an unrepentant fashion said is a custodial set-up. He will not change it—it is a treatment clinic but it must remain primarily a custodial institution. They tried to get you to change this. You would not change it, so consequently they have left.

Now you have brought in relatively inexperienced and untrained people. The man you brought in, whom you chose to describe as a treatment officer, is not even a social worker; he is a 6-month probationary course graduate. So in 1963 you are going to start building a team that was built with top professional people from 1955 to 1962, and destroyed, and now you are going to try to build a professional team with unprofessional

leaders, people without the adequate qualifications.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister can go on as long as he wants but there is no use in his coming in here and trying to assure us on this side of the House that he is going after professional people because the hon. Minister is not going to get professional people. Even if you raise your salary scale, which is from \$5,000-\$8,200 to \$10,000-\$15,000, you will get the poorer kind of people who will come for the money only. The people you had were dedicated people and they have left because they cannot work within the custodial atmosphere that you are determined to maintain in these institutions.

Let us face it, and let the public recognize that what you have brought in now are unqualified people who have had no experience in the drug field before, people who have not even got the qualifications of a graduate social worker and they are now going to be heading this institution.

Mr. Chairman, this is a shame; this is irresponsible; this is pouring money down the drain and if it was not that I felt it would be a little irresponsible in the overall picture of this department I would vote against the estimates of this department—

An hon. member: Maybe we should.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe we should; you are right, because as long as this government persists in a façade of progressive approach—yet as the hon. Minister has repeated, he repeated it to me on Monday, he has repeated it here again tonight—even in a treatment institution he insists that it must be custodial. You cannot even come to grips with the simple proposition: are you running a jail or a treatment centre? You insist on running it as a jail.

We could talk from now until Doomsday—and it is like beating our heads against a stone wall. But you are wrong, you are wrong in your concept, you are wrong in your operations when you are not getting professional people, and you will not get the professional people. Experience is there, and you can talk all you want but you cannot deny it.

You have just now, of your own volition, in coming to grips with the situation which you mishandled, destroyed the best treatment unit we have. They are all going to leave. Now what are you going to do? Advertise in the *New Statesman and Nation*, and the *News of the World* and what-not in England to try to get some more from there? That is the position we are in and let us face it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to put in that the psychologist, Mr. Sunday, who has been moved to replace the head psychologist in this institution is a man of considerable experience—

Mr. MacDonald: With no experience in the drug clinic.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: —and he has been the chief psychologist at the big institution at Guelph where they have a large neuro-psychiatric clinic and I think he will be quite the equivalent of the man he is replacing.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what you hope.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get the floor here for quite a few hours. I will say this: that I have never seen a department where an estimate is presented for the year 1962 in March of 1962 and an estimate for the year 1963-64 presented in December of 1962. Really and truly I do not know how this department works. I had hoped that we would have had at least a report from the department before the estimates were brought up so that we could have discussed the department intelligently. I have quite a few things that I would have liked to have brought up.

But I am going to go on the assumption that the per diem costs, which you have at these training schools, are about the same thing as you had last year. I am concerned about the private training schools that you have in the province, and it comes under item number 9 of Vote 2001. Last year I brought to the attention of the hon. Minister the fact that there was inequality and unfairness in the payment of this department to the private training schools of the province. I am told that, according to the regulations, when a boy or girl appears in front of the juvenile courts and is committed to one of these training schools that it is the custom, once they know the religious denomination, to send him or her to one of the training schools maintained by the province or one of the private training schools.

These private training schools certainly do a service for the province and they fulfil a requirement. Nevertheless this government does not face its responsibilities the way they should because, at the present time—and I note that this has not been changed since last year—today, in fact, I inquired and found the per diem rate that you are paying to St. John's training school is just \$4.25 a day and that you had some of the training

schools in Ontario here where the per diem costs are as high as \$9.79.

An hon. member: They have bacon and eggs there.

Mr. Belanger: I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that these private training schools are certainly faced with the same expenses for food, for maintenance and for salaries. In fact they were told that in order to carry on the work they had to add extra staff. Still, the per diem rate that they received is the same as it was last year. I want to say this to the hon. Minister that last year they had a deficit of some \$85,000, and I am told that this government certainly paid them. I see that on the statement of accounts that you did pay them \$85,000. But you also included in your letter when you sent them the cheque that this would be the last time. In the future they would have to look into their expenses. You would not make up any deficit. This I have from the person in charge of the training school. I cannot understand why this government, knowing that these training schools fulfil a service, still discriminates and does not want to give them the requirements they should have.

It costs them \$5.25 per day per boy to operate, and still all you give them is \$4.25 per boy per day. You are forcing them to go into the red and come to ask you, to beg, to have a grant. Certainly this government is not doing the right thing here. Why do you not pay them the cost that they are supposed to receive, at least? You know that the salaries they receive regarding themselves are nothing compared to what they receive in the provincially operated institutions.

I want to say, also, that this school was built for 150 boys. Today they have 210 boys. They give you a service; they appear in the courts and are delegated to these institutions; yet they cannot do the work to rehabilitate these people the way they would like to do it because of the increase.

It is the same in all these institutions, not only this one; they have to let them go without the full rehabilitation they want to give them. The brothers have told me that they would like to show to these boys in their care, that in order to adapt themselves to society, they should do this and they should do that.

I want to repeat that this government should realize that they have an obligation to at least pay their per diem cost. I would like to say that on Monday I listened to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) make

quite a talk here in regard to Ontario human rights. I would like to read you this excerpt:

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario human rights code is much more than a series of laws designed to deal with a prejudiced minority. It is rather a set of inviolable principles to be practised and lived from day to day by all of us; not only because the law requires it, but rather because enlightened social behaviour demands it. Or, to put it another way, if as sometimes happens an act of discrimination is committed in a locality, it is our view that the moral sanction of the community in which it takes place may very well be a vastly more effective corrective factor than the purely legal sanctions which are contained in the human rights code.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that if you are going to ask the people of Ontario to practise this, I think the government itself, at least, should be practising it.

I do not know what you intend to do. I brought it up last year and you have done nothing about it except for the fact that you have covered up the deficit. I do not think that these institutions should be forced to ask for grants. I think you should pay them the costs of operation. I would like to know what the views of the hon. Minister are in regard to this.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, as regards these 3 schools operated by the private orders, we pay them \$4.25 per diem. This is the amount that was agreed upon and considered satisfactory to them.

Mr. Belanger: Oh, that is not right. I mentioned that last year; that is not right.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: And that, as regards the other two schools, St. Mary's and St. Joseph's, it is sufficient. But, as regards the St. John school, there was further payment made to them last year of about \$80,000 to cover their deficit. I may say that the costs of operating our schools run higher. The boys' school at Cobourg runs not \$4.25 but \$4.97 a day; and there is the small, specialized school for girls at Port Bolster with about 20 girls in it that has an inordinately high per capita cost of \$7.99.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question on this first vote in relation to the statutory grants according to public accounts, page 2—the special warrants. There is a grant of

\$3,675 to Mr. G. D. Blake, as a compassionate allowance for an injury. What was the nature of the injury and how did it happen?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This person lost a finger, or some fingers, in the press at Millbrook. The claim was put before the Workmen's Compensation Board. This is the amount that was awarded and this is the amount the department paid.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): If I may ask a question, sir? I notice that the previous hon. Minister of Reform Institutions had suggested the policy, after he had been at the United Nations congress, of paying prisoners. If this was from the Workmen's Compensation Board, is this worked out on the basis of some salary that the man would get?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think that is substantially the way it was arranged; the Workmen's Compensation Board worked out the compensation to the man on the basis of the salary he would be earning if he were doing comparable work in civilian industry.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, could I follow up again; are you paying any money to inmates? If I could refer the hon. Minister to the speech by the hon. Minister previously on February 27, 1961—and if I could just digress for one point—I notice some very inspiring things that he said there, sir.

One was with respect to the Fauteux committee. I am not sure if I understood the hon. Minister correctly to say that the Fauteux committee's report was not applicable to Ontario, because the statement by his hon. predecessor was that:

It may very well be that, with our declared intention to co-operate with the federal government in its implementation of the report of the Fauteux committee, Canada, and not least Ontario, will, during the next few years, have secured a foremost place in penal reforms throughout the world.

I know that the previous hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, from the statement he made, spoke most inspiringly of the recommendation. I should say, sir, that he had also mentioned that he had been at the United Nations congress and was considering the idea of paying inmates. I can appreciate this is a complex question and he said that the department was looking into this, but that was two years ago or a year ago.

Could the hon. Minister tell me what has followed from this suggestion of his?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There has been no determination on the subject of what a prisoner should be paid in Canada, or in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry. I did not hear the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I said there has been no determination what prisoners in the reformatories of Ontario should be paid.

Mr. Thompson: Well this, as I say, was on February 27, 1961, and I will read again the statement of the previous hon. Minister of Reform Institutions who was in my opinion a man of action. He said:

I have therefore instructed all my superintendents to consider the many facets implied in this suggestion [that is remunerating prisoners] so that we in the department can consider the problem from every angle. I shall hope to inform the hon. members of the outcome of our deliberations.

And yet the hon. Minister says that as yet there is no consideration. Does the hon. Minister himself have an opinion on this?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: It would be modified by the fact that there is such a diversity of the work and programmes in the department and it would be a great problem to determine how much one should be paid. Supposing one is taking part-time study and part-time work, or all time study, it would be very difficult to establish any individual system or any fixed standard that would apply across the board. There has been no determination on paying prisoners.

Mr. Thompson: Then your superintendents as yet have not reported to you. They are still considering the problem.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: They came to no conclusion that we should pay.

Mr. Thompson: I see. Could I turn to this other question—and I am really using the speech of the previous hon. Minister—I was interested when he had mentioned, and if I could quote him, I am sure he will not mind, he said:

Progressive countries have penetrated the forest of medieval thought and prejudice and broken through to the open plains beyond where modern sciences are allowed to cultivate an insight into the causes of anti-social behaviour.

We are not likely to discover a cure to such behaviour problems until causations have been analyzed and motives understood. This is why I put such high emphasis on the need for research.

I remember last year in the estimates, with many others on this side of the House, making a plea for research. Is the only connection that you have with the universities of Ontario in this estimate giving this grant to social workers for their training?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, that covers it. The four social workers and four psychologists that are doing research at the university, \$12,000.

Mr. Thompson: Surely, sir, you have conferred, I would hope, with the previous hon. Minister—I do not know if he would want to comment on this—he certainly would not, I hope, consider that a high emphasis on the need for research would consist of giving some training to 5 or 6 social workers. I think that man of action, when he talked about high emphasis on research, meant more than that grant. Sir, with you again I would make the plea, because there is no question that this was put clearly.

I wish I could have thought of the words myself, about the department trying to break through the medieval approaches that have been held. "We are not likely to discover a cure to such behaviour problems" said the hon. Minister at that time "until causations have been analyzed and motivations understood. This is why I put such high emphasis on the need for research."

I would hope, and I say this seriously, that you would give very deep consideration to research as suggested by not only my own hon. leader, but the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party.

I have also been excited about the fact that you were going to do some research into the causation of delinquency at the school level. I must say that for me it frankly came as a disappointment that this research had not been followed up. I hoped, sir, that you would accept this challenge; most of the progressive countries of the world in seeking knowledge naturally wanted to look at the causations in order to be able to prescribe the proper treatment.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, what are the qualifications that guards in your reform institutions have to have, academic and otherwise? Does it still remain grade 8 education

and the ability to defend himself? Is that all?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Grade 8 and preferably grade 10 is what we are working on these days.

Mr. Troy: Sir, an attendant in our Ontario hospitals, at least grade 10 and possibly higher? It seems to me that you certainly get a much better type of person if you have some experience in high school. Is it still the same thing, too, that he have the ability to defend himself? What type is that? Is it unarmed combat, judo, or what? With ability to box, or what are the other qualifications, sir?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The other qualifications are between 25 and 45—

Mr. Troy: Just grade 8 and—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Preferably grade 10.

Mr. Troy: Between 25 and 45. What are the physical qualifications the department demands—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: He has to have a physical examination, and be 5 feet 8 inches tall.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): He must have an Irish background.

Mr. Troy: I will ask the hon. member for High Park if he just has Irish; but he has got out of these things long ago.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. Minister if he received a directive, or rather a request, from The Department of Economics and Development to consider their "Buy Canadian" programme in regard to their purchases through the department.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think that we received a request from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) to check our buying habits and ascertain if we were buying, where possible, Canadian-made products.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask the question is that I noted in one spot, just quickly, that there are substantial purchases from the Rochester-Pittsburgh coal company and I understand that this is a well-established American firm.

Mr. Thompson: On a point of information, Mr. Chairman, I noted that the hon. Minister,

before supper, had mentioned he did not have any facts on recidivism, on repeaters. Could I draw his attention to the statement of Mr. Dan Cogan, who is the chief probation officer? He has suggested that, in 1960, between 65 per cent and 75 per cent of those admitted to the provincial reformatories each year had been incarcerated previously. I have taken the presumption, sir, to compare this with Holland—where one per cent of the people who have been incarcerated, have been repeaters. The hon. Minister's own department had made a statement to the effect that 65 per cent to 75 per cent were repeaters.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This was The Department of the Attorney-General—the probationary service.

Mr. Thompson: Oh, I am sorry. Yes.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, on vote 2001, item 5—advisory committee of allowances and expenses. My question to the hon. Minister is: How many members are there on this committee? How are they selected—by geography, or ability, or what?

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Surely the hon. Minister does not have to find out?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There are two committees involved. There is the advisory committee, the Minister's advisory committee, called MACTO, and there is—

Mr. Thomas: That is the one to which I am referring.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: And the questions were—how many? Seven members. They were appointed, I think, by order-in-council before my time. They were chosen for their knowledge and interest in the work. They have given splendid service since that time. The other committee is the training school advisory board.

Mr. Thomas: Well, Mr. Chairman, the name of Mr. M. C. Davies is there. Would that be the ex-Speaker of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes.

Mr. Thomas: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, a further question: How often does this committee meet? The reasons for my question, Mr. Chairman, are these: The allowances and expenses paid to Mr. Davies are about double what they are to any other member. Do they meet as a body, or do they meet individually, or what?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: They meet regularly as a body. They meet a couple of days every month. They have travelled all over this province, from Quebec to the Manitoba border. They have visited every jail in Ontario, and I think that you will see that there is a larger charge for travelling expenses for Mr. Davies because he comes up from Windsor on every occasion. The other members live in or near Toronto for the most part.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, I admit that there is quite a difference in the travelling allowances of the various members, but I want to read from the public accounts. Mr. Caldwell—his allowance was \$360. Mr. Davies—\$560. Mr. Kinnear—\$160. Mr. McKenzie—\$360. Why would Mr. Davies get \$560 and the rest get a much lower amount?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There is a per diem rate. Each one receives the same per diem; the difference is in the travelling expenses.

Mr. Thomas: The difference is not the travelling time. I agree there is a difference in the expenses for travelling, but there is a per diem rate. Surely, if they meet as a body, their per diem rate would be the same.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. The time taken. My hon. friend knows that the time of travel is put in as a per diem rate.

Mr. Thomas: You are talking of expenses. I am talking about the per diem rate.

Mr. Haskett: The per diem rate. There were more days taken in his travelling—coming back and forth—so he received the extra per diem—

Mr. MacDonald. The train leaves after midnight.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, under grants there I do not notice any grant to the association or to the rehabilitation group which has been set up in the city of Windsor under the sponsorship of the Reverend Neil Libby. This is a group set up by the Anglican Church and I certainly think consideration should have been given to them if they have made an application.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not think that St. Leonard's House has opened yet. I think their opening is set for some time in the new year.

Mr. Newman: They would have made application now, seeing that this is for the

budget for the coming year. Have they not made application?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: To my knowledge, they have not made application.

Mr. Newman: I will see to it that they do.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask about the advisory committee?

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I brought this matter up before. Last year the hon. Minister said that he was seeking 15 teachers, 15 rehabilitation officers, 7 social workers, 7 psychologists and two psychiatrists. I would like to know how many he actually hired, in each group.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have filled all the vacancies for teachers. It was 15 teachers we needed.

Mr. Trotter: But you hired 15.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: What were the other offices?

Mr. Trotter: There were 15 teachers, 15 rehabilitation officers—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I have not got the comparative figures here on these. I will get them from my hon. friend. The rehabilitation staff has increased considerably. I gave the number this afternoon as 51 rehabilitation officers.

Mr. Trotter: Let us put it this way. How many more rehabilitation officers have you this year compared with last year? You see, if we had these reports we would not have to ask these questions. But you have not given us the reports as of March 31, 1962. Normally we can look these things up and, if we had them, we would not have to take the time of the House.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The report would still not give you the year before.

Mr. Trotter: But could we have some idea? My question is: how many more rehabilitation officers do you have this year compared with last year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will get it for you in just a moment.

Mr. Trotter: While you are looking that up, I might ask this: have you changed during the past year the works programme in the jails? In other words, have you given the

inmates in the jails the opportunity to do any work, or have you changed the programme at all?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, we are not concerned in the programme of the jails, they fall within the jurisdiction of the municipalities. But we have made that very substantial improvement that I mentioned by taking off prisoners that are sentenced for over 30 days and up to 90 days that formerly spent their whole sentences in the jails. We now take them out of the jails—those that are sentenced from 30 to 90 days—and put them on our industrial farms or other establishments where they are working.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I certainly disagree with the theory of the government that they have no responsibility for what goes on in jails. I think I should repeat to you what the John Howard society told you in a report of last March, or in 1961, of what goes on in the jails. It said the only works programmes, with minor exceptions, are cleaning, gardening and general maintenance and some clothing and record keeping operations. The physical structures do not permit the development of a works programme due to lack of space and other areas. There is almost complete idleness and the time is occupied yarning, some card playing, reading of magazines or books and using outdoor yards so designed that walking is usually the only activity.

Now for a Department of Reform Institutions here in the province of Ontario I think that is a pretty sorry statement for the John Howard society to have to make. After all, it is the John Howard society which get these grants to try to get these people back to work, back as ordinary people and certainly the department is of no help or assistance in that line. You have not answered my question about the rehabilitation officers. Have they dug up the answers?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have 7 more rehabilitation officers than we had this time last year.

Mr. Trotter: How many more?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Seven more.

Mr. Trotter: Seven more. Well, you had hoped for 13 but you got 7. Have you any psychologists at all? Full-time psychologists? You were seeking 7 last year.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: We have 18 full-time psychologists and 6 part-time psychologists.

Mr. Trotter: How many did you have last year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will get that.

Mr. Trotter: Well, I know one thing. If you do not pay in comparison to their learning, the psychologists and the teachers, any more than you pay the jailers, it is no wonder that you cannot get jailers with any more than grade 8. I think you pay them about from \$2,900 to \$4,500. The most of them are in the \$3,000 class.

You cannot get men, the best type of men who are supposed to be working in a reform institution, for that kind of money. I think your problem is that you are just too cheap and trying to get by on a small budget to do work that it is utterly impossible to do.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: My hon. friend knows that the jail staff now come under the municipal jails.

An hon. member: Oh, this is just—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think the hon. member is speaking about the jail guards. If he means the guards in our institutions, they begin at not \$2,800 but at \$3,480.

Mr. Trotter: I know you bring back this matter of the municipalities being responsible, but going back to this report of 1954, of the Stewart commission, one of their first recommendations was this: that the province should take over the complete responsibility for jails in the province of Ontario.

You have completely reversed the advice of this group. I certainly feel that you have made a very serious mistake. All it has enabled you to do is to keep passing the buck to the municipalities which are now hard pressed to meet their present finances. The responsibility really lies with the province and this is one of the basic errors that you, as the Minister, have made. You will never live it down.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I know that you have in a way answered this question, but I was very interested to know in connection with your advisory committee, your predecessor suggested the advisory committee cover certain subjects. Is your advisory committee on the treatment of the offender, doing a study of any particular subject now?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The MACTO, as we call it, is busily engaged in various projects and is meeting regularly and it has a full programme.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister, are they doing a study, for example, on parole and rehabilitation?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think a study on that subject was completed before I became the hon. Minister and they reported on it.

Mr. Thompson: I was going to ask the hon. Minister if they are still doing that study. I understand from the previous hon. Minister that they were doing that study and he gave the suggestion that this was completed, but he said that they were going to do a further study and he would seem to me to have been giving direction to the committee. If I could quote:

The advisory council on the treatment of the offender has completed a most useful year's work. Its first subject was parole and rehabilitation and this subject was covered fully in the most impressive manner by that board. Currently the position of jails in a modern correctional programme is under their consideration.

I wondered, in addition to what the previous hon. Minister told us, that subjects were under discussion, has the present hon. Minister got any particular study that he gives priority to, for the board to study, or is there just a general survey?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The study that was being made to which the hon. member for Dovercourt refers was a study on the rehabilitation problem and out of this study and recommendations made came several changes, perhaps the most notable being the change that was made in our organizational set-up whereby we now have district rehabilitation offices. They are being set up, and I think it will greatly expedite, and is already proving that it is expediting, the whole after-care work. They have since worked assiduously and I pay them tribute for a very splendid job and a very able group of people, including the former Speaker of the House.

They have been working continuously since I came into office and I do not think they are going to run out of matters being referred to them by the Minister. They do not make short-term studies, they take these matters and give them very serious consideration indeed.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister advised this House that he did not have any definite figures with respect to female inmates in connection with alcoholism. Now there has been a clinic which was set up and which last year had facilities, accord-

ing to the hon. Minister for some 36 patients at a time for treatment of male alcoholics. Would the hon. Minister be able to advise us how many inmates received this type of treatment during the last year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Male alcoholics? We have facilities for treating 150 male alcoholics at the one time and while the total goes up and down somewhat, there was one time when we had 153 or 155, which exceeded our accommodation and we had to use some space in an adjoining building.

I do not know if I have the total number that we now have there. I would explain to the hon. member that these people being treated for alcoholism in the Alexander G. Brown Memorial Clinic are admitted there for the last month of their sentence. It is not considered advisable to place them there at the beginning of their sentence. We figure that the best use can be made of that facility by treating these people during the last month of their sentences.

I will see if I can get the figure. If I cannot get it now I will let the hon. member have the total who have gone through in the last year.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, it would appear they were making progress in this direction. The reason I asked the question, the hon. Minister will recall that the previous hon. Minister made a statement in this House in 1960 to the effect that those addicted to alcohol comprised the largest single group undergoing sentence. So if that be the case, there would be a great number of these people who require this treatment and do I understand that the facilities were expanded considerably during the past year?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Just before last year. They have been in operation for more than a year.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Thank you.

One further question: would the hon. Minister advise me whether or not purchases by his department are all done on a tender basis?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: First of all with regard to the number of alcoholics we treat, I think I would want to point out to the hon. member that not everyone who is addicted to the use of alcohol is going to get any substantial benefit, if any benefit, from the treatment unless there is a desire for it and a receptivity that is marked. The hon. member knows very well that you are not going to get results from it. That is why we have found

that up until now, with one exception for a brief period when we went up to 153 or 155, we found the accommodation was adequate.

The question: are all our purchases on a tender basis? Yes, all.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Are they open tenders or invitation tenders?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That question was asked last year. It is a type of invitation tender that is spread over a wide area and I think that anyone who wants to be on the invitation tender list is put on it.

Mr. Singer: How do they get on it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I say I think anyone who wants to be on it has only to ask to be on it and he is on it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would there be any publication anywhere which would indicate the purchases that are going to be made by the department so that people would have the opportunity of tendering, of seeking out the department to find out what they are intending to purchase?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I think we buy a very wide range of articles, some in very small quantities. I do not think it would be reasonable to put out such a publication for general distribution; but if the hon. member has any particular class of wares in which he is interested or has people asking to be put on the list to be invited to tender, their names would be accepted.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask one short question of the hon. Minister. Since he has now turned the jurisdiction of the jails over to the counties and the municipalities, when guards are hired does the department still have to give approval to the applications?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The Act which was amended last year said that the appointment of the guards was in the hands of the municipality excepting as regards the jailer, that is the governor, whose appointment must be approved by the department.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has certainly got more than his share of exercise today in the number of times that he has had to get up and make the responses that he has made to the numerous questions that have been addressed

to him, and generally in a very courteous fashion. I might go on to say, sir, that in my opinion whatever else the hon. Minister is he is certainly a gentleman. I say that, and I wish the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) was in his seat tonight because he made some reference today in the House to the matter of politeness and I wanted to say for his ears, and perhaps some of his hon. colleagues will tell him, that one definition of a gentleman is a person who is never rude unintentionally.

I say that the hon. Minister is a gentleman because I want to record for the House that as the head of this department in the 4 years that I have had the pleasure of being the steward of my community, the hon. gentleman who heads this department is the first member of the Cabinet who ever visited that great metropolis north of the French River, who ever had the courtesy to call me up on the telephone and to say that he was in town. And they have all been there, they have all been there in their majesty and with their satraps and with the ward heelers behind them from the hon. Prime Minister down, but he is the first who ever got on the phone and said: "I am in town, how are you?"

Now having said that—were you saying something to me, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: This is entirely apart from vote 2001.

Mr. Sopha: Well I wanted to tell you I had to say that about the hon. Minister before I could vote for his salary, which is in this vote. But having said that, I want to go on to say that I do not think the hon. gentleman should head up this department. I think the hon. Prime Minister made a mistake, and I say that seriously. I think he made a mistake when he made the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Ward-robe) Minister of Mines and made this hon. gentleman Minister of Reform Institutions. I say that seriously. But the hon. Prime Minister at the time was under certain pressures. The influence of northern Ontario is not great on this government. North of the French we only have two Ministers, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) and the hon. Minister of Mines. We have 3 other people who exercise a very mitigated influence on the government and they are all in the ONR, those 3.

Mr. Chairman: This is entirely apart—

Mr. Sopha: But I am getting back to it, I am saying—

Mr. Chairman: Order! You have the opportunity at other times to discuss these matters. This is vote 2001.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, do you suggest to me seriously that—

Mr. Chairman: The number of Ministers north of the French River has nothing to do with vote 2001.

Mr. Sopha: It has everything to do with everything.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! Vote 2001.

Mr. Sopha: I want to say to you that I am speaking on this vote and I say it respectfully to you. I say that it was a mistake to replace the former hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. I am talking about this department, the salary—

Mr. Chairman: The salary is statutory.

An hon. member: It is all right.

Mr. Chairman: The salary is statutory, it has nothing to do with it at all. It is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, you are new in the chair and I want to get off to a good start with you so I will leave it and return to it at a later time.

I am glad the hon. Minister from St. Andrew (Mr. Grossman) is in his seat.

An hon. member: It is about time.

Mr. Sopha: The chief liquor commissioner of the province. And in talking about this department, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the relevance of a product that the chief liquor commissioner sells. In its relevance—

An hon. member: What do you know about it?

Mr. Sopha: I do know about it, I know very much about it. And that product I want to identify as goof—g-o-o-f—and its relevance to the number of people that are in our institutions. It comes under various names: Catawba, four aces, panther juice, iodine and so on.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The institutions are dealt with in vote 2003; this is vote 2001.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, let us not carry on a running fight. I want to talk about

the high incidence of recidivism that results from alcoholism. My hon. colleagues have spent a great deal of time, the hon. leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for York South referred to it, the hon. Minister referred to it and I want to refer to it. Now do not bang the gavel again, please.

Mr. Chairman: You are at liberty to refer to it in passing, but this is not the proper time to refer to alcoholism.

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to deal with it in passing, I want to deal with it head on.

Mr. Chairman: This is not the proper time to deal with that subject.

Mr. Sopha: I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, you are wrong. With the greatest respect, you are wrong.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with vote 2001. I rule that you are out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: In vote 2001 we want to deal with main office expenses, in 2002 with parole and rehabilitation, and then on to institutions in vote 2003. If the member connects the other subjects up to institutions on vote 2003 that is very well, but after all we have had a great deal of latitude here today and it is time that we got ahead with the estimates and dealt with them in an orderly manner.

Mr. Thompson: There is no point in having a Department of Reform Institutions if there are no offenders. The hon. member for Sudbury is talking about the cause which produces offenders. We have had the hon. Minister talk about it and everyone else.

Mr. Chairman: He was referring to those in institutions, which should be dealt with in vote 2003.

Mr. Thompson: We are talking about the fact that there are many people who take goof, or whatever it is called, outside the institution but they may end up in an institution. We are talking on the general principle for having this department.

Mr. Chairman: You will have your opportunity in vote 2003, that is my ruling. Anything further on 2001?

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I respect your judgment and I want to note how you have exercised my hon. colleagues in the way that you have interrupted me, they have had to rise to my defence.

Will you observe with me, Mr. Chairman, that there is an item in vote 2001, John Howard Society of Toronto; John Howard and Elizabeth Fry, Port Arthur; Elizabeth Fry, Toronto and Elizabeth Fry, Ottawa—the Salvation Army, yes. Taking those 5 sir, I submit to you that money that is paid out of the public moneys of this province to them is paid in connection with their work with offenders who may or may not be, but likely are, repeaters, recidivists within our reform institutions.

Mr. Chairman: Having established a connection with vote 2001, you may proceed.

Mr. Sopha: I wish to contend, sir, having established that point, I wish to contend and make this simple proposition that many of the people—and particularly here is one that I know a little bit more about than the others—the Salvation Army, because I see them more often in the magistrate's court, a very noble institution quick in their response to the call of the needy and in the relief of human suffering in the magistrate's court. Day in and day out the people with whom the Salvation Army personnel have to deal are many of the people who eventually come into the hands of the hon. Minister and his officials.

I have said before in the House that in my experience in the courts, when magistrate's court opens in the morning the order of business, at least in my community goes this way: drunks first, then QC's, then the rest of the profession.

Under this very selective law you have there in the morning, you have these people, 10, 15, perhaps 20 of them, but as you get near a festive season, the Yuletide season, the numbers increase—you get more of them. In mid-summer you do not get nearly as many as you get in the winter—

An hon. member: It's the cold weather.

Mr. Sopha: These are the people that have been selected by the police—and the police, sir, exercise their own concept of jurisprudence in their selection of them. It is a concept of jurisprudence, of course, it is! The policeman goes along the street and he sees the old tippler, a happy old tippler, wending his way home and he says: "Come on along, Charlie, go home to the wife and kids." And if Charlie goes along and does not cause any trouble, that is the last you hear of this little encounter with alcohol.

But on the other hand, if he is a bit snarly with the policeman, then he is going to find himself in the lockup for that night and he

is going to be before the Queen's justices the next morning in magistrate's court.

So that is the exercise of the concept of jurisprudence, you see. The policeman has selected this one. As I have said before, you never find policemen stationed outside our best golf clubs or best country clubs in order to encounter the best people from the economic point of view in our society. They are never haled before the justices, so they never become repeaters.

You know the way the repeater thing goes, if I may refresh your mind about it. The first time he comes up—\$10 and costs or 5 days. The second time it is \$25 and costs or 30 days, and the third time there is no monetary penalty at all, it is three months.

A good many of these repeaters, in fact I would say the majority of them, reside in our district jails up to 3 months. What does the hon. Minister say? He said half the population of our jails are alcoholics or are there because of alcohol offences? A goodly number anyway—a goodly number.

An hon. member: Thirty thousand.

Mr. Sopha: But a goodly number of that goodly number, as I have said before, are there because of the assumption of that inferior product that the chief liquor commissioner sells.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): I do not sell it, you sell it.

Mr. Sopha: And he complains, as he did complain, if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, complains because he was on an aircraft, was he not, and they did not serve Canadian wine—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Sopha: He got into a snit about it—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. Sopha: The reason you cannot sell Canadian wine is because so much of it is inferior.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Ontario wine producers will be glad to hear that.

Mr. Sopha: My friend, the late Albert Wren, who used to occupy the seat down here, used to say in relation to the cheap wine—and I am always in my remarks referring to the cheap wine—the 75 cent variety.

An hon. member: A gallon!

Mr. Sopha: Some of it may be. He used to say that he was positively convinced that it contained a form of poison, some kind of ether or something; it puts people out of their heads, and when we form the government I am going to make a sincere plea to the Prime Minister, the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Wintermeyer), that we do something about eliminating that product from sale in our stores, and make a sincere effort to improve the quality of our wines in an endeavour to take that nefarious, noxious product away from the lower income groups.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have the finest wine in the world in this province.

Mr. Sopha: Some of it may be. Some of it may be. I am referring to the 75 cent variety.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we can raise the price of it if the hon. member would like us to.

Mr. Sopha: Let me be absolutely clear. That noxious variety is consumed by that group, as I said before, who are taken from society and are put in prison for being intoxicated in a public place, that very selective group.

As far as that goes, our concept of punishment, the concept of punishment in a democracy, is such that any time you have 3,265 people in your institutions—the whole 3,265 have been selected and put there—they have had imposed on them, in other words, a term of imprisonment because at that particular time those who tried them, those who prosecuted them, selected them as being in some degree anti-social. Let me put it this way in order to formulate what may be my theory of punishment.

One of the most honest men I ever met was a famous safecracker. He was a very successful safecracker. He is now dead, he died at Dorchester prison in New Brunswick. He was one of the most honest people I ever met. He said to me, "I have spent almost all my life in prison. I have been in prison since 1929, off and on, but when I was out I blew a few safes and I lived high on the hog, I had a really good time, but eventually they caught up to me and they put me back in." But he said, and herein was his honesty, his basic honesty, he said, "That is the way I make my living." He said, "Other people may be clergymen, others may run hotels,

drive taxis or do something else. The way I chose to make my living was by blowing safes and stealing the contents and as long as they let me out I will do that until I come back in."

Mr. Cowling: Do you call that honest?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. I want to say this. In my conception I found that man to be much more honest, according to my theory of crime and punishment, than the director of a company who will use his special position of trust, the fiduciary relationship between himself and the shareholders of the company, to his private advantage, who will know that his company is going to merge with another, a larger company, and who knows that the shares of the company are going to go up in value, and with that knowledge he buys the shares of the company. I call the safecracker more honest than him. I call him more honest than the director of the company who knows of the merger, buys the shares and when asked by a reporter, "Is it true that your company is going to merge with 'Y' Company?" he answers, "No, there is no truth in it."

But, you see, according to our standards—I say to the hon. member for High Park, Mr. Chairman—the safecracker is in jail, but the other person who breaks his position of trust, you often as not find him to be steward of a church or president of a businessmen's club. He is out; he is out of jail.

Mr. Cowling: I think the hon. member is stretching it just a bit.

Mr. Sopha: That may be. But what I am saying is this, that of the 3,265 people who are there at any particular time, a great many of them are there purely by chance—purely by the flop of the mop, if you will, the roll of the cookie, the way the cookie crumbles—that is why they are in at any particular time. A goodly number of them, I go on to say, are there because of the calibre or the lack of mental capacity of the men who tried them, their judges, the lack of ability of the men who tried them. We know as lawyers that there are a goodly number of those who are charged with the responsibility of imposing punishment who in the one case may have a pet aversion, they may be against some particular type of crime—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. We have allowed a lot of latitude but the discussion of these court cases, the man who was cracking safes and so on, is getting quite a distance

away from vote 2001, the ordinary expenditure of the main office of reform institutions. If the member would like to speak, we do not want to interfere with his address, but we would like him to return to the subject, please.

Mr. Sopha: You and I, Mr. Chairman, were getting along so fine.

Mr. Chairman: We can, as long as you keep on the subject.

Mr. Sopha: As I was saying about the John Howard Society whose responsibility it is to deal with this very grave problem—and I would say, Mr. Chairman, to you, that in order to approach intelligently the problem of the elimination of recidivism, repeaters, the very thing that exercises the efforts of the John Howard Society, the Elizabeth Fry Society, the Salvation Army, that one has to have some concept of who constitute the prison population, who make it up. You have to know the people with whom you are dealing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at that point it is natural for me, if it comes to my mind, to say that the approach of the hon. member for York South, who is always so helpful in his comments—particularly, his comments are more helpful when he is seated than when he is standing. His approach to the whole thing is highly idealistic, in my opinion. He believes that everybody who is in an institution—

Mr. Chairman: Let us return to the Salvation Army and the John Howard Society.

An hon. member: The harbour light is out, sir, and he cannot find it.

Mr. Sopha: Look, Mr. Chairman, let's you and I have an understanding about this.

Mr. Chairman: Stay with your speech, keep to the subject.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. I am dealing with the question of repeaters. I was saying, sir, I understand the hon. member for York South spoke at some length this afternoon, and I am dealing with what you allowed him to speak about in my remarks, that he seems to say to the hon. Minister—and here is where he and I disagree—he seems to say to the hon. Minister that if you will not spend enough money in hiring trained people to get social workers and psychologists and psychiatrists, you get enough of them if you pay them a high enough salary, then you are able in totality to straighten out those people that you find in your institutions.

Mr. MacDonald: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. Sopha: He seems to say that. If I understood his remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member misinterprets.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am sorry. He tells me he did not say that. Then if he did not say that, he recognizes with me that at any particular time within the institution there is a group of people in our present state of knowledge of the human mind, the present stage of development of the science of psychiatry and psychology, there is a group of people within the custody of these institutions who (a) do not want to be helped and (b) they cannot be helped. They are the chronic institutionalized people who will find themselves in custody for most of their natural lives. When they are out they will pursue by reason of choice a programme of anti-social behaviour; indeed they will. And who can sum it up better, if I may make brief reference to the visit to the city of Father Clark, the Jesuit priest, who inspires the book or the film, I forget which it is, "Hoodlum Priest". I guess it was a book and movie both. He said, in one of his references to the group of which he spoke: "Some guys should never leave penitentiary."

He is referring, of course, to the institutionalized individual that we find within our institutions, and here is what happens. As far as I can see in my connection with this, the experience that I have had, these people go one, two or three times to the reform institutions of this province under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister and then after about the third time there, they make the big leap into the post-graduate course, the big league. The "Big House," they call it, the penitentiary—Kingston. That is their post-graduate course, their doctor's thesis, so to speak, in crime, when they reach the big time.

There are some of them, I dare say, that chafe. They chafe at that period in their sophomore years that are spent in the reform institutions until they make that step into the big time, the "Big House", and start to pursue, as I have called it, their doctor's thesis, in crime. They go to the real university of crime down at Kingston.

It is quite remarkable, as the hon. Minister knows, maybe some other hon. gentleman will know it, that when they are prosecuted for escaping from the reform institutions then as often as not they will get up and

ask the magistrate trying them, they will say: "When you sentence me, will you make the sentence long enough, or will you qualify the sentence so that I have to go to the 'Big House', to Kingston?"

They want to make the league at that point. Not that I think if they take them back to the reform institution that they are going to be subject to any special penalty, or any special particular punishment for having escaped. It is fairly easy to escape from Burwash, for example. All you have to do is walk out. They are caught fairly quickly, most of them, but you see they are escaping in such an easy way, it seems to me.

I sit in court and listen to them try it and I hear them say this to the magistrate, they say: "Will you send us to Kingston, your worship?" More often than not, he does. It sort of promotes them at that time, the way they go off to Kingston.

There is that type of individual, unfortunately, within our society. I have come to recognize him and to know him. He has various characteristics about him that are easily recognizable. I will not go into them, but he is content—let me sum it up this way—he is content to be institutionalized.

He will get along and if you looked up his record in the department you would probably find that he is no particular trouble to the authorities. He is a model prisoner. No doubt, they put a star on his portfolio. Maybe, when he comes back for his repetitive sentence, the custodial officers say something like "Welcome home." He is a model prisoner when he is in. When he is out, as I understand, as I have observed his behaviour, he wends his way along the thin line between legality and illegality, not caring which side of the line he is on, until eventually he teeters over into illegality, is caught again and the vicious circle repeats itself and he is back in the institution.

Now these are the people with whom the hon. Minister is dealing. But among those, and I do not say that they are the majority, I just say—and I will have to measure my words very carefully—I say that some of them are the people, Mr. Chairman, that the John Howard Society wants to help, seriously. These are the people that the John Howard Society tries to help. This money, \$15,000—a niggling amount—is well spent because the John Howard Society, when these people come out as often as not they know enough to go to the John Howard Society and the John Howard Society tries to get them a job, sends them along the

way to rehabilitation and to the leading of a useful, economically useful, and social life. In other words, to stop them from being what they are, or have been, enemies of society.

Put them aside. There is another group that benefits from the custody, that can be helped. There is a group that, if caught, have practised and skilled people deal with them, then that is the last time we will ever see them or support them at the taxpayers' expense. They will pay their debt to society, they will go out and they will, from that time on, lead useful and completely adjusted and social lives.

I wonder to what extent it has to do, and I say this to the hon. Minister, with the associations that they form in prison. To what effect are they warped by the people they meet within the institutions. I ask myself is any endeavour made to spot the type of individual who really wants to rehabilitate. When he comes through the front gates, is there an effort to spot him and say if we isolate this fellow, if we keep him in some form of cocoon and keep him away from the others, can we send him away from the institution without having been contaminated by the others?

I do not know if an effort is made along that line at all, Mr. Chairman. But where the great effort can be made, and in order to emphasize what was said by my hon. friend from Dovercourt and my hon. friend from Wentworth, Mr. Chairman, as well as my hon. friends from the party to the left here, that if it is a question of salary, if it is a question of money—and the hon. gentleman this afternoon, in some of his frank comments seemed to say it was—then in the interests of the people of this province, the law enforcement and the whole question of custody should lead us to the irresistible conclusion that no reasonable expense should be spared in order to hire the best possible people and pay them what they can command in the market in an effort to persuade them to remain on over a number of years as permanent employees in association with The Department of Reform Institutions.

In order to put a text to what I say, may I refer to some remarks by the predecessor of the hon. Minister when he was last here discussing this very problem. He was talking about psychologists and psychiatrists. The then hon. Minister, I have it now, and I am quoting:

Eleven psychiatrists—does the hon. member want the psychologists too? Nine psychologists and 11 psychiatrists.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: That is for the entire reform institutions programme for all of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, that is right.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Is this sufficient?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Certainly not, but let the hon. member try to get them. We are trying to get more all the time.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I was going to bring that up under another item, but I understand that last year the hon. Minister told us that he was short on several classes of personnel.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Are we still short?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Minister tell us why?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Because they are impossible to get.

An hon. member: The hon. Minister had one, but he let him go.

He is referring to a psychiatrist. I suspect that was my hon. friend to the left who made that remark, because he made it again today.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is quite true. He was offered more money.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Are we short of social workers, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, we are.

You see, apparently the offer of more money was not sufficient to keep this man there. The hon. Minister in his remarks makes a plain inference that he was conscious that money might be the factor and he readily said, well we offered this man more money. I do not think they pay very much, but, and I come to the conclusion, the next step I take from that if I believe they do not pay very much money to get skilled personnel, is that they do not get them to offer themselves. They can make more money elsewhere.

Where you are dealing with 3,265 people, who are a drain on the 6 million of us in this province, supporting them—how much a day does it cost to keep one of them in an institution? \$2,000 a year, the hon. member for Parkdale says, sir, we 6 million have to pay to keep these 3,265. I say that any reasonable expense is justified.

If the hon. Minister goes to the Treasury Board and he wants more money—he only

wanted a million dollars more this year—this means that things to me after 4 years are about the same as they were last year. If he wants only a million more then there is no great new programme being developed. But if he goes to the Treasury Board and wants more money to hire competent people, certainly no one will get up and say that we should not have more competent people and should not pay them what they can command on the market. Nobody would dare get up and say that. When he goes to the Treasury Board he can say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), who sits there as chairman: "How can you justify paying \$60,000 to the thoroughbred horse society, for the breeding of horses, when you will not give me any more for the saving of human souls, for the readjustment and rehabilitation of people like ourselves within the society—human beings?"

I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that this government has a policy that they will not pay very much for brains; they are not willing to spend a dollar to get a good man. I suspect that. I have not much evidence of it, but I suspect that they want to get people cheaply and are content or want to pay them far below what they can get for comparable activity in private industry.

In this thankless department, in this depressed atmosphere where you are dealing with people in custody, where the custodial officers themselves are virtually prisoners in that they are locked up too, you will not get good people to come in and work unless they are paid some little extra premium. They will not come in to that atmosphere. That is the way I see it, and the way I see is some avenue toward amelioration and some daring new development in our whole programme of rehabilitation.

To sum it up, I say: Let us accept the anti-social—rather, not accept them but let us realize that we have them, there anti-social types of individual who need to be locked up to protect society from them and protect themselves against society, to protect them from the temptation to do wrong. Let us accept that to be our fate. Like the poor, they will always be with us.

But there are other ones who can be put on the right road. Something can be done for them. Let us not only accept them; let us accept the challenge and recognize it. Let us decide now what degree of expertise, skill and ability there is at hand that we, the government of Ontario, can purchase to assist us; what trained people are available?

In my heart I know that I do not have the

feeling that I merely spout idle words because I know in this department, from my own experience, that they had a psychiatrist about 4 or 5 years ago—and an able man he was; I had dealings with him. I know how co-operative he was and how interested he was in helping people. I forget his name now; it was a European name. But he left the department. The reason I do not know, but it was not a question of money as the hon. Minister told us. If he has been replaced I do not know it, but for a long time he was not replaced.

I know that some small start was made down at Millbrook in the establishment of a centre for the treatment of sexual deviates. I do not know how successful that has been, but it is a very modest beginning. I do know that not every sexual deviate goes there, only the most extreme kinds, only the most anti-social, only those whose manifestations indicate that they are a great danger to society.

I also am told by people, who I do not think are lying to me, that a great deal of sexual deviation goes on within the institutions. I am told that a great deal of ill-adjusted and unaccepted abnormal sexual practices occur. I suppose they cannot be avoided; they cannot all be stopped. But we do not make a fresh start until we accept the challenge of what we must do. I do not say this in any disparaging fashion to the hon. Minister. What we must do—as has been ably said by the hon. member for York South—has been more ably documented and said in the speech last year by the hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman. He set it out, and I think that time he spoke for one hour and 45 minutes. It was a very careful treatise of the situation within our department and it bears reading and rereading.

Before I sit down, there is one other special matter I want to deal with under the main office, because this does not deal with any particular jail. It must deal with the decision taken in the main office, that is how I relate it to this estimate. That is the case of Dennis, just tried at Sudbury, and the responsibility of the hon. Minister for what was done in that case.

I observe, in the *Toronto Telegram* tonight, that Dennis is jerking the tears. The *Toronto Telegram* has him syndicated; he is doing a series of articles for which, I hope, he is being paid because he must be without funds and I hope they are paying him well. Gerard Dennis, of course, is "Raffles"—the notorious international criminal of some years ago who has just been tried and acquitted, and so

forth. The prosecution, I assume, was initiated by this department and is the direct responsibility of the hon. Minister.

You will permit me to remark, Mr. Chairman, I hope, that Dennis was ably defended by one of the leading criminal lawyers of this province, Arthur Maloney, QC, assisted by Frank J. Keenan, St. Catharines, and by François Legault, formerly of The Department of the Attorney-General of the province of Ontario. All served without fee. Mr. Legault is now a practising solicitor in Sudbury.

If Gerard Dennis escaped from Burwash in 1943—and nobody will ever know whether he did because he was acquitted of the charge, the jury found him not guilty—one wonders why the department, when they apprehended him—and they had no difficulty in apprehending him because the American police delivered him to the border and turned him over to the officials of this department—did not take him to Burwash and confine him there to carry out his sentence? They had the legal right to hold him for the expiration of his sentence—whatever it was, 6 or 8 months, a year, I do not know—why did they not confine him? They chose not to do that. Mind you, Mr. Chairman, I had better tell some of the hon. members of the House, who do not know the facts, that Gerard Dennis had served some 14 years in a penitentiary in the United States.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have read all this.

Mr. Sopha: I am glad the hon. Minister without Portfolio reads something, because I have only observed him with the funny papers.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I was merely trying to elucidate the background. I am glad the hon. members have read that he had served some 14 years. But this department chose to charge him with escaping from Burwash in 1943 and there the comedy of errors began.

They appeared in court and the prosecution of this department was so well prepared to prove their case, mark you, Mr. Chairman, against a man who had been held for 5 months in custody in the district jail at Sudbury, pending his trial upon this charge.

They appeared there with documents which demonstrated that the warrant to commitment only entitled the governor at Guelph to hold him, and not the governor at Burwash

at all. And never during the course of the trial did this department ever prove that the man was lawfully in custody at Burwash at any time. So far as the jury and the judge were concerned, and they of course suspected that the man had escaped from somewhere I suppose, so far as they were concerned, the man had never been in Burwash, that he had been committed under warrant of commitment—by a warrant signed by the hand of a magistrate in Toronto—to the institution at Guelph. And they had the man arrested.

Mr. Maloney, of course, drew this to the attention of the court. The next step was taken and the very honest custodial officers who came forward to give evidence identified Gerard Dennis as being the man whom they had seen in 1943, and their memories were very acute, indeed, very sharp, they said we—I was talking about a ministerial decision. I want to observe for the purposes of the record that—and I want to observe especially for my hon. friend from York-Humber (Mr. Lewis), I want to observe especially for him, and a good friend he is—that the hon. Minister whom I allege had made a ministerial decision in regard to this, at no time did he ever interrupt me.

An hon. member: If he interrupted you, we would be here all night.

Mr. Sopha: Well, it may be that you will be the next Minister of Reform Institutions. You may have the responsibility of interrupting me. I had almost come to the end of what I was going to say. If you will just give me a minute or more, I had come to the part where I was talking about the custodial officers who came forward to give evidence. They said they remembered the day that this man left he was out on the work party. They counted the prisoners upon their return. One was missing, and they assumed that one was Gerard Dennis. But very honestly, when they were cross-examined skillfully by Arthur Maloney, they had to admit that so far as they were concerned, he might have been transferred to another institution.

And there, the case of The Department of Reform Institutions flopped. And the very intelligent jury—and we are accustomed to intelligent juries north of the French—very rapidly acquitted this man. My question to the hon. Minister is: After the man had done 14 years—we are told 5 of them illegally, that he ought not to have served 5 of them in the United States—then why in the first place was he charged at all? The public conscience would not have been offended. In no way would it have been offended if

this man had been allowed to go free. We do not persecute in our society. The man had paid his debt. He had paid his debt in a prison in the United States. We do not, as a people, like to persecute an individual, and I suspect that is largely the reason that the good people of Sudbury acquitted him. It was because they realized that simple fact.

If he was to be prosecuted, then why is not the department efficient enough to have the case prepared in order to make it a serious business? That man had remained in jail over 5 months pending his trial because he would not be granted bail. The judges would not grant him bail because he had a record. You know, a remarkable thing—and here is the point at which I am going to sit down. If you are pending trial or if you have been convicted and if you appeal—I tell you something about the law of this province and its injustice—if you are pending appeal and you have a record, you will not be granted bail. You will not be granted bail. It is as simple as that. That was the case with Dennis.

He had a record and he could not get bail, so he sat in the Sudbury jail for 5 months pending his trial. The department came along and presented their flimsy evidence, but the conscience of the community, revived in the articulated form of the jury—the old British jury, upon which you can depend, which you over there have tried to nibble away over the years, more so the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Frost) who does not come among us any more, than the remainder—the British jury did the right thing by Dennis and by the community and they set him free to write his articles for the *Toronto Telegram* as he is doing now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for permitting me to finish these few brief remarks.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2001 carried.

On vote 2002:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, in connection with vote 2002, I would suggest to the hon. Minister that this really is the crux of our whole system of penal reform. I consider that parole and rehabilitation have been the emphasis that you have been stressing and your hon. predecessor was stressing. I asked you previously in connection with the men leaving the institutions—I am talking about the question during the last year's estimates. I had wondered if again you followed the suggestion from—and I keep quoting the United Nations congress because it did draw together a great number of experts from across the world. Our own hon. Minister

was there, your predecessor, and I think there was a pattern set, something like the human rights code to which we should aim.

These experts had suggested that with respect to men ready to go out into society again—that to be ready, there should be preparation for them. There should first, after a period that they have had within an institution, be a period when they are getting adjusted to freedom. In other words, as I read the story of Dennis, it seemed to me that he suddenly walked out into society.

There was no period of readjustment prior to moving out. I know that the United Nations congress suggested that perhaps during the last 3 or 4 months before a man leaves an institution—and I am thinking of a sentence of two years less a day—that he is allowed more and more freedom. There is even a period suggested when he goes out and gets work but comes back at night to an institution. Fine. And I wondered, sir, what is your practice. I am thinking, for example, of someone from Millbrook. Previously the hon. Minister spoke to me about these forest camps. But I am talking perhaps about the men who were in Millbrook. What is the process of their release?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, when a man is released he comes under the care of our rehabilitation staff. But I would say this to my hon. friend: Perhaps there is a difference in the need for this intermediate step, which is spoken of commendably in some areas, where a man is suddenly released from close custody, where he has lived in a cell, where he has lived in a cell block, where he has been, as in that new prison built in England for the same type of prison that we have at Guelph—and I read the description of the custody and the security and the close confinement in which one lives there. In our institutions, such as our big Guelph institution or even our industrial farms, our prisoners have a great deal more movement in and out and more freedom to mix with their fellows and there is not anything like the same sudden break from a prison life into the open that may be the case in so many of these countries where they have just close confinement and nothing comparable to these minimum security or medium security institutions that we have where the men are moving in relatively normal relation with their fellows.

At our forest camps the men live in conditions closely approximating, almost identical, with the conditions in which they will live when they are released if they go into construction or lumber work. It would do your

heart good to see the transformation that occurs in these men under those conditions. I have a great belief in the out-of-doors and the re-creative value that comes from outdoor living. There the boys live in dormitories just about like the lumber operation huts that we saw when we were on our trip up north. I could not discern any differences in the life that our fellows live in our forest operation camps and the life those lumber men live in those camps in that work which we saw up near Kapuskasing.

They come in from their work in the evening, they go to their huts, wash up, they walk across to the dining room, they take their places there, they can spend the evening playing cards or playing games or reading or watching television and they go to their dormitories for the night. There are no locks and there are no bars and the only fence is one about 18 inches high around the lawn to keep motor cars from driving on the grass. They are no further from a paved highway than we are from College Street. Those circumstances are different only in degree from the conditions in our industrial farms where a great number of our men are; or, to an even less degree, in the institutions like our Burch Training Centre or the Brampton Training Centre. In those circumstances, I think the hon. member will realize there would be no point in trying to introduce this other complicating factor. There would be no value in it. We satisfy all of those conditions I think perhaps in better measure than you could under the conditions he suggests.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. Minister referring to the forest camps, I commend him wholeheartedly. Last year he said there were 600 young people who went through the forest camps, but there are 9,000 people in the institutions in the course of a year. This is a very small proportion getting the benefit of the approach outlined. I would suggest that if we were to examine some of the European countries—and I think I agree with the hon. Minister it is unfair to be referring to the penal systems in European countries constantly, because there is a different sociological background, we are not as homogeneous as they are over there—but in Holland and a number of these countries they have very few maximum security jails; they have a great number of minimum security. I would think that with many of these people, looking at our results, sir, looking at the results of our people as they come out, we have to be very frank and say we have done a poor job. These fellows

should not have come out when they did because they are coming back again. So either we were not able to help them, or else they were not ready to come out.

Therefore I feel, sir, that there should be perhaps more—more tentacles, let us put it this way. I do not mean pressing or forcing them down, but tentacles which will help to support them helpfully into society. I think there should be more arms to help the men adjust. I think that release is a shock to some of these people.

I recently met with a group of ex-offenders and they told me of the sudden change which took place. They told me that from the parole board which was meant to help them in readjusting to a job they got a ticket and a suit and they landed in Toronto and they had to hunt for a job. I would suggest, sir, that the parole board is the most significant aspect of all our work. I do not care how exemplary a man is in jail, the test of whether his rehabilitation has been successful comes when he leaves the jail. Those first few weeks after he leaves are probably the most fundamental to his whole development.

I notice the parole board has three members. One of them—I recognize the name very well—is a fine gentleman, whom I did not have the privilege to meet but he was my Conservative contender in the riding of Dovercourt. I do not know his background in this. I know he was a sincere person and I am sure there were other reasons than the fact he was a Conservative standard-bearer in Dovercourt that he has been placed on the parole board. I would think that this is so important that these men who are on this parole board should have long experience with penal institutions.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member that the chairman of our parole board, Mr. Mason, has been in this work for about 15 years. Would I clarify the situation any for hon. members if I were to point out that our parole board has a very limited jurisdiction. The paroling of our prisoners as regards the definite part of the sentence is within the sole jurisdiction of the national parole board. We have jurisdiction only over that portion of the man's sentence which was specified as an indefinite sentence. And that occurs in only a relatively small number of cases and in most of them our parole board has the benefit of the study which has been made by the national parole board, whose responsibility is substantially greater in that area.

Mr. Thompson: Would the hon. Minister help me in this? Assuming a man was sentenced for two years less a day, an adult, and he went, for example, to Guelph Reformatory. If after a year and a half he asked if he could come out of the reformatory, does the national parole board do the study that is requested?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes. The paroling of such a prisoner would rest with the national parole board. If he had in addition a 3-months or 6-months indefinite sentence, then it would be our responsibility to consider parole only in relation to that part of the sentence.

I would say this, though, that as regards the national parole board which does the paroling of the prisoner with respect to the definite portion of his sentence which is allowable by parole, they not infrequently ask our officers to give them assistance in the interviewing.

Mr. Thompson: Would the hon. Minister feel if there were a longer period of indefinite sentence, if there were more of these situations, would this be of help to him?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The hon. member is on a very enlightened subject and I would hesitate to let myself go on it because it is outside our jurisdiction. I would not like to tread on other people's toes, but I think I appreciate the attitude of the hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry that I am still pursuing this, but I do think it is the most important aspect of the hon. Minister's work. In view of the fact that the national parole board does this job, in view of the fact that the hon. Minister's own parole board does only the indefinite sentence parole, in view of the fact that these are very few, I wonder if the hon. Minister could get the number of parolees. And in view of the fact that these gentlemen on this board get paid more than even, I think, the Deputy Minister in the department, why are they getting a salary as high as this when it seems that their job is not by any means as onerous as even the social workers that the hon. Minister has?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Does the hon. member want to know the number of our prisoners that our parole board released from part of their indefinite sentences?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I do.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Second, the hon. member asks, why parole board members are paid more than the Deputy Minister.

Mr. Thompson: Well I am just considering the weight of responsibility of a Deputy Minister. These men are obviously paid a high salary in relation to others. I do not want to put it in such personal terms—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There must be some confusion in the way the salary figures are being read. As regards the number of prisoners paroled in the fiscal year 1961-62: 1,634 prisoners appeared before the parole board, the number of paroles that were affected was 1,006 and the number of successfully completed paroles was 815 or 80.8 per cent.

Mr. Thompson: When these 1,630 applications for parole appear, what actually is the file? Is it a social history of the man, a report from the institution or just what is it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would be happy to let the hon. member see one of the files and see the mass of information that is collated on it. The man's background and his sentence and his record when he was with us, and as much of his personal history before that as we can accumulate. It is all studied by these people who are expert in appraising the situation.

Mr. Thompson: I might say that I appreciate very much the information. I would like to add to what the hon. member for Sudbury said at this time, sir, that I appreciate very much the hon. Minister's gentlemanly approach under harassing circumstances at times in answering us. And then I will continue after I have said this to ask some more questions, if I could.

I am interested in why the hon. Minister has not considered half-way houses, that is the need of having a hostel in a city. Again this has been advocated and proved in many other countries, and they have a much lower rate of recidivism than we have.

It seems to me that we have pleaded on this side of the House, I have pleaded since my maiden speech, for some of these things. Yet it seems to me that the hon. Minister is reluctant to assist in this area. But when the hon. Minister's predecessor goes to the United Nations congress and when these things are expressed, he himself is exuberant about these kinds of approaches. I have felt that with this spark he would enlighten the present hon. Minister and then he also would carry this banner of real reform through. Could the hon. Minister tell what the department does with respect to hostels so that if a man comes out he will be accepted in a community setting?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, the experience of our department has been that there has been no particularly significant success in these halfway houses. We have not attempted them under the department's own operation. I do not know which country the hon. member would suggest was the most successful for us to study, but our department has not felt that it was particularly suited to our situation. We have, on the other hand, resorted more to the use of this expanding rehabilitation set-up.

Mr. Thompson: Well, if I could I would refer the hon. Minister again to the United Nations congress. The hon. Minister said that his experience has been that they have not been successful and yet in the next sentence he says he has not had any experience in his department.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I said in the department we have not, but there are some operating in various parts of Canada under private agencies.

Mr. Thompson: Yes. I am sorry. I stand corrected on that. But in other words, the hon. Minister is suggesting he does not feel it warrants experimentation by his department, that he does not feel half-way houses or hostels for men are justified by his department.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is the feeling of the department but we do not have a closed mind on it. We are not so definitely opposed to it that we would not give consideration to a scheme if we saw one we thought was useful and adaptable to this scene.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister does encourage it, does he not? I remember, when I was sitting with the manpower committee, that there was a gentleman representing an Anglican hostel. I understand there is some kind of a grant given by the department for the work which they are doing.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. The question was raised with respect to the projected establishment of that nature in Windsor and I think I said that as far as I knew we had had no request for a grant. The Salvation Army operates an establishment of similar kind here in Toronto; we make a substantial grant, as the hon. member can see, to Salvation Army work.

Mr. Thompson: If I may suggest, Mr. Chairman, I would feel that if there is one area where we need to try some bold experimentation, it is in connection with trying to

cut down this very high rate of recidivism, having these repeaters constantly coming back. I think that our philosophy, which I hope is also felt from their side of the House, is that rehabilitation is probably the test of the effectiveness of your whole reform approach. I would hope that certainly the hon. Minister would at least be wanting to experiment with this approach, which is certainly suggested by many criminologists across the world, of some kind of an intermediary house. I find it rather dogmatic that the department will say "we feel it will not work". I think the only way the hon. Minister will find it will work is if the department itself would move into this and experiment on it.

Another question is that I feel a very important aspect in the rehabilitation of an offender is that he should be equipped with some sort of training when he goes out. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I will hold this until we get into the institutions because I am speaking of the training at the institutions.

What I do feel, in connection with the offender, is what the hon. Minister can also appreciate; and what I think, we all can. If, as young persons, we committed some offence; if the hon. Minister, in his youth, had in some way got into misfortune with the law, I would hope that after a period of good conduct, he could go before some form of a tribunal to have this record eradicated. I would suggest, as I did last year, that the hon. Minister should give consideration to this. He told me he would give consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 2002 carried?

Mr. Thompson: No, I am sorry. I am waiting—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member made a statement. He did not ask a question.

Mr. Thompson: I suggested to the hon. Minister that since last year he was kind enough to say he would look into this, I wondered—I know his sympathies are with this—what he had found out when he looked into it.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There has been no formal action to wipe out a record; that seems a difficulty. I would say to the hon. member that we have been working toward a wider acceptance of released men; indeed in our department and in the civil service a record does not bar a man. I might have said, with respect to the half-way house—I am sorry for the oversight—that the Elizabeth Fry's newest home has some provision for a few released prisoners. In that respect they are doing a

piece of work that we are watching with interest.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I might just point out that what the hon. member for Dovercourt mentioned, about clearing a man's record after a number of years, was recommended by the committee in 1954. This is one of the many recommendations which were made, a good recommendation that has been completely ignored by the government. I think it is time they used what influence they could with the federal government. I realize to some extent this involves both the provincial and the federal governments, but certainly something could be done.

There is just one item in this that should make a difference for after-care and rehabilitating inmates, and it does to some extent involve the federal government, but it certainly involves the hon. Minister's department, too. That is the care of those people who have been drug addicts after they have been discharged from an institution. We have heard illustrations tonight, one illustration from the hon. member for York South, Mr. Chairman, how difficult it is for an individual to stay off drugs. They are discharged with \$20 right in an area where they could find their old haunts once again.

There is one way to solve drug addiction, at least not to solve it but certainly to help the situation. That is if the government would establish clinics to where a known addict could go to seek help. I think in order to obtain sufficient dope to last an addict a day it costs \$60, and probably he has to steal 10 times that amount in order to raise enough to buy it on the market. So there is a tremendous number of addicts who are stealing. If we would set up clinics where people could go and get the drugs free, where is was medically supervised, where the government had proper supervision, you would find that you would be able to keep a lot of these people, who wander off the straight and narrow, working hard.

The John Howard Society has been advocating this approach for some time, and I think it certainly is a situation where the government can do something.

So often an addict can keep off the habit for a certain length of time, then there comes a period when he is on the verge of going back to his old habits. If the opportunity was there for him to seek help in a legal, normal way you would keep him out of jail. It is far easier to keep a man on parole, where it would cost about \$250 a year to keep

him, than to pay the \$2,000 a year it costs to keep him in jail. I suggest that this is one method that can be used.

I would like to ask this one question of the hon. Minister: Why is it that the government seems to take no leadership or no interest, despite all the pressure that there has been and all the interest in this, in establishing clinics to help drug addicts?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I think that except for those who have been in our institutions, they do not fall within our jurisdiction. I do not say I would not be interested in the hon. member's proposal but I think to establish bureaus to treat drug users generally would hardly be our problem.

Mr. Trotter: I realize, when it comes to drugs, it is partly federal; but surely it is one of these things that could be worked out with the federal government. Even hon. Mr. Fulton, Conservative though he may be, has far more forward-looking ideas on penal reform than this administration has. At least Mr. Fulton had the good sense to follow some of the Liberal recommendations that were made back in 1957. But the fact is that unless you work with the federal government your government is going to have to pay the bill for these people who fall from the straight and narrow.

I think that it is in the interest of the taxpayer of Ontario, to say nothing of the social value of keeping these people out of jails, that we work out some system where the drug addict does receive help from a clinic. I think this is just one more instance that the present government has been in power too long, is too lazy to do anything, and is just passing the buck.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to speak on this as well, Mr. Chairman. I thoroughly support the remarks of the hon. member for Parkdale. If there are hon. gentlemen at my far right who do not feel that the human misery these people have gone through is important and worthwhile to discuss here, then I would suggest to them that they do not warrant a seat in this House.

I had the privilege to talk to a group of people, who were struggling to fight drug addiction, about a month ago. When I talked with these people—one of them had been off drugs for 14 years, one of them for 14 months—I asked them where they had to go in order to get treatment. They told me: "We had to go to England where we could get treatment from free clinics".

I asked one of them to describe to me what

sort of treatment she had received from the institutions of Ontario. This is a respectable woman who today is in a responsible position in the city. She told me she had been thrown in the Don Jail, that she had no treatment, and that she had suffered agony while she was in there. Finally she was sent out on the streets again and went to all kinds of depravity to get these drugs that her body ached for.

I think there are probably 500 of these drug addicts around Toronto. I feel that this department, when it knows the driving need that drug addicts have to acquire drugs, when it knows the expanding influence of crime that takes place in order to achieve this need, when it knows the peddlers and the people who bring drugs in, and the fortunes that are made from it, when it knows the people are forced to go into prostitution, into trying to steal and everything else, it would seem to me again a smugness that is completely unwarranted on the part of this department to say: "This really is not our concern."

I think that we should be deeply concerned about having such clinics. I must say I have listened politely for 3 years now to the answers to questions that I have raised. I have listened to the answers to questions which have been brought forward. The questions have been brought forward by people from every country. I have listened to the enthusiastic remarks of a previous hon. Minister. And yet the answers that you get when you ask for the reform of people who, unfortunately—and it could be any of us—got on the wrong side of society, the answer you get is: "We do not think it will work. We do not think it will work" or "It is not my department".

I asked the hon. Minister about permitting men to go out from institutions, in order that they could work while yet still living in the institution, and what was the courageous reply of the department? "We do not think this will work".

When we asked about hostels, half-way hostels, important for the men to get integrated into the community, what was the reply? "We do not think it will work. We have not actually experimented ourselves, but we have had a look at some other people, voluntary agencies, struggling to get some finances in order to make a go of it." When we ask if the department is giving them support or not, we have to wait for a reply. I still do not know if the hon. Minister is helping these half-way hostels.

Then, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for Parkdale stands up and talks about the

suffering in this city of about 500 people, we get the answer: "Really this has nothing to do with us. It should be the federal department".

I have talked with these people and, I speak with some emotion about it. I think that both our federal and our Ontario government have a very real responsibility to move into these areas. These people, whom I met, are people who are trying to move themselves upwards and assume the dignity of being human beings again. They are searching everywhere for some help, and surely when it comes to the estimates of this department the hon. member for Parkdale and every hon. member who sees people suffering in the way that these people are, should urge that we as a government take responsibility for providing community resources such as clinics for these people.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on this subject.

I have listened to the so-called debate here tonight. It has been very far from the estimates of this department. When the hon. Minister pointed out that certain things are brought in here that do not concern his department, he is not saying that the government is not interested in these things. If we are to proceed with any sense of order in dealing with the business of the House, I think it is necessary for all hon. members to realize that there is no subject that cannot be debated here but that it has to be debated in the right place.

To have an outburst such as this last one concerning the establishment of clinics for the free treatment of drug addicts—now I assume that this free treatment comes whether you happen to be a former inmate of one of our reform institutions, whether you happen to be a former inmate of a federal penitentiary, whether you happen to be a former inmate of a jail or whether you happen to be a citizen who is a drug addict and not fallen afoul of the law. The place to discuss this is not within the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions. There are other places to discuss it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, since the hon. Prime Minister was referring to what he said was my outburst. In connection with what he was suggesting I was referring to a broad approach about drug addicts. I would like to narrow it and say I am referring to the drug addict who has come before the courts, who has been in an institution of the department, and who may be on

parole now. Let me narrow it to the point of rehabilitation. I think we know of drug addicts to that extent because they have been before the court.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am seeking, Mr. Chairman, just a delimitation in the debate which takes place in this House, so that we can debate these subjects as they apply to the department concerned. The whole course of this debate today, in my opinion, is out of order. We started some years ago permitting the Minister to make a general statement; we moved from that position to where the leader of the Opposition would make a general statement; and from there we have gone to the position where the leader of the NDP would make a general statement—

Mr. Bryden: That was always recognized.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It was not always so. If the hon. member had been in this House long enough he would know that. But we are now down to the position where apparently it is considered that any member can get up and make a general statement on the estimates before we begin to deal with the various items contained in the estimates. Now if we adhere to procedure as we go through the estimates anything you want to discuss can be discussed within the particular vote, and if we follow it this way we will achieve some order and continue with the business of the House, rather than having some statements repeated 3 or 4 times by the same man—perhaps not 3 or 4, but at least twice on several occasions.

I am seeking to get some order into the conduct of the business of the House because we have a lot of business to get through and I am prepared to sit here as long as it is necessary to accomplish the business, and I will so do.

Vote 2002 agreed to.

On vote 2003:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, if you want to look at the last page under 2003, where it says "district jails," I want to say a word about the Kenora jail, which is one of the district jails. I should like to ask the hon. Minister—I very seldom ask a question in these estimates because I find the returns are not very rewarding—but I should like to ask him: a magistrate in the city of Kenora, town of Kenora, I guess it is, a magistrate there, one of the men that the late Albert Wren had put to rest politically, so to speak, told

me that during the previous year—that would be 1961—that half of the female population of all jails in Ontario in the year 1961 was in the jail at Kenora. Half the female prisoners, held in custody in Ontario, were in jail at Kenora. Now is that so? Is that information correct?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I will try to give the figure, Mr. Chairman, but I hardly think it is correct.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The same question was asked and answered last year.

Mr. Thompson: What was the answer last year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is in last year's *Hansard*.

Mr. Sopha: We know the hon. Minister without Portfolio to be such an intelligent little fellow, Mr. Chairman. He makes \$82 million a year, therefore he is the most intelligent fellow in the province. I want to warn him, do not get snotty with me again like he did tonight or I will ask him a few questions.

An hon. member: Simmer down!

Mr. Sopha: It is difficult to simmer down. I always get a ratty response from him whenever he intervenes.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Who is being surly now? Do not be surly, mercy, do not be surly. Oh, no!

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to get the total number of female prisoners that passed through the Kenora jail in a year. That is the hon. member's question, vis-à-vis the total number of females who passed through all the jails in Ontario? I will have to compute that total, but the largest number in the Kenora jail on any one day was 23. The regular number in the Toronto jail may run up as high as about 100. Those are only two of the 45 jails. If you will total the other 43 and add them to the Toronto count, you will see how small a percentage the number of females in the Kenora jail would bear to the overall total of female prisoners in the province.

But I will get the total figures for the hon. member in the course of a day or so and let him have the computation. I think that answers his question in a general way.

Mr. Sopha: I would say in passing that the magistrate specifically referred to the high

number of Indian women prisoners that they had there. It is an unfortunate commentary upon our society—of course, I just say this in passing—that whenever the Indian comes in contact with the white man it is not long until he is in the custody of the law, unfortunately. When he is in a state of nature, left in a state of nature, he is adjusted and conducts himself in a very exemplary fashion.

Now I want to say a word about Burwash industrial farm, which is a place dear to my heart. Many of my best friends and clients have been to Burwash, I have a good many of my clients there at any particular time.

Mr. Bryden: Did the hon. member have any escape?

Mr. Sopha: None. I have none who go there who have not paid me.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I wanted to hear if the hon. member was going to give us any statistics on the number of wins he has in all these court cases we hear about.

Mr. Sopha: No, not at all.

I wanted to pay particular tribute to the very excellent man that the department has who administers the Burwash industrial farm, in the person of Mr. Jack Heddle. An excellent civil servant he is and as far as I am able to observe, a person who runs that large institution—a very difficult institution as hon. members know, that I think has only repeaters in it, I do not think first time offenders go to Burwash, perhaps I am wrong in that, but that is the impression I got. It covers a large expanse and territory, and he runs it in very sterling fashion.

Also he has as a very able assistant Mr. Thomas Curtin, the man who runs the farming operations there, a man who in the many years he has served the department has told me that when he came there—that was in the days of the Hepburn government, I think, if I may use that designation without exciting any irascibility among the hon. members of the House—very little of the land was cleared.

They now farm at that institution, I am told, approximately 3,200 or 3,500 acres. Mr. Curtin told me at one time that before he retires from the service of the department at the retirement age he hopes to have 5,000 acres under cultivation. And if he has 5,000 acres under cultivation he says that his life will have been well spent, and indeed it will.

I just want to go on hastily and say this, that I do not think that Burwash industrial

farm is playing its full role in the economy of northern Ontario. And I mean by its full role that it is a very fine agricultural enterprise, and I would like to see this department look upon Burwash industrial farm in something of the way of a model farm. Now on the one hand they have an excellent herd of dairy cattle there, Holstein-Friesian, on the other hand they have an excellent herd of beef cattle and they have been cross-breeding the Charolais and the Hereford. They have been carrying out such experiments—in order to indicate the eye I have been keeping on them—they have been experimenting with the wintering of cattle outside with no shelter at all except such shelter as they can find in the bush and providing fodder and keeping the streams open for them to get water. That experiment, I am told, has proved very successful. I would like to see Burwash industrial farm be more accessible, be made more accessible, to the farming community of the district of Sudbury.

Now just in one particular regard I say to the hon. Minister, and I say to the hon. members of this House, so far as I am aware, in the district of Sudbury we have not got a veterinarian who treats large animal diseases. If there is one, I do not know about it. The two veterinarians we do have—and I know of only two who are in practice, only two in our district, huge district that it is—so far as I am aware they confine their practice to other things and they confine their practice geographically to an urban one. They do not get around much in the community. Burwash has not got a veterinarian.

However, they have in Mr. Curtin and his staff very able people who are very knowledgeable of animal diseases, their prevention, their treatment and their cure. I would like to see in that regard Burwash made into a more accessible institution.

What this department could do, I suggest, is open up the institution at some specified times and invite members of the agricultural, the farming, community, to come there and to see how they do things. This experiment could have all sorts of possibilities. Now mark you, so far as I am aware—I know it is certainly true in my case and I do not ask for any special privileges—if somebody presents himself at Burwash industrial farm and says, how do you treat a cow for scours, or what do you do about some other complaint, then Mr. Curtin or one other member of the staff will readily give you the information from their experience.

They will do that if you call them over

the phone. They will tell you what they know about animal husbandry. They will tell you what they know about field crops and anything else in agriculture, with their vast amount of experience. But I would like to see a more positive step taken by this department in regard to Burwash industrial farm.

It could, of course, continue to carry out its prime purpose, which is the custody of offenders, but it also could become something of an experimental station or something of a demonstration farm for assistance to the agricultural industry in the district of Sudbury. I daresay I do not do anyone discredit in the district of Sudbury if I say that so far as agriculture is concerned, I think in all the districts in northern Ontario, north of the French, including northwestern Ontario, I think the district is the least advanced economically in the field of agriculture.

Up in Timiskaming they have that fine demonstration farm at New Liskeard operated by The Department of Agriculture. They have, even in the Cochrane district, which is much farther north and subject to greater vagaries of the climate more agricultural enterprise, more successful agricultural enterprise, than there is in the district of Sudbury. For one thing, so far as Sudbury is concerned, farming is to a great extent on a part-time basis, a good many people who farm also work in industry at Inco and Falconbridge.

Burwash could fulfill a true role in the Sudbury district if something was done of the nature that I am attempting to formulate and that is to say to the people, the farmers of the district of Sudbury: we know a bit about agriculture, we are willing to share that knowledge with you, our gates are open, we will set aside certain days on which we will invite farmers to come and we will show you how we do things. Furthermore, if you have any trouble, if you run into any difficulties in your own farming operations then you may call us or seek information from us and tap our experience and it will be made available to you.

I think that would be a great advance and I hope the department will take it under advisement, I hope they will try to do something along that line in order to increase the role and the impact of that fine farm that is there in the south half of Burwash township and the north half of the one to the south of it, and increase its role in our community.

Those comments are put forward respectfully and with the greatest courtesy.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I would thank the hon. member for Sudbury for his words. We will take his suggestion under consideration. I appreciate there is merit in it and it might be possible that there could be occasions when the farming people in the area would be given an opportunity to see some of the work that is being done at Burwash.

Burwash is our largest establishment by acreage. It is some 35,000 acres in extent, largely in bush. Large bush operations are carried on. There is a planing mill for processing the lumber. There is a large herd, as the hon. member has said, with about 600 head of very fine cattle.

There are some projects being carried out in conjunction with The Ontario Department of Agriculture. The herd at Guelph—it is not a beef cattle herd but some excellent agricultural work is carried on—is also an outstanding herd, one of the finest Holstein herds in the country. One of the cows there recently established a record of milk production in excess of 250,000 pounds of milk and almost 10,000 pounds of butterfat.

The work is so scientific on our farms that the milk cows at Guelph for instance are milked 3 times a day. There is an increase of about 10, 12, 15 per cent in yearly production by 3 times a day instead of twice a day milking. And the cows are milked to music.

If you were to move into one of our other institutions, for instance at Millbrook, you would see the production of the automobile licence plates that is a most excellent and up-to-date manufacturing operation. As I mentioned in my opening remarks it was our director of industrial production who was asked to give a paper at the American Association of Correction in Philadelphia because they recognized the outstanding industrial work that is being done in the department.

Another production at Millbrook which surprised me, I do not think I have mentioned this to hon. members in the House, was that they manufacture all the Braille textbooks used by the blind children in the schools in Canada. It is the only operation of its kind in the country. We produce Braille textbooks with less incidence of error than we were able to buy commercially. These are supplied to the blind schools at a cost less than a third of what they were costing when they were imported.

These are just some of the facets that are engrossingly interesting. At both Guelph and Burch you can see canning operations on a tremendous scale. We produce products that go into all our institutions and into the hos-

pitals and into other departments of government. At Guelph we make all the blankets for our institutions, for the hospitals under the province and for The Department and Lands and Forests.

When we were at Burch about two or three weeks ago they were making sauerkraut. They had never before made much sauerkraut—just a little for our own institutions. They made a couple of hundred pounds last year. The Department of Health asked us if we would provide it for their hospitals, and when we were at Burch they were filling two vats with 11 tons of cabbage in the manufacture of sauerkraut. And in the end of the building was such a pile of cabbages as I have never seen.

At Guelph last year they produced canned vegetables and fruits and jams and jellies and such, all in the large 105-ounce cans that we use to service our institutions and those of The Department of Health. Production totalled over 500,000 cans of canned food, using mostly our own products. We do some buying of corn and peas and tomatoes, I think, from neighbouring farmers who are close by.

These are some of the facets of the manufacturing operations in our institutions that are perhaps far beyond the knowledge of most of our hon. members. I think they challenge the understanding and they do comprise a large part of the industrial work that we are able to provide for our inmates, to keep them busy and to teach them the operations that are akin to fully industrial civilian operations.

I thank the hon. member for his suggestion in regard to the Burwash farm, and we shall certainly give it thought.

Mr. Sopha: It stimulates two comments in reply which I feel obliged to make. The hon. Minister says that these projects are carried out in conjunction with The Department of Agriculture. I know of no field man for The Department of Agriculture who is stationed at Burwash industrial farm to see what is being done.

Second, if the hon. Minister carries out an experiment there and it proves to be successful in agriculture or agronomy, has the department any right to keep the matter secret to itself? A beef herd has been allowed to winter, 3 of our northern winters out there, without shelter without losing an animal. But I never saw any place where the hon. Minister ever published the results of the experiment, where he ever said to the farmers: here is what we did, we gave these

animals no shelter at all in the northern winter, we found they survived. I never saw it in any papers where the hon. Minister ever said that, I never saw any publication of The Department of Agriculture that referred to it. It is a little more, I say to the hon. Minister; it a little more than custody of prisoners. He is carrying out vital experiments in the field of agriculture, especially in northern agriculture, where we are conscious of what the Russians are doing, or what we hear they are doing in Siberia. But we hear more about what the Russians are doing in Siberia than we do about the experiments that the hon. Minister carries out at Burwash.

Another thing was the disease that has bothered farmers, in cross-breeding and calving. The herd at Burwash was afflicted with this, when you crossed the Charolais bull to the Hereford cow. But apparently that problem was solved. I never saw any paper published; I never saw any announcement; I never saw any assistance to farmers ever given by word of mouth from the department. So when the hon. Minister gets up and idly says that we are carrying out these in conjunction with The Department of Agriculture, then I say to the hon. Minister I take that *cum grano salum*.

An hon. member: Is that good or bad?

Mr. Sopha: *Cum grano salum*. I think those are just words. I do not think that the man, his buddy, who sits on the hon. Minister's right, is particularly interested in what the hon. Minister is doing.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a question about two or three of the smaller institutions. What is the present population and the capacity population for Port Bolster, Lindsay and Simcoe?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The capacities for—?

Mr. MacDonald: Port Bolster, Lindsay and Simcoe.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Port Bolster has a capacity of 20, and at present there are 13. Lindsay has a capacity of 120, and 35 new girls have been moved in there. Simcoe, as I announced in my opening remarks, was opened last month officially. We will start moving boys into it following the Christmas recess.

Mr. MacDonald: What about Elliot Lake?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Elliot Lake is a reformatory which has a capacity for 52, and there are 49 prisoners there today.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a point I wanted to make on these, particularly Port Bolster and Lindsay. A rather distinguished member of the bench in Ontario, during a social conversation I had with him once, was drawing attention to what he thought—and from examination I think maybe there is a point in his observation—was the high per capita expense involved. In fact, the hon. Minister noted it earlier today.

I think small institutions are preferable and I think we are moving in the right direction. But I am wondering whether the reasons for their establishment are not political. I do not know why the girls' school was put in Lindsay, other than one reason that would come springing to my mind. The same thing would be true of some of the others. But it seems to me that we may have gone too far here.

If you have institutions with only 13 or 20 girls in each, or 35, you maybe have gone from the one extreme of the big institution, and of all the problems of institutional life, to one that is so small that you are getting very high per capita costs without necessarily contributing anything beyond what might be achieved in an institution of, say, 100, or 125, or 150. I wonder if there is a more sensible compromise. Has this thought occurred to the hon. Minister? What are his reflections on it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Compromise of about what size?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I would think about 100 to 125 rather than the big institution. But now we are down to 13, 20, or 35.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. The hon. member asked me the capacity, for instance, at Lindsay, and I said it was 120. And the new training school for boys at Simcoe has a capacity of 120. That seems to have hit just about the figure the hon. member would think was most suitable and it would perhaps be as large an institution as is desirable.

Mr. MacDonald: But there are only 35 in the Lindsay school.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Just a moment. With regard to the little home at Port Bolster, Trelawney House, that does a specialized piece of work with a type of young girl who is upset and whom we want to get into a small institution; into a home atmosphere, not an institution. I am sure the hon. member would approve of what is being done in that way.

The little home we use at Port Bolster admittedly has a higher per diem cost because of its small size. We are doing exactly what certain hon. members have suggested we should do: we disregard cost in some places for the better results we can hope to obtain.

I am satisfied that the situation at Port Bolster is of that nature. I do not know that it would be duplicated, that we would open others of that kind, but I think for one of a kind it is a very suitable spot into which to move a certain class of girls.

It has had these particular advantages: The girls who have gone there have attended the local elementary or secondary schools; they go in and out every day, that is how open an institution it is. All our training schools are of that nature. They attend the mid-week girls' group in the local church; some of them sing in the choir.

It has been an opportunity for a pilot project, to see how it would work. It has been eminently successful in integrating these young girls, who have come from difficult backgrounds, completely into the community where they live, and allow them to move as normal people in that community. They simply live in Trelawney House as they would live in a boarding house or in their own home with a large family. I would think that it was an instance that has thoroughly justified the experiment, despite the fact, as I say, that it has a considerably higher per diem cost because of the small number of students.

As regards the Lindsay situation, I think that the hon. member will appreciate this. When we opened Lindsay, we were overcrowded in the training school for girls at Galt. The easy and natural thing to do would be to have drained off the overcrowding from the training school at Galt and put them into Lindsay and bring it up to complement and have them even; but we decided otherwise. We made the decision on the basis of what would be best, not only for the girls now but for the future of the work in that institution.

We put in, as superintendent at Lindsay, a woman who had not been in training school work but who had been one of our superintendents and had an excellent record as the superintendent. We put in all new staff. We have been moving in not girls who had been to Lindsay or other training schools, with any background of that kind, but selectees from our reception and diagnostic centre for girls. We have been moving into Lindsay a group of girls who had no experi-

ence of other things, so that we could establish at Lindsay an entirely new start with a new *esprit de corps* and new traditions; and I have yet to see any reason to feel we did not do the right thing there.

This population at Lindsay will build up to its complement, not in a great hurry, but in the course of months, and we will soon have Lindsay operating at normal complement, with a group which has had no contact with these other institutions. I suggest to hon. members that it is a trial that is worthwhile.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise some questions in connection with work in institutions. It is easy for me frankly to be unfair in this, to suggest that many of the things that the department is having people do is in order to make the institution self-sufficient and that the purpose of rehabilitation is being ignored—the purpose of training a man so that he can go out into the world. Mr. Chairman, I could ask the hon. Minister: how many of the men who have done the Braille printing for the blind people have jobs now in this very industry on the outside? I could ask the hon. Minister about the licence plates, and ask him how many fellows who have learned this complicated trade of printing licence plates have got jobs outside in some similar industry?

I can realize that, in connection with work in institutions—I remember the remarks of the Deputy Minister to me that there are certain men who need this kind of monotonous work for periods. But there are many who need to see a value in work, need to see a goal from taking training, a purpose in work. This might be why they are in an institution—because they neither had the training previously nor the stamina to take training. I would suggest that there still should be constant appraisals of the programmes that we have in institutions.

I was interested, during a meeting of the manpower committee on which I am sitting with the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Simonett) as chairman, that the representative said he felt there was little recognition for a lot of the inmates of their training in the institutions. In apprenticeship, there was no recognition of the time they had spent. Now accepting there are difficulties with people who are inmates in that they are serving short periods, and they will not get a full training, their training is not recognized perhaps because of unions and industry.

In fact, I will be quite frank and say that I have often heard it suggested that it is the unions who are holding us up on this training

recognition because they are concerned about a man getting some kind of training and moving into their jobs. Yet I have talked to several union people—and we all know union leaders, Mr. Douglas Hamilton and others. These are men with, in my opinion, a great humanitarian spirit. I am sure that if there was the opportunity for a frank discussion about the appraisal of training for men who had gone wrong with society, that there could be still more movement made in connection with productive training.

I am suggesting that licence plates and some of these other things are not very productive for the man when he moves outside, apart from the value of work. I ask the hon. Minister if, after a period of a year as Minister, he has used this opportunity to re-appraise the skills and the training given in the form of work. Has he called together union and industry? I say this because I remember, as a member of a board of the Canadian National Institute of the Blind in Winnipeg, our traditional approach at the time was that all blind people could do was weave baskets. Then we got an enterprising person who discovered, with imagination, so many opportunities into which blind people could move. I would suggest that if we are constantly looking at this imaginatively we could find other opportunities for the training of inmates.

I wonder if the hon. Minister has called together representatives of unions and industry during his period, and what results he has had from such a meeting.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No. I have not called together leaders of labour and industry during my time.

I mentioned in my opening remarks that there were a number of problems involved in industrial production, that of assuring work for the men so that we do not have them working one minute and then running out of work, that we also have a constant supply of goods to meet the requirements of those who place their orders with us from our government departments.

As regards the separation of our inmates so that some are on work and some are on training, we put into the training the full stream of those whom we have, who we think will take advantage of and benefit from it. Those who cannot, those who are not suitable for those training institutes, we use in some of our other works. We put them to such work as we have available, to employ their time usefully.

Gone is the day when a man will pick up a

load of dirt and take it to the far end of the yard and empty it, then pick it up and bring it back. Men are working on useful work. With regard to those working on Braille, I can say there would be little or no opportunity for them to work on Braille when they get out because nowhere else is it being done. Some of the boys in that institution designed and built a better machine for Braille operations, for doing the Braille work. I would think that most of those people have education and accomplishments that would enable them to find jobs when they were released.

Mr. Thompson: Could I suggest that, with respect to this question of work, I remember going out to Brampton with the Deputy Minister and seeing the fine work they are doing there. I would like to congratulate the department and many of the conscientious people who are helping those young offenders. One of the problems, however, was that their periods of apprenticeship were not recognized. One of the people suggested to me this might be caused by union standards, and so on, and I was just offering the suggestion—I know the hon. Minister is very open-minded—that perhaps it might be an idea to not only talk to the apprenticeship branch but also to call in union representatives and industry in connection with—

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned in my opening remarks some of the problems. One of the greatest problems with regard to training in our institutions like Brampton is the limited period of time that these people are with us. The amount of training we can do is circumscribed by the period they are with us. We have sought to get them credit for the time they spend on their training. We also find there are cases where we must first upgrade them academically so that their time will qualify. These things have all been studied and we do the best we can under the difficult circumstances.

Mr. Thompson: Could I also suggest to the hon. Minister that in connection with the teachers, and I am thinking of the vocational teachers, I consider that the teachers need a wider background than just teaching? I think they also need some background in working with problem cases. I was interested in the schedule of salaries for the teachers. Often it is not as high as a teacher in a high school, and yet I think these people should certainly be given greater compensation to get the best people for this job.

Hon. Mr. Haskett: On the occasion of the hon. member's visit to Brampton, he might have had occasion to speak to some of the instructors out there. I have had some experience in the past in boys' work and young people's work, and I must say that in addition to their skill as teachers they impress me as being outstanding leaders and workers with young people.

Mr. Belanger: In item 3, you have so many services listed under general maintenance. You have here medicine, medical comforts, including tobacco. Now I do not think I would be fair to the jailer at Essex county jail who complained to me in the past that the tobacco allowance they were receiving was not very great indeed. He complained to me to that effect. Therefore, I would like to know what is the tobacco allowance that is given the inmates there?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: There is a prescribed amount and I will just find what it is. I am not a user so I cannot tell the hon. member too much.

Under regulation 25 a jailer may allow a prisoner weekly 3 packages of cigarettes, 20's, or two packages of pipe tobacco, 1 S/12; or two packages of cigarette tobacco, 1 S/12 or two plugs of tobacco, 1 S/12; or 12 cigars.

Vote 2003 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: That concludes The Department of Reform Institutions' estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply do now rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will take certain second readings that are on the order paper, bills that have been printed. We have left some of the minor ones. I will not go on with The Department of Mines tomorrow and we will proceed with the Throne Speech debate.

An hon. member: Will there be a night session tomorrow night?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, there will not be a night session tomorrow night.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.40 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Thursday, December 13, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Thursday, December 13, 1962

County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	295
Indian Welfare Services Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, second reading	296
Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowances Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, second reading	297
General Welfare Assistance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, second reading	297
Children's Institutions Act, 1962-63, bill intituled, Mr. Cecile, second reading	298
Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63, bill intituled, Mr. Cecile, second reading	300
Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-63, bill intituled, Mr. Cecile, second reading	301
Parks Assistance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading	305
Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading	306
Game and Fish Act, 1961-62, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading	306
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	306
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	306
Public Libraries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	306
Income Tax Act, 1961-62, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	306
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Belanger, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Gisborn	306
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to	322
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	322

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1962

The House met at 3:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the west gallery students from the following schools: West Nissouri township school area No. 1, Middlesex county and New Bowman public school, Dundas.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make uniform and simplify the allowances payable by the province to county and district court judges. It provides for the same allowance to be paid to all county and district court judges except the chief judge of the court and the senior county judge in York county.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) and his department for the wonderful job they have done in decorating the Parliament buildings for the Christmas season.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, you will recall that in reply to a question by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy) I confirmed the fact that a routine audit had brought to light certain inaccuracies of the garage stock control in district 13, North Bay. I also assured the House that I would reply to the second part of the hon. member's question, which was: "Will

he report to this House the results of such an investigation?" I am now prepared to make such a statement.

The department audit of materials and garage stocks in North Bay made last summer indicated that various articles of stock were missing. Subsequent investigations brought to light the fact that the records were altered to cover the shortages. The manner in which and by whom the materials were removed and the records altered have not been established. It was further found that considerations and favours had been given some of our employees closely associated with the garage stock by suppliers.

As soon as these facts were brought to light, 4 of the stockroom and garage employees were suspended for two weeks, demoted and later transferred to ensure satisfactory stock control and adherence to proper procedures and control safeguards.

All of the employees mentioned previously as having been suspended, demoted and transferred have since resigned rather than move from North Bay.

One additional man also associated with stock operations has since resigned.

It is now quite obvious that the trouble has been the result of failure to follow established control features set to ensure an efficient garage operation. We are quite confident that with the replacement of the 5 people mentioned above by people drawn from other districts throughout the province, the proper corrective measures will ensure a satisfactory garage operation in the future. Although the district engineer and district maintenance engineer were in no way involved in the discrepancies discovered, it was felt that they should have shown more active interest in the administration of this function of the North Bay district and that it was in the best interests of the department that these engineers be transferred to other districts.

The district engineer has now been transferred to Cochrane and the maintenance engineer to the design branch in head office.

Mr. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question to that statement,

does that mean that the district engineer is in some way involved?

Mr. G. Lavergne (Russell): Does the hon. member not understand English? The hon. Minister has just told him.

Mr. Troy: I understand it much better than the hon. member does. I understand it also when I read the papers the result of the vote in Eastview.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Troy: In reference to this condition, does the hon. Minister say it is just of a temporary nature or just of a short duration or has it been going on for some time? Does the hon. Minister now know how these things disappeared from the garage?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, I promised the hon. member an answer to his question, I have given it. If he would listen to me, he would have heard me say that the investigation by the department audit people was made last summer; he would have heard me say that the district engineer and district maintenance engineer were in no way involved in the discrepancy discovered, and so on. I answered both the things the hon. member questioned.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister another question? Does he mean to say that the maintenance engineer was not demoted? And also does he mean to say that this situation just arose from a routine audit? It is my understanding—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think the member should realize that the question period is something which cannot involve lengthy cross-examination. In my opinion the Minister answered the questions, and I believe all members should pay strict attention to Ministers when they are answering questions. Supplementary questions are quite in order, but they must be sharp-pointed and questions dealing directly with the subject concerned.

Mr. Troy: I think my question was pointed enough, but I have a question that was to be answered today by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay). I could have obtained the answer probably from the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) another day, but the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said I would get a better answer from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. Is he here today or maybe he is on another jaunt. Is he in Cuba this time?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member submitted a question a few days ago and since the Minister was not here at that time and is not here yet, I do not think the question is of sufficient urgent importance to be answered by anyone else except the Minister to whom it is directed.

Mr. Troy: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I think it is of very urgent importance to the industry of northern Ontario if this particular product, one of the few waste products that we still have, is not being made use of. I think it is quite urgent to us anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE INDIAN WELFARE SERVICES ACT

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare) moves second reading of Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Indian Welfare Services Act.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Act provides that Indian residents in Ontario are entitled to the benefits of old age assistance, blind and disabled persons' allowances to the same extent as any other resident in Ontario. In the case of mothers' allowances, however, the present Act specifies that only two groups of Indian mothers with dependent children may have eligibility for this type of assistance, namely, widows or mothers whose husbands are permanently unemployable.

It is considered timely that we should now extend the benefits available under The Mothers' Allowances Act to Indians on the same legislative basis as is now provided for non-Indians, as is done in relation to the 3 federal-provincial welfare programmes I have mentioned. This will mean that we shall be in a position to pay mothers' allowances in the normal way to other groups of eligible Indian mothers such as those who have been deserted by their husbands or those who are unmarried.

I say in the normal way because we have been treating these cases under the special care section of The Mothers' Allowances Act and granting assistance through order-in-council. The amendment will take the Indian mothers out of the special case category and permit the allowances to be paid under the same process as is available for non-Indian mothers.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): May I ask the hon. Minister, does it include an Indian whether he is a treaty Indian or not, or whether or not he lives on a reservation?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There is no qualification in that respect.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MOTHERS' AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves second reading of Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowances Act.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, has the hon. Minister taken into consideration that possibly the definition of a dependent child could include an individual over the age of 18 but still in successful attendance at a school?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That has been taken care of, Mr. Speaker. I may say that the main purpose of this amending Act is to remove the cases involving the permanently unemployable fathers in order that such cases may be transferred to The General Welfare Assistance Act. As I mentioned in first reading, 50 per cent of the costs of the cases to be transferred may be claimed from the federal government under that Act, and the agreement made with the federal government with respect to employment assistance.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE GENERAL WELFARE ASSISTANCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves second reading of Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, in the main this amending Act is complementary to the bill to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act which removes the cases involving permanently unemployable fathers.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister what effect this would have on the recipient of assistance? Would it make any difference in the allowance paid, or is it merely a matter of getting more money from the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I think the last sentence that the hon. member has expressed, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what that is. The change will not affect the administration of the allowances whatever, or the amounts the mothers or dependent fathers will be eligible to receive.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Following that answer, Mr. Speaker, would this not then put a financial burden on the municipality inasmuch as they would be responsible for 20 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, the municipalities will not be involved in any way, administratively or financially.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the hon. Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would point out to the members that it is sometimes a little difficult to distinguish between what should be done at second reading and in committee stage, especially with bills of this nature, but cross-questioning and minor questions can be taken care of better in committee. Today we are discussing general principles of the bill.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, is this bill going to committee?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It will be the committee of the whole House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Trotter: This question, Mr. Speaker, has to do with regard to the principle of the bill. I believe this affects the amendment in this instance as well as the whole type of legislation, in that if I understand it correctly if a person applies for aid in this instance and is turned down, there is no right of appeal.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It has nothing to do with that at all.

Mr. Trotter: I would say in this case, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the bill will make it possible to pay assistance directly. If an individual applies under this Act for aid from the province and is turned down, does he have any right of appeal?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The persons, Mr. Speaker, will not apply under this Act at any time. It is a matter of administration by the department of transferring one case to the other Act, with the same administration, with the same grants for the mothers. It has nothing to do with the municipalities having to pay anything more.

The application is either made under The Mothers' Allowances Act, which it will be in this case, or else if they make application under The General Welfare Assistance Act it will be under the general Act as it stands now. It is simply for purposes, as my hon.

friend from Woodbine mentioned a moment ago, just to be able, according to the federal-provincial agreement to recover 50 per cent of allowable expenditures for these cases under that agreement.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, on Bill No. 13, I wonder if I could make two points. One is that I would be interested in the principle of these bills getting a thorough scrutiny by very interested people in the community. As I understand it, sir, in some conversations this morning with people belonging to agencies, they have not received the bill as yet. I also know that some agencies have. They are deeply concerned and I am sure that the hon. Minister would like to have their points of view made known to hon. members so that there can be more thorough questions.

I think this is a very technical field in some ways, and I myself would have to rely on phoning certain people to ask them what their feelings are about it. I imagine that this is simply an oversight on the part of the department, in the rush of Christmas mail or something, because I understand that on other occasions the hon. Minister's department has got these bills out ahead of time. I would like to point out that it did not come out at this time, and that a number of the agency people had not received the bills.

As I understand, one of the principles of this bill—I am sorry that I came in late—is in connection with getting more funds through the federal government. Now, the question that I have is with respect to the fact that the municipalities, because of this change, are going to have to pay 20 per cent of the cost. Am I correct on that?

Did the hon. Minister say the municipalities will have to operate—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No.

Mr. Thompson: Will they be responsible—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No.

Mr. Thompson: Thanks. I would just leave then, with my one point.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-63

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves second reading of Bill No. 14, The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-63.

Mr. Thompson: I was interested, sir, in reading that the operating cost is going to be changed from a flat rate of \$8 a month in respect of each child, to 50 per cent of the care of children for whom the cost is otherwise unpaid, up to the maximum prescribed by the regulations.

Frankly, I was trying to find out just before coming into the House whether, with respect to children's aid societies, where they have referred children and where they are paying something. As I understand, the children's aid society then is paying for the upkeep of the child in the institution. With this new amendment it would mean that that child would not get the 50 per cent. Am I right on that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, I would like at this moment possibly to make a statement which I intended to make to try to explain the purpose of this. This is a new Act to replace and extend the present provisions now made for the institutional care of children under The Charitable Institutions Act. A thorough review of the charitable institutions now serving children was made by an advisory committee under the chairmanship of Miss Bessie Touzel, executive director of the Ontario welfare council. The study was mainly concerned with the various types of children's institutions that are available and the kind of services rendered. Financial aspects and relationships were also reviewed in some depth.

Basically, the new Act as presented here is the result of the recommendations of that committee. At the present time there are about 24 children's institutions operating under The Charitable Institutions Act which will be treated under the new Act when it comes into force along with others that may be established from time to time. They are sponsored by religious, fraternal and other private charitable organizations.

Orphanages as such are virtually a thing of the past. The emphasis in function, today, is placed on treatment through group care with the ultimate goal of having the children returned to the community. Some children suffer from emotional disturbances which require specialized treatment in the institutions that are equipped to provide such care. Others present behaviour problems or patterns of delinquency which cannot be handled within the normal family setting; but such children often benefit from an institutional programme of socialization or re-education.

Then there are still other children who sometimes require group care because a

family setting is not available at the time, or because they are awaiting placement in another type of care, or for a variety of other reasons.

There has been a developing specialization on the part of some of the children's institutions towards providing a particular type of services in relation to the special needs of the children placed in their care.

As it now stands, however, The Charitable Institutions Act treats children's institutions in one all-inclusive group, regardless of the specific function for which they are established or the kind of children they serve. The present flat rate provincial subsidy of \$8 monthly for each child in residence is applied to all.

Under the new Act, we are proposing to establish specific classes of children's institutions according to function and the type of children cared for.

Three major classes of children's institutions may be cited as follows:

1. Where the institutional programme provides for the specialized treatment and care of the emotionally disturbed or highly nervous child, not to be confused with or developed as substitutes for mental hospitals which treat the psychotic or mentally ill child.

2. Where the institution provides a planned programme of re-education or socialization with treatment, where necessary, for children with behaviour problems or for those unable to adjust to normal family life.

3. Where the service of the institution is primarily that of providing group boarding residential care for children who for a variety of reasons are not in a position at the time to benefit from a normal family relationship; as for example, family care not available, awaiting placement in another type of care, and so on.

It is evident, of course, that the cost of operating and maintaining each of these major classes of children's institutions will vary considerably. Where the institution provides a highly specialized programme of care and treatment for emotionally disturbed children, the cost is much greater than that incurred for a programme of group boarding care for more or less normal children. Accordingly, we are proposing to establish in the regulations a minimum sharable maintenance grant for each class of children's institutions to take into account the differences in the type of programme provided by each and the cost incurred.

Each institution, of course, will be re-

quired to meet certain specific standards of care, service and treatment in relation to the class to which it belongs for the purpose of the provincial subsidy on the operating and maintenance costs. The new subsidies are to be applied to the cost of the care of a child where its parents are unable to meet the full cost as charged by the institution.

The new Act will permit the province to reimburse the organization operating the institution on the following basis:

- (a) Fifty per cent of the actual cost incurred by the organization for the maintenance and care of such children, or

- (b) Fifty per cent of the maximum sharable maintenance grant established in the regulations for the particular class to which the institution belongs, whichever is the lesser.

Building grants are being retained on the same basis as we have them now—that is, for new construction, funds are made available to charitable organizations in the amount of \$2,500 per bed, or 50 per cent of the cost of construction, whichever is the lesser. In relation to the purchase of existing buildings, the grant is calculated at the rate of \$750 per bed or 50 per cent of the cost of acquisition, whichever is the lesser.

With this new legislation, Mr. Speaker, we shall be in the position to give greater recognition to the trend towards specialization in the institutional care of children, and to encourage private charitable organizations to develop their institutional programmes in keeping with present and future trends.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. Minister, sir, on this move. I think, frankly, it is long overdue. I think that the report he had on children's institutions in Ontario, which was done by Miss Bessie Touzel and others, was really an indictment of the responsibility of our government to these young people who, because of difficulties over which they had no control, over family circumstances or hereditary aspects, were cluttered in these institutions. I congratulate the hon. Minister that this move is being made, that the various institutions are now being categorized according to the particular needs of the child, and that the focus is now on the child and how the best care can be given to him.

I shall look forward with great interest to see the suggestions the hon. Minister has made about maintaining the high standards for particularly emotionally disturbed children by the staff. I know hon. members are as

aware as I am that it has been unfortunate in the past that there have been emotionally disturbed children who have been just looked after on a custodial basis rather than with trained skilled people. I appreciate very much the effort the government is making. It costs more in connection with the care of emotionally disturbed children; the rates will be higher for the care of these children.

In the institutions now, the flat rate of \$8 a month is given to all children, no matter where they come from or how they come to be in the institutions; but your new basis is that they will get 50 per cent of the net cost of disturbed children for whom the cost is otherwise unpaid. I am wondering if, for example, an institution that has had children referred by, let me say, the Catholic Children's Aid—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would once again like to explain that the bill is in its second reading and the Minister gives an explanation of the bill, on the principle of the bill. Any member is entitled to advise and speak to the principle of the bill. However, under this particular type of debate the Minister is only allowed to speak on one occasion, the same as the other members of the House. I do think the members should look the bill over and define when the questions should be asked in committee stage rather than during the principle of the bill.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. I feel that one of the principles of this bill is to try to help these institutions from the point of view of costs. And it is on this principle that I would like clarification. I am asking whether, on the basis that we are providing help—the 50 per cent of the net cost of the care of children for whom the cost is otherwise unpaid—there could be a situation where more of these children who were in institutions had been referred and where the cost was being paid from such sources. There might only be two of them for whom the cost was not being paid; previously they would all get an \$8 flat rate, while now there would only be two of them for whom the cost was not paid, so we would only look after two of them.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, I am sure this could be explained, as the hon. member mentioned, in committee. However, I might say that the children's aid societies will not be freed from paying in this because they receive moneys from other sources to pay the costs in full, both from the municipality and grants from the province. As far as the

basic principle is concerned, it is the same principle that is applied under The Charitable Institutions Act, generally speaking.

Mr. Thompson: I beg to differ, but I will wait until the committee—

Mr. Speaker: Order. We can see the difficulty when we get into the fine points and items of the bill at this particular time.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I would still like to follow up. There is one thing I am interested in; could I ask you? Are these bills going to the health and welfare committee? Where are they going to be perused?

Mr. Speaker: In the whole House.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to suggest, sir, that if we have a health and welfare committee it would seem the logical thing to me that bills come to the health and welfare committee for consideration.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have no objection. This is very far-reaching and forward legislation, as the hon. member has admitted, and if he would like it to go to the health and welfare committee, before it is debated in committee of the whole House, that is perfectly all right with the government.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that it would have gone to the health and welfare committee before coming to the House.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, that is quite impossible.

An hon. member: You know that.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: It is not impossible.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Maybe it is not the normal thing, but I do not think it is impossible.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-63

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves second reading of Bill No. 15, The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, before the introduction of the new Children's Institutions Act, it is necessary to present a new Charitable Institutions Act from which the children's institutions are now deleted but which will treat all of the types of charitable institutions, basically those that care for adult persons. Under this Act we have:

- (a) homes for unmarried mothers;
- (b) homes for the aged;
- (c) a miscellaneous group of institutions mainly for youths; and
- (d) hostels for the care of transient persons.

In the main these institutions are operated by religious or fraternal organizations.

The provisions in the old Act have been brought forward into the new in a more uniform and up-to-date fashion; construction and building grants are being retained in the same amounts as before while the provincial subsidy in operating and maintenance costs is also at the same rate, namely 75 per cent of the net cost incurred by the organization for the maintenance of the persons residing in the institution.

Reference is made in this legislation for the first time to a new class of adult charitable institutions, namely "correctional institutions." For some time there has been an evident need for the establishment of additional institutions or residential facilities for persons, mainly teenagers and youths, who are in a pre-delinquent stage of development or have been placed on probation by the courts or released on parole. Group care is often indicated in such cases in order that all possible may be done to correct behaviour patterns and to assist in re-establishment in the community.

A number of charitable organizations have already moved into this field of endeavour and the new Act will give recognition to their efforts by making provincial funds available for capital purposes as well as in relation to the operating and maintenance costs. In the case of the latter the provincial subsidy has been set at 50 per cent of the net cost incurred by the organizations for the maintenance of the residents instead of the 75 per cent rate established for the other type of institutions. This is necessary because the federal government does not share in the cost of maintaining persons in correctional institutions.

As indicated earlier, this new Act was necessary because of the introduction of The Children's Institutions Act. Basically we shall now have legislation to treat children's

institutions separately from those that provide care for adults. And, in this way we shall be in a more favourable position to concentrate on the development of each phase of the charitable institutions programme in its own right and in relation to the differences of approach that each of the two groups requires.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HOMES FOR RETARDED CHILDREN ACT, 1962-63

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves second reading of Bill No. 16, The Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-63.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker—does the hon. Minister want to speak first?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I would like to make a statement on this matter, Mr. Speaker. This is a new Act designed to provide financial assistance for the establishment, operation and maintenance of residential accommodation for certain retarded children. For many years local parents' groups, in affiliation with the Ontario Association for Retarded Children, have conducted day school classes for trainable retarded children. The Department of Education has provided, and is continuing to grant, financial assistance for the establishment and operation of the necessary educational facilities.

It has become increasingly evident, however, that there are many trainable retarded children throughout Ontario who are not in a position to attend these day school classes. In some cases it would be necessary or advisable for the children to live away from home while attending the schools operated by the parents' groups. Distances to the nearest class are often too great, and transportation costs too high, for parents to assume; and, of course, most of these children would not be capable of travelling to and from the classes on their own. In other cases parents find it extremely difficult, if not almost impossible at times, to continue giving care in the home. Indeed, such continuing home care may sometimes prove damaging to the family as a whole, as well as to the retarded child himself.

This new legislation will make it possible for the province to assist local associations for retarded children in providing and maintaining the residential accommodation required in conjunction with their classroom facilities.

The Act provides for capital grants to the local associations as follows:

(a) for the construction of new buildings or additions to existing buildings that are to be used for the residential accommodation of retarded children, a grant calculated at the rate of \$2,500 per bed or 50 per cent of the costs of construction, whichever is the lesser; and

(b) for the purchase of an already existing building, a grant at the rate of \$750 per bed or 50 per cent of the cost of acquisition, whichever is the lesser.

These building grants are equivalent to those now provided for other types of charitable institutions.

In addition the Act will provide for a provincial subsidy on the operating and maintenance costs of these homes for retarded children. Where the parents of the retarded child are not able to pay in full for the cost of residential accommodation of their child in the home and such cost is incurred by the local association, the province will reimburse the association in an amount equal to:

(a) Fifty per cent of the actual cost of the residential accommodation of the child; or

(b) Fifty per cent of the maximum amount to which the province may contribute as prescribed in the regulations, whichever is the lesser.

Established and proven standards of care and service will be required to be maintained by the parents' associations in the operation of their residences for retarded children. Such standards are required of other organizations that operate children's institutions under the legislation of this department and it is proposed that similar regulations would apply in this instance.

It should be noted here that this Act is concerned solely with the trainable retarded child. It does not apply to the non-trainable or institutional cases who are admissible to the Ontario hospital schools operated by The Department of Health. Nor does it apply to the educable cases, known as the slow learners, who are eligible for inclusion within the regular public school programme in the auxiliary classes established for the purpose.

The homes that will be established under this Act are not intended to be developed as improper and inadequate substitutes for Ontario hospital schools or for the care of those retarded children who may otherwise be served by the auxiliary class provisions of the public school programme. Over the past year, an interdepartmental committee representing the Departments of Health,

Education and Welfare has met on several occasions, to discuss the problems relating to the care of retarded children. With the knowledge that the number of such children in Ontario is increasing, it is apparent that additional residential facilities are required. We believe that we can go a long way towards meeting this need by assisting local parents' associations to expand their programmes in the manner indicated.

Numbers of retarded children who are now being cared for in other children's institutions might more properly be accommodated in the type of home proposed by this Act, leaving those other institutions freer to provide for the children who need a more specialized kind of treatment and care. We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that the enactment of this legislation will be an important step forward in providing for the services to the retarded children of this province. And I am quite satisfied, sir, that this should be sent along with the others to committee.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that with the entry of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Davis) into the Cabinet there would have been a new approach by this government to the very serious problem of retarded children.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) when he was a private member was foremost among those hon. members in this House in speaking in the education committee about the problems of retarded children. He led a revolt one day in the education committee when he was a private member and he moved a motion that the cost of educating retarded children be made a cost of the normal sources and systems of education. I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that that motion carried unanimously, all parties in this House were represented and everyone there was convinced—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: May I point out that this has nothing to do with the second reading of this bill. Once again this could be more properly introduced in the estimates of The Department of Education. As I said last night, Mr. Speaker, there is a place in this House to debate everything, but let us do it in the right place.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, with great respect to the hon. Prime Minister the principles of this bill deals with retarded children and—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Not with the education of retarded children.

Mr. Singer: Now if the hon. Prime Minister will just be patient he will see how the principle of this bill applies to this whole problem.

Mr. Speaker, following the encouragement that I used to get from the new hon. Minister of Education, I was perhaps a little further encouraged when I listened to the Speech from the Throne. That seemed to bode good things for the future of retarded children. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, when we see Bill No. 16 come forward we recognize that all of the fine speeches by hon. members on the government benches about coping with this problem really do not mean very much. They have not wrestled with the real problem that is presented and this bill is a poor excuse for an attempt to cope with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill they provide for a system of boarding schools for retarded youngsters. It may be, it may well be, that a system of boarding schools for retarded youngsters is most important. But how is this system going to be financed? This system is going to be financed by the parents of these retarded youngsters and their friends who contribute, have come before this House, in committees of this House on so many occasions, to complain that they are not able to cope with this burden, that they are already paying their taxes as normal parents and normal residents of our province do, that through no fault of their own they have this substantial additional burden, and they have asked for, and I think they are justified in asking for, much additional help which they have not been given by this government.

That is why I say—and I hope the hon. Prime Minister will recognize now the train of thought that I was trying to build up—that is why I say that this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a poor excuse for the sort of promise that I had hoped would be forthcoming when the hon. Minister of Education was given his present appointment.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known to all hon. members of this House that the problem of a group of residents, and usually they are parents of these retarded youngsters, that the problems that these parents have to face when they band together to raise those funds necessary to build a school is a most serious and difficult problem. In fact, these people are put almost into the position of perpetual beggars for alms. They have to go around in their communities with their hands out, with their hats out, in an effort to provide something that we, as the government of

Ontario, should be providing. The government of Ontario is not providing for this sort of thing.

Now what do we get here today in Bill 16, Mr. Speaker? We get another piece of paper that will allow these already hard-pressed people another cause for which to go out hat in hand begging for additional sums of money.

What happens and where does the other 50 per cent of the money come from? The hon. Minister says if there is a difficulty in the parents who are concerned with paying the current costs that some additional grants will be made. But where is the money going to come from, Mr. Speaker, that is going to build these schools?

The hon. Minister says that these homes are for those retarded youngsters who are not eligible for admission into the Ontario hospitals. I do not think there is an hon. member in this House, Mr. Speaker, who does not recognize that the accommodation for retarded youngsters in our Ontario hospitals is woefully inadequate, that there are long waiting lists.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) is not in his seat, but I see he is in the House and I think he knows this and is more sympathetic to this problem than perhaps any other hon. Minister in this House. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Scrooges on the Treasury bench will not give him enough money to build proper accommodation, will not give him enough to have this accommodation made available.

So what do we get this afternoon from the hon. Minister of Public Welfare? He says we are going to throw out another piece of legislation that is apparently going to solve some problem that is not going to be solved other than by public money.

This, Mr. Speaker, is why I condemn this government for doing nothing more after their high-sounding words than bringing in a bill which will only work if those persons in our community who are already so hard-pressed are prepared again to take hat in hand and go out and beg for more money.

Mr. Speaker, surely it is high time that we in the Legislature of the province of Ontario recognize that the problems of retarded children are the problems of all of the people of Ontario. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that this government accepted this as one of their responsibilities.

One thing that the hon. Minister did not touch upon at all is the very serious problem

of providing for staffs for these schools for retarded children, providing for staffs for the homes that he mentions in this bill. Where are these staffs going to come from? Is this government even offering a training course to provide competent people to run these homes? No mention of that in this bill at all.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a picayune, minute step forward and, for that reason, I am going to vote for it. But I emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, this is a poor excuse for avoiding the real responsibility that this government has and it would be a commendable thing, Mr. Speaker, if the government could harken to the words of the new hon. Minister of Education, those words he made as a private member; and if he is making them now as a Cabinet Minister apparently he is not making them loudly enough to impress his thoughts on the minds of this front bench.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member for York Centre was speaking, sir, I heard a quiet interjection from the hon. Minister of Education which maybe did not get on the record to the effect that: "Don't be too anxious", or "Don't be too impatient"; and he smiled benignly, all suggesting that perhaps something more was in the mill. I hope I interpret his words and his smile correctly.

However, we will have to wait for that. I would like, in speaking to the principle of this bill, to say that I think there are really two aspects to the principle, Mr. Speaker. On one I have no misgivings at all, on the other I share the doubts and the misgivings of the hon. member for York Centre.

Now, the first principle is the principle that here we envisage the building of community homes for retarded children.

I think this is basically sound. As I stated in my contribution to the Throne debate, I think it is part and parcel of the same kind of approach which is leading us now to build psychiatric wings to our general hospitals so that those who are in need of mental health treatment will be able to get it in the local community instead of having to go off to some big institution away from their normal family and community connections.

Apparently what is envisaged here is the building of a community home which, if I interpret it correctly, is going to be somewhat intermediary to the position of the retarded child that is going to stay in the home where it was born and with the rest of the family because it apparently is not so much of a disruptive factor, or else for some reason or other the family is able to cope with the

burden that a retarded child often places. That of course is preferable if it is possible. There are some other categories of retarded children that are obviously beyond any capacity or potential for training, and as I conceive of the new pattern of development, presumably they now are going to go into the big institutions.

But there is an intermediate group of retarded children that represent enough of a disruptive factor in the home that it leads to nervous conditions and undue tensions in the case of the mother, perhaps in the relationship of other children in the home, that it is better that they be removed from the home itself.

But it is also, it seems to me, desirable if they are going to be removed from the home they should be removed to a community institution rather than one that will be hundreds of miles away where no member of the family will, except on rare occasions, be able to see the child.

Now this principle, and surely this is implicit in the grants that are now being made, I agree with, I think it is a good one.

When you get down to the underlying principles of the financing of it I am a bit puzzled, quite frankly. I will agree with the hon. member for York Centre, sir, that if, in addition to the burden now resting on the families of retarded children who are trying to get schooling, you are going to raise the prospect of an added burden of building a permanent home, it seems to me that this is asking too much and is a step in the wrong direction. Because I suggest, Mr. Speaker, as I did in the Throne Speech debate, that surely the right direction is the direction that our present hon. Minister of Education was espousing so eloquently when he was speaking as a private member on behalf of the retarded children's association. Namely, having experimented with retarded children's schools, having found that they are necessary, that they have a role to play both in the instance of the children themselves and of the families from which they come, surely the intelligent, the humane, the civilized thing to do, is to integrate these schools as part of our public school structure. Then it would mean that the community as a whole would share in their financing, the province through its grants would share in its financing and this would remove something of the present burden that retarded children's parents have to share.

Now I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps I am not talking, except in the extremely rare and tragic instance, of a

family having two children, one of whom would be in a retarded children's class and one of which might go to the home. These really are two problems, and rarely would they be in the same family. Thank God there is not, to my knowledge, any family which has two retarded children, one of whom would have to stay at home and go to a class and one of which would have to go to one of these community homes. There may be rare instances.

In other words, my comment on the principle, when we are talking about the underlying financial problems involved in the principle, is that I would like clarification. I would like at least some indication from the present hon. Minister as to what the government's thinking is of terms of steps in the future—if they consider that this is one step and a part of a growing programme that they are going to unfold to us in the fullness of time. Not having that growing programme before me, I am somewhat at a loss to be able to come to any final judgment on the one step that they are proposing to take here and without the information with regard to their whole plan I share much of the misgivings of the hon. member for York Centre. If there is no justification for those misgivings I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would be wise for the hon. Minister at the earliest possible date to give some clarification as to the whole future as the government sees it.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if another group might possibly be included in this too. I speak of those youngsters who may or may not be retarded, too young to give any indication yet, but whose physical condition is such at the moment that they cannot be looked after at home. There are independent homes which do take these infants, ones with cerebral palsy. I speak of a case which was just brought to my attention today. Here is a baby 5 months old, cerebral palsy, frequent convulsions, defective hearing, defective eyesight; there is a family of 5 or more. There are a few independent homes that look after these cases.

Now would the hon. Minister give consideration to giving a subsidy to homes of that nature?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a question that could very well be taken in committee.

Mr. Troy: Thank you very much.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PARKS ASSISTANCE ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves second reading of Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Parks Assistance Act.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. Minister does not want to talk on this bill.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): I did not think it necessary. I could not say any more than I did on first reading, I made it quite evident what the purpose is—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, for perhaps the umpteenth time in this House, I think it is important again to point out that there are some 16-odd statutes that deal with parks; and some 6 or more departments of this government that deal with parks. I would have thought that by now when the government brings in a bill dealing with parks it would have been able to work out some system of consolidation of the various statutes dealing with parks and perhaps the fixing of responsibility with one department to deal with parks. To add to all of the confusion we have the parks integration board.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with this bill itself, but the whole approach of this government in dealing with parks through some 16-odd statutes and some 6-odd different departments, all of which go their own merry way independently, is an indication of the confusion and mixed-up thinking that affects this government in almost all phases.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I would say that there is undoubtedly more and more authority in The Department of Lands and Forests and more and more action in that department in connection with the general problem of parks in the province. There are, of course, parks in which the municipalities are particularly concerned and I think if my hon. friend would take more time to read the statutes rather than take the time of the House in criticizing on a broad front without reading them, he would find that they do co-ordinate in a much better manner than he has indicated.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, now that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) is here, from regions afar, would it be possible to revert to the orders of the day and put that question—

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LAKES AND RIVERS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE GAME AND FISH ACT, 1961-62

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 20, An Act to amend The Game and Fish Act, 1961-62.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say to the House that I desire that this bill go to the game and fish committee later in the session.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 23, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may we have the assurance of the hon. Minister of Education that this will go to committee?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, when I moved first reading of the bill I assured the hon. members all these bills would go to the committee on education.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-62

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth occasion on which I have had the privilege of participating in the Throne debate. I may say that every year it becomes more and more interesting as one watches the developments, the manoeuvres, the changes, the finesse, the re-shuffling, and the strategies which the government will stage in order to show that they are the dictators of this province and no one else.

Generally, on arising to speak, one congratulates the Speaker for his very fine work. And this I do very sincerely, Mr. Speaker. I also wish to congratulate my colleague the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) who has joined our ranks and I want to say that he will add much to the deliberations of this House. He is young, energetic and willing—all good requirements for a worthy member. I should also perhaps congratulate the hon. members who have been elevated to Cabinet positions but this I will leave to another part of this speech.

Mr. Speaker, today I want to actually speak on the Throne speech.

I will say that the Throne speech of Tuesday, November 27, 1962, will long be remembered by the hon. members on this side of the House, not because it contained material that was so exceptional but because I believe it was the longest that I have ever heard and one which will furnish a quantity of material with which to go on the hustings during the next election campaign here in Ontario.

On Wednesday, November 22, 1961 we listened with great interest to the Throne speech of the present hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). We accepted it with few amendments because the new hon. Prime Minister had only been in office for a very short time. However, this year, it is indeed a different matter. I re-read the Throne speech of last year and compared it with the one of this year. I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister did this before he wrote the speech, or whoever wrote it for him. It is filled with promises which were made last year and which were not even carried out. In fact, some of them are written almost word for

word. How a government thinks that the people of this province will accept this without raising complaints is indeed beyond me.

The people of Canada, and naturally of Ontario, were deceived by the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada, John Diefenbaker—who was supported by our hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues, previous to June 18 of this year—with such rash promises and statements, that the affairs of the country were in good condition, only to find a week after the election that the country had to borrow a billion dollars and that the people had to embark on an austerity programme. The people were deceived and there is no denial of that.

I maintain that this government of Ontario has torn a leaf off their book. Remember, I said a leaf, not a page, because a page is only one side.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this Legislature it is my duty to speak on this because I feel there should not be a recurrence of what we had in June of this year. It is for this reason that I want to bring to the attention of this House and to the people of Ontario that the Throne speech of November 27 was deceiving and misleading.

At the very outset of that memorable document, we find these words, and I quote from the Throne speech:

The Ontario economy is experiencing one of its best years on record and outstanding economic achievements have been a feature of 1962.

Now, that is quite a statement to make.

In the October, 1962 review of economic trends, prepared by the Ontario Department of Economics and Development, we find on page 2, the second paragraph, this quotation:

Business failures in both Ontario and Canada have been at a surprisingly high level this year in view of the reasonably high level of economic activity. Both in number of failures and liabilities the totals have been higher than in 1961.

Does this show that the Ontario economy is experiencing one of its best years on record?

Then I would like to turn to page 4 of the same report and quote:

The Canadian labour force dropped much more sharply than usual in September as the very large number of students in the work force this year returned to school. While there are still about 100,000 more persons in the active work force this year than there were in September, 1961 the rise over the

year is well below the average increment of 130,000 per year from 1951 to 1961. Employment also dropped by more than the usual seasonal amount in September so that there was virtually no change in the unemployment level which continued at 5.8 per cent of the work force on a reasonably adjusted basis.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): That is for Canada, of course, my hon. friend.

Mr. Belanger: This is the hon. Minister's report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Read it all!

Mr. Belanger: Just a minute. In the Throne speech it states that the unemployment figure is 3 per cent of the labour force. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the figures to which the hon. gentlemen are referring to are the Canadian unemployment figures.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): It is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Certainly it is.

Mr. Belanger: The hon. Minister is head of this department, is he not? Is this the report from his department?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Indeed it is and it says what the unemployment figure is in Canada.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Is the hon. Minister making a speech? He will get a chance.

Mr. Belanger: Yet the Throne speech states that the unemployment figure is 3.7 per cent of the labour force. I would like to know who is correct, the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario or the hon. Minister of Economics and Development? I think they should get together before they make any statements or any speeches.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Belanger: And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to show you again how this economic trend is deceiving. Let me show you how

from the financial report of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), published in October of this year, to further substantiate that this statement that the "economy of Ontario is experiencing its best year on record" is false. This is the report which, on page 19, under note 10, shows the revenue of taxes for the year ending March 31, 1962, as compared to March 31, 1961, as follows:

Corporation taxes showed a decline of \$19,813,069. Mines profit tax showed a decline of \$1,652,392. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the decline in the corporation tax and the mines profits tax offset the increase in the gasoline tax, hospital tax which is the amusement tax, land transfer tax, logging tax, motor vehicle fuel tax, race tracks tax, security transfer tax, succession duty and other taxes, by \$6,315,052.

An hon. member: You are twisting figures.

Mr. Belanger: Thus the \$6,315,052 deficit in tax revenue had to be made up from the revenue of the \$78,746,682 in the sales tax, which this government imposed and told the province of Ontario was going to be for education. Yet this government has the audacity to tell the people that: "Ontario is experiencing one of its best years on record." If that is not deceiving and misleading the people, I would like to know what is. Mr. Speaker, facts, figures and statements speak for themselves and I am quoting from figures given here in the report of the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

The hon. Minister of Economics and Development announced, Mr. Speaker, at the last session of this Legislature, the formation of the Ontario economic council, under which there were 28 different committees. This was quite an undertaking, and to see that they be all active demanded a tremendous amount of supervision. I wonder how many of those 28 committees do function today?

What happened to the sub-committee under the advisory council to study the economic problems of northern Ontario?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The forgotten area.

Mr. Belanger: On Friday, and I am sorry the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) is not in his seat—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: There are not very many who are.

Mr. Belanger: On Friday, December 7, the hon. Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker, in

very eloquent and flowery words, painted a picture of northern Ontario as one of great progress.

Mr. J. F. Edwards: There are good roads up there.

Mr. Belanger: I would ask him to recall that during the northern Ontario tour which The Department of Lands and Forests promoted last September, some of the editorials which the northern Ontario papers printed were not so flowery. Some complained that the government seemed to have forgotten northern Ontario; it seemed to have forgotten that they were part and parcel of this great province of ours. They all hoped that the tour would open the eyes of the government, and especially the hon. Cabinet Ministers—

Mr. Sopha: I heard about that tour.

Mr. J. F. Edwards: You were not around—

Mr. Sopha: No, I was not there.

Mr. Belanger: —that northern Ontario needed attention and needed it now.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Belanger: But the hon. Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker, states that everything is lovely. There are new industries, new roads, new parks. In fact, there is a spirit of lovely living. What does he say to the fact that his department showed a mines profit tax decline of \$1,652,392?

An hon. member: Why does the hon. member not ask him and find out?

Mr. Belanger: That is not mere peanuts—that is revenue needed by this province. If the mines profit tax is down then the mines are not producing to the extent that they should; and if the mines are not producing then there is unemployment in the mines. I would like to know how he can paint a flowery picture of unemployment? I say let us not deceive the people of northern Ontario. It just will not jibe. They remember Elliot Lake and what was promised for them, and what they have today.

Mr. J. F. Edwards: They were let down by C. D. Howe; the hon. member knows that.

An hon. member: Who is he?

Mr. Belanger: Well, now, the hon. member for Perth again wants to interrupt the proceedings.

Mr. J. F. Edwards: What is the matter? Is it bothering the hon. member?

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. I have several questions to ask him.

An hon. member: He is here too.

Mr. Belanger: Yes. I thought perhaps if I had risen to speak on the Throne debate last Tuesday that he would not have had the pleasure of hearing this.

I would like to ask him what new measures were taken to develop and conserve our natural resources? What accelerated programme of parks development was introduced for northern Ontario? What measures were taken to strengthen the individual and family security of the province? What action was taken to improve the emergency measures organization?

Mr. Speaker, I could go on to ask the hon. Minister question after question about this Ontario economic council, but I do not want to embarrass him too much. At the time of the introduction of the Ontario economic council programme it was wonderful. It received great play in the papers. Editorials and editorials were written. But how effective has it been? There lies the answer.

To me, Mr. Speaker, this is another way that the present government is deceiving and misleading the people of Ontario.

An hon. member: They have been doing it for 20 years.

Mr. Belanger: This is the way they are doing it, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development has attempted to promote his trade crusade in Ontario, but I believe he has put all his eggs into one basket and has forgotten the rest. To be a Minister, to travel here and there, to be in Tokyo, to be in Germany, to be in England, to be in Chicago, to be in California, does not matter. I want to tell him this: He is only one man, and in travelling here and there he is forgetting a very important thing, that he has problems right here in Ontario that require his attention.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I said that I should congratulate the new hon. Ministers and the boards and the commission members on their recent appointments. I do so and I want to wish them success in their undertakings. I do want to recall to them, however, that as Ministers of the Crown they must serve all the people of Ontario and not just certain segments of it.

I have one observation to make, Mr. Speaker. The present hon. Prime Minister is following the same pattern as the former Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) in his appointments. That is, he is forgetting the old stalwarts of the party which have given to this government the majority that it now enjoys to be in power.

Mr. J. F. Edwards: Who is the hon. member to say?

An hon. member: We are fighting for you.

Mr. Belanger: May I ask hon. members to look at the seating plan before them and think of the number of times that these hon. members through re-election have been the reason why this present government is today in office. On Tuesday, December 4, when the hon. Prime Minister replied to that inspiring, well-planned, well-prepared speech which my hon. leader (Mr. Wintermeyer) had just made, when the hon. Prime Minister replied to him he had nothing prepared in front of him.

But I will say this, that he forgot that if it were not for the old guard like the hon. members for Waterloo South (Mr. Myers), Rainy River (Mr. Noden), Middlesex South (Mr. Allen), Hastings West (Mr. Sandercock), Kent West (Mr. Parry), Perth (Mr. J. F. Edwards), York East (Mr. Beckett), Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow), Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney), Lambton East (Mr. Janes), Essex South (Mr. Murdoch), Welland (Mr. Morningstar), York North (Mr. Mackenzie), Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby), York-Scarborough (Mr. Sutton), Lincoln (Mr. Daley), Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), Grey North (Mr. Phillips) and Kingston (Mr. Nickle); they would not be in power today.

These are the hon. gentlemen responsible for this government being in power today. Yet how often were they recognized by the previous Prime Minister, as well as the present hon. Prime Minister, when making Cabinet, boards and commission changes?

Mr. Speaker, in Quebec City there is a monument of a dog gnawing at a bone and under it there is this inscription: "Je me souviens", which means "I remember". I think this could be a soliloquy to what this party has done to these hon. members, these members gave years and years of faithful service to the party. I wonder, indeed, if the leaders of the party have remembered them.

Mr. J. F. Edwards: We can look after our own party, the hon. member does not have to tell us how.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. F. Edwards: We are not divided in any way.

Mr. Belanger: I do not know where the hon. member was but he really is disturbing me this afternoon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, the promises in the Throne speech were numerous and very ambiguous. The Medicare plan stated a committee would study this. It will do likewise, that is appoint a committee, to study arts; it will appoint a civil service arbitration board; The Department of Lands and Forests will make a survey of the marine resources, it will embark on a plan to commence immediately to acquire parts of the shore lines of the Great Lakes and other needed lands, but this is a programme for 20 years to come. It will establish a producers' and processors' and consumers' food council; it will make studies to provide commuter services to Metropolitan Toronto. Studies, surveys, commissions, boards, these are what this government is offering to the people of Ontario.

It is very hard for me to understand and I am just a humble layman, that many of these projects require so much study when last year this government embarked on a very costly educational project for our secondary schools with practically no study at all. The Robarts Plan, as it is now known, was introduced at the last session, 1962, and came into operation in September, 1962. To say that the plan was executed and put into operation quickly is putting it mildly indeed.

There was a motive for its expediency. I will leave that for hon. members and the people of Ontario to judge. But when I see so many services, so many projects promised by this government since I have been a member of this House and which were acclaimed by newspapers throughout the whole of the province, but as yet have not even gotten off the ground, is it any wonder that I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am right in my assumption that the Throne speech this year is a deceiving and misleading one?

Mr. Speaker, this action of the present government to refer to committees, commissions, boards—and lately we heard a new one from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), a directorate—reminds me of what we used to do in city council when some alderman proposed something that was con-

troversial or that we knew would not be too well received by the electorate. We would refer this to a committee either of council or of a group of citizens and then we were sure it would die a natural death.

I do not know if the purposes of the government are the same here. It could be. Or again it could be a means of attracting more and more supporters to the Conservative Party. The more commissions, the more boards, the more directorates they have, the more paid supporters they have of the party. At school if we wanted to make our Christmas concert a success we had as many participants as possible for the children will not only bring their parents to the concert, but they will bring their grandparents, their aunts, their uncles, their neighbours, their nieces and nephews—

An hon. member: And the hon. member for Perth.

Mr. Belanger: That is right, and the hon. member for Perth. I do not know, but perhaps this is the thinking of the government here today.

Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. leader certainly gave a wonderful directive to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development the other day when he said, and I quote:

We will be prepared to form Crown corporations and to share with private investment in the establishment of enterprises that will broaden the base of the economy. In this connection some \$400 million worth of automobile parts are being imported this year for assembly in Ontario plants.

I say in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that recently the editor of the Windsor *Daily Star*, Mr. Richard Graybriel, pointed out very conclusively that if in Ontario we would establish a transmission plant we would save annually \$40 million worth of American imports. I believe that here is a field where the government's economic department could do much to provide employment and reduce the import which is so staggering today.

The department quotes facts and figures of these imports and asks us to buy Canadian products or British products. Why not investigate this field? In fact, if he wants to get some real information on the possibility of this, I would be indeed happy to give the hon. Minister some information, but I have tried to see him in his office in the month of July, in the month of August, in the month of September, but I could never reach him.

Mr. Sopha: Which Minister was that?

Mr. Belanger: The hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

Mr. G. Laverne (Russell): He is too busy doing things for the province of Ontario—

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Russell over there will have a chance to address this gathering—I hope he has, I have not heard him say anything yet. The only thing I have heard him say is mumble, mumble.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give the government credit for some of the legislation they have planned to enact which will prove beneficial to the people I represent. I must congratulate the new hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Auld)—and no doubt the previous hon. Minister (Mr. Rowntree) had something to do with this—when he announced on Tuesday, December 4, that the department was introducing quarterly licensing for commercial vehicles and trailers commencing on April 1, 1963. This is to assist farmers, gardeners and others engaged in seasonal occupation. I proposed this to the Minister of Transport last year, as stated in *Hansard* of February 26, and I would like to quote:

Again I say it could be of great help to the farmers and the gardeners and the nursery keeper if truck licences were not as high as they are at the present time. I would recommend to the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Rowntree) that he look into the legislation of the state of Michigan concerning the licence fee of these people for trucks that are used only at certain times of the year.

Then I went on to point out the fees that they pay in the state of Michigan and I concluded with this:

Now here they consider the plight of the farmer who uses his truck for his business only at certain times of the year without restricting him in using it for his own personal use for the rest of the year. But in Ontario we do not consider this, we charge him a flat rate regardless of how he uses his truck.

Now we are going to see a change in this legislation.

Again, sir, I am very happy to see the way the hon. Provincial Treasurer works the federal authorities, to give foreign tax credit for income tax purposes to the commuters in the Windsor, Niagara Falls and Sarnia areas. Four thousand commuters

in the Windsor area will benefit by this new arrangement. When the legislation is presented these 4,000 commuters will be given credit on their 1962 income tax which they pay to the United States when filing their 1962 income tax return.

M. le président, j'aimerais à féliciter le gouvernement pour avoir eu l'initiative d'introduire dans son programme de cette année la construction d'une école normale bilingue à Sudbury. La demande faite par la population anglo-saxonne de la province pour l'introduction de l'enseignement du français dans les écoles primaires d'Ontario démontre qu'aujourd'hui plus que jamais nous reconnaissons que le Canada est un pays bilingue. Je suis certain que si la population anglaise de cette province fait un effort pour apprendre cette belle langue qu'il y aura une meilleure entente entre ces deux grandes races de la province et du pays.

Dans le passé les canadiens-français d'Ontario ont fait leur part pour apprendre l'anglais. Ils ont apprécié le fait qu'il pouvait apprendre leur langue maternelle. C'est le commencement d'un rapprochement qui aurait dû exister des années passées. Je suis heureux de voir que le gouvernement prend une part active dans ce rapprochement. Nous sommes un pays bilingue, travaillons, jouons, faisons affaires ensemble pour une meilleure amitié, une meilleure entente.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister made reference a couple of days ago after my hon. leader's speech that the Conservative party had been in power for nearly 20 years and that during that time the province had experienced great progress. Surely the party will take into consideration that some of those years were the war years when every available man and woman who were not in war services were in great demand in our industries. Then there followed the post-war years when the boom continued because people had been deprived of many commodities due to the rationing experienced throughout the 7 years of the war. Any government would have prospered during those years. I say to the government, take credit when credit is due, but surely they must allow for the circumstances.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the government that there are many reasons why I feel this government will find themselves on this side of the House after the next election and we on that side.

Twenty years is a long time for one government to be in office. People say it is time for a change. The federal Liberals found

that out in 1957, but I want to say to hon. members that history does repeat itself. History does repeat itself.

The results of the federal election in Ontario on June 18 show that this province today is Liberal-minded.

The results of the 6 Ontario by-elections held in 1962 showed that we are the choice of the people and not the hon. members opposite.

I may say to hon. members on that side that the Robarts image is not the Frost image that they had in the past.

Government by committees, boards, councils and directorates is not what the people want. They elected members to represent them and not committees. They want members to represent them.

The crime probe has certainly left an impression on the people of this province and there will have to be some answering done here.

There is a large number of the present hon. government members who will not be running again. To select the right candidates to replace them will be a hard task facing this party.

The deccits and the mismanagement which I have pointed out will certainly have to be answered. The inability of the hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet to make decisions has not favoured very well with the people of Ontario.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that the Conservative party has lost touch with the people of Ontario. Once that occurs, the hon. members opposite are finished.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that I have been very critical. Nevertheless, I want to offer to the government and this House these final thoughts. The time has arrived for the provincial government to give serious consideration to the tax structure. Levies are so high that businesses are suffering to the extent that they either have to go out of business or curtail their operations. As a result the economy is suffering. When there should be expansion there is retrenchment; where there should be freedom there are restraints.

I must point out that the province does not have unlimited tax powers. The federal government makes heavy demands in certain fields while the province taps what other sources are available. In some cases, indeed, there is duplication. There is now a 3 per cent sales tax in Ontario and the federal gov-

ernment also takes a hidden sales tax of 11 per cent. The devaluation of the Canadian dollar must be considered a tax on imported articles because the price of those goods are automatically increased. The new federal surcharge on imported goods must also be considered as another levy. As a result of the last two steps taken by the federal government, our cost of living has reached a new high. And it will go higher as time goes by when new stocks are placed on merchants' shelves.

The federal government and the provincial government also have heavy levies in profit taxes, death duties and estate tax. We are also well aware of the automobile taxes, liquor taxes, the gasoline taxes, and the taxes and the taxes and the taxes.

It has been said that taxes have to be raised to meet the demands by the public. But I wonder if the public does not now realize they are paying for everything that comes back to them. I believe that they have a new awareness that there is a need for economy on the part of the government as well as on their part. There is no doubt there is government waste at the present time. The number of government departments is just one example of this waste. Many can be combined to effect savings.

Some thinking should be given by the province into taxes, efficiency of government, ways of developing natural resources even more, and incentives to industry and business expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I say that we are troubled with the present, and that we must look into the future with more confidence and more determination than we are showing at the present time. Thank you kindly.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (York-Humber): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the debate in reply to the speech from the Throne. In so doing I would like first to express to you my own very best wishes and appreciation for the many kindnesses that you have extended to me; also for the justice and equity which you have brought to the honourable position which you occupy.

Realizing there are many hon. members yet who will desire time to be heard in this session, may I just take a few minutes now and briefly review a subject that is of great interest and importance to my constituents of York-Humber, a residential and industrial riding here in Metropolitan Toronto.

That is, the early prohibition in Canada against the importation, manufacture and

sale of margarine or similar products. As early as 1886, an enactment was passed by the Parliament of Canada forbidding the sale of certain substitutes for butter. It is important to remember that at that time such unproven foodstuffs were looked upon in suspicion and fear, and even as injurious to health. Remember, too, that authoritative agencies of control such as we have now—the Canadian medical board, council of nutrition, pure foods and drug Act, national research council, and many more, were non-existent at that time. There were simply no points of reference or recommendation for such newcomers to the market in those days.

In the 62 years following 1866 only twice were these rigid prohibitions relaxed. First in 1917 in the latter years of the first world war, and thereafter in varying degrees throughout the early part of 1924 owing to a national shortage of edible oils and fats, and again during the second world war when Canadian soldiers were issued yellow margarine under army orders.

However, in December 1948 when, under a Supreme Court of Canada ruling, the federal government prohibited against the manufacture and sale of margarine in Canada, it was declared unconstitutional and invalid, and properly rested under provincial jurisdiction. Shortly thereafter each province hastened to enact its own governing legislation as it saw fit, with the emphasis of protecting consumers against free-wheeling and fraudulent misrepresentation in the sale of margarine as a substitute for butter.

Governments were understandably concerned about protecting the public from misrepresentation of a product of which Canadians had no knowledge or experience except in the form in which it was sold some 30 years before. The respective governments, in admitting this new and untried commodity within their borders were naturally concerned for the continuing welfare of the dairy industry and butter manufacturers, and every conceivable protective restriction was incorporated in the respective Acts relating to the manufacture and sale of margarine. Remember, this was a new field of legislation for the provinces. And each proceeded vigorously to bridge all possible gaps, where sale was authorized until orderly marketing and acceptance was assured, and any effects on established industry could be measured.

Restriction and policing were all effectively applied as to contents, packaging, wrapping and labelling and even yellow colouring was forbidden at the point of manufacture, which

still applies except in two provinces, British Columbia and Newfoundland.

In all this the overriding consideration was without doubt the possibility of unfair and even disastrous competition for the producers of butter; a development which, in the trial of many years now, has now been dispelled.

But, sir, to nurse along and entertain this bogey further surely borders on the edge of darkness. We have only to refer to the statistics from the province of British Columbia, with its important dairy industry in the great Fraser Valley, to find a complete negation for this outmoded concept.

Yellow-coloured margarine, sir, has been offered for a choice for consumers on the retail shelves of this province since 1952. We cannot accept that the Ontario consumers, nor, for that matter, the producers of butter here, are less enlightened than their British Columbia counterparts. Margarine today is established as a healthy, nutritious food and a farm product. It is made of milk and edible oil seeds, all of which could be grown in Canada.

Nor do we, by any means, underestimate the importance of the dairy industry. The question which we think faces the government and the dairy industry is how to maintain and increase the consumption of milk and therefore maintain our dairy herds at their present level without piling up butter at the expense of the taxpayers?

Obviously the law can do a lot of things, but it cannot force people to buy what they do not want or cannot afford.

Let us start out by being completely frank the Canadian way. The Ontario consumer, if he or she so wishes, has the right to buy margarine. Further, in their opinion they should have the right to buy it coloured, even pale-yellow coloured. Moreover, the manufacturers of this commodity, in good business sense, would be quite willing to meet their wishes in providing the simple integration of yellow colouring in the manufacturing process.

Why, in common sense, they would like to know, can this not be done? For who is so unimaginative or naive in our enlightened times to believe that margarine may be confused with any other product by reason of a similar colouring? To suggest such would be an insult to ordinary intelligence. Price, form, packaging and labelling all preclude this possibility beyond any doubt.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: To make the whole situation more ridiculous and more insulting, the government does permit coloured margarine by enclosing wafers and pellets, but not without drudgery and inconvenience to the user. Coloured wafers and coloured pellets and squeeze bags which enable the user to colour margarine himself or herself are legal. To have the manufacturer do this for the consumer is illegal. Of course, the squeeze bags and the colour wafer are more expensive and add to the cost of the margarine to the consumer, so what the law does is to make margarine more expensive and less convenient. We may dispose of the idea now, that consumers buy butter in preference to margarine only because the latter is not coloured yellow. Surely they can accept the fact that the consumers who prefer butter and who are allowed to, will buy butter, and those who prefer margarine by choice or necessity will buy margarine—yellow coloured or not?

How then can it be defended that yellow-coloured margarine at the point of manufacture will encroach on the butter market? Many people will buy both for one reason or another. The buying public has established butter and margarine as complementary rather than competitive foods. The tempo of demand for either product will not alter one whit only by reason of yellow-coloured margarine being sold. It does not follow, I suggest, that any increase in the per capita consumption of margarine in the province of Ontario would be reflected in a corresponding reduction in the consumption of butter or vice versa. The demand for both products will continue to rise in relation to ever-burgeoning population needs.

I should like now to refer to the following facts and observations which petitioned for the early removal of the discriminatory fetters contained in The Oleomargarine Act of Ontario forbidding by law the yellow colouring of margarine at the point of manufacture. Ontario consumers have a right to expect a freedom of choice in the market place—

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: —and that food be offered to them in the most acceptable form and palatable appearance, and with particular reference to include margarine prepared in an inviting pale yellow appearance, the universal preference.

There is no suggestion by the great army of consumers here that any of the inspection, marketing or identifying controls be eased—far from it. The Ontario shopper is an intelli-

gent person and appreciates real protection. Ontario consumers do not believe in the perpetuation of obsolescent and restraining legislation which works unnecessary hardships on the day-by-day task of living. But the continuation of the present law is an insult to our intelligence. The thousands upon thousands of margarine buyers in Ontario who reasonably elect to use their margarine yellow in colour live with this time-wasting and messy problem of mixing the colour into their margarine. Make no mistake, this includes many, many of our farm wives too—who work hard and long on a very tight schedule.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): The colour does not alter the taste.

Mr. Lewis: Ontario consumers do not think it fair or just that low income families, old age pensioners, or people on special diets should suffer by being unable to obtain this vital food in the preferred yellow form. More and more people, particularly men, are having margarine prescribed by their doctor—they too try to cater to their finer sensitivities and in an economic necessity, or otherwise, reflect on that better day when they were in a position to put yellow colouring in their butter.

Ontario consumers invite an honest, straight answer from those concerned as to why this Canadian-manufactured basic food, margarine, recommended as it is by the most highly recognized authorities in the land, including Canada's food rules, has been singled out to the exclusion of all other Canadian foodstuffs for special persecution. For example, in The Ontario Oleomargarine Act the yellow-manufactured is forbidden, importation forbidden, and this is the only food which is under the federal sales tax of 11 per cent. This is the only food that is subject to this tax. Why?

Ontario consumers believe in the encouragement and development of new farm industries. Oil-seed growing for food is a young, flourishing industry in Ontario and other parts of Canada and has enjoyed phenomenal growth—soya bean in Ontario, sunflower and rape seed in the prairies. Aside from this very desirable and profitable diversification available to farmers, dozens of factories have sprung up to service the industry. It has taken its place in the Canadian economy as a new multi-million dollar farm enterprise. This rank discrimination in the form of a colour ban against the product, margarine, of this young robust industry, a new farm industry at that, defies explanation.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He has convinced me but I do not think he has got Zeb Janes, yet.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member will have his turn in a minute, as he told me last night.

In summary, following removal of the ban of yellow-coloured manufactured margarine, I am confident that these truths will envisage:

(a) butter demand will be maintained and evidenced in its full share of its traditional market as proven in many other areas where yellow manufactured margarine is sold;

(b) the goodwill of the overwhelming majority of Ontario consumers will be restored in the administration—users and non-users of margarine alike;

(c) acceding to the lawful will of the majority of our Ontario people is the democratic process, as we know it, and has its own imminent rewards;

(d) the young Canadian farm industry of oil-seed growers will feel deservedly encouraged to take its rightful place in our economy;

(e) the less fortunate of our citizens confronted with economic necessity, health problems or otherwise, will feel a grateful warmth that their preference for an indispensable and palatable-appearing table food has been tangibly recognized; and

(f) the Ontario men and women alike will be relieved of the inane frustration, messy and senseless drudgery of adding colouring to their margarine.

And, Mr. Speaker, finally, when this day arrives a candle will be lit in a million Ontario kitchens. I thank you very much.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in the Throne debate, I would first offer you my best wishes, sir, and promise to the best of my ability to co-operate—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Tell us whether you are for margarine or not.

Mr. Gisborn: —with you in conducting the business of this House in the proper and orderly manner that it deserves. I have a heavy cold, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members will notice and I would beg their indulgence in my humble efforts this afternoon.

As a member for the past 7 years, Mr. Speaker, I must say it has been interesting and challenging and I have enjoyed to the utmost the fellowship and the friendship of all hon. members of the House in the business and working of the various committees in carrying out the business of the Legislature.

I have also received a great deal of satisfaction in serving my constituents in their wishes to have their rights under the statutes of the province in regards to pension, compensation, mothers' allowances, and so on. It does give one some satisfaction even if it is only in this small manner.

During my term, Mr. Speaker, I have, as many of the hon. members may have, been approached by my constituents in a sort of complaining way: "You have been a member of the Legislature—you are a member at the present time—what have you been doing about some of the problems that face us today; and what have you been doing about some of the needs we feel we are entitled to? Why haven't we got the minimum wage? Why haven't we got vacations with pay? Why haven't we got better welfare provisions? Why haven't we got the 40-hour week? We put you down there and you have been there 7 years and we still have not got some of these provisions that we feel we are entitled to."

I tried to explain to them the procedures of the Legislature, how the government is constructed and what has to take place before some of the needs of the people are looked to. And I would illustrate it with a story, Mr. Speaker, and with all deference to the hon. members and this honourable House.

It appears that the devil had been challenging St. Peter to a game of baseball for some time and he would never accept, could not find time for it. And then the Giants and the Dodgers got to heaven and St. Peter immediately called the devil and said, "I will now play you that game of baseball." The devil said, "You are going to lose for sure." St. Peter said, "Now just how do you figure I am going to lose for sure, because I have just received the greatest collection of ball players that ever lived?" "It does not matter", said the devil, "you are going to lose for sure because we have got all the umpires down here."

Now, Mr. Speaker, things change in years and I am one that believes in looking to the past. I feel that to forget the past is the best way to relive it. So I would like to go back just a few years, not very far, say

1958, if we recollect, it was the period when we hit the high peak of unemployment in this province in the post-war years.

If hon. members remember, the trade union movement was faced with, I might say, a tirade of abuse from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association inasmuch as they felt that the high wages of the organized trade union movement were responsible for the unemployment situation. At that time also they were supported by the federal Conservative Party, inasmuch as the Rt. hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) proclaimed what he called the hold-the-line policy in regard to wage increases across Cnaada.

Of course, the organized trade union movement, supported by expert economists across the country, dispelled that idea. They felt that what was needed at that particular time was more purchasing power in the hands of the consumer to give the economy the lift that it needed.

If we also recollect, we remember the Stelco plant was struck by the United Steel Workers of America, the local I belong to, to obtain what they felt was a fair share of the production of that industry. It continued for some 3 months and concluded with what was considered an honourable settlement.

It set the pattern, Mr. Speaker, across the country for wage increase.

If we recollect, early in 1959 the economy started to go up and unemployment down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said before in this House, and I think it bears repeating, that the organized trade union movement in this province and in this nation has made a very great contribution to the orderly expansion and development of industry in the province. If hon. members notice that the basic industries, those large industries such as auto, electrical, in the chemicals and others where there are well established trade unions, they are thriving and expanding and have a very healthy position in the country today.

I often wonder sometimes if in 1937 if the leader of the Liberal Party of the day, Mitchell Hepburn, had had his way, if he had had his way in 1937 when he made a declaration that he would drive the CIO out of the province, if there would have been a different picture. If he had been successful in that drive and the establishment of the CIO in Ontario at that time had been thwarted, what would have been the situation in the past few years, if we would have

had the same economic increase? I think we would have had what might be called two sides of the tracks. We would have had the affluent society on the one side, more affluent and more privileged, and on the other side privation and poverty. So I think that we can give some credit to the industrial unions for bringing about some distribution of the wealth of the heavy basic industries across this province.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Notwithstanding the Liberals.

Mr. Gisborn: There has been in the past year statements by management and labour leaders that strikes were outmoded and wasteful and a senseless way in settling industrial disputes. I am one of those, Mr. Speaker, who believe in that statement. I do not think that anyone could deny that such is the proper approach. Strikes are an outmoded and a wasteful way of settling industrial disputes.

I would like to make it clear at this point that I do not say they are obsolete. I think that there is a difference in the terms, Mr. Speaker, of being obsolete and outmoded. Something can be outmoded but at times useful and necessary, and at this particular time the strike weapon is still absolutely necessary on particular occasions.

Maybe if we looked at some of the reasons we might say that it would not be necessary; but take the present time. A 10-week strike has just concluded at Dominion Glass in Hamilton and I am very sure that there was no need for that strike than the need for more Conservative members across the way, because that company was in a financially good condition. They had no competition, if any at all; there were poor conditions in the plant—that was well established by investigation—and their rates were down in the \$1.43 to \$1.63 brackets. They struck for 10 weeks, got a fair settlement and are back to work.

At the present time we have Coca-Cola on strike in Hamilton. This strike I think was unnecessary; but they were certified last March and were not able to bring about a collective agreement with that company. Their rates are almost what you would term substandard.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Get them in a labour-management council; that will get co-operation.

Mr. Gisborn: In the strike taking place in St. Thomas today, of the municipal workers, I understand that the council has invoked section 89 which has taken them out from

under the provisions of The Labour Relations Act, I will have more to say about that at another time, but I understand that what brought about the work stoppage there was about who was going to sit at the bargaining table.

There were two locals under the council. The council insisted they only bargain with one local and the union insisted that both locals be at the bargaining table. They might have deep reasons; there might have been technical reasons. I certainly do not think they were reasons that would justify a stoppage if we had had some orderly labour relation provisions to avoid these sort of things at the present time.

As I said, I went back to 1958, and related what I thought was the situation then in regard to our economy, just briefly, of course, and what happened. At the present time we have a different attitude and I am pleased to say that it is somewhat different towards the trade union movement at least, although we may not have the same reasons for the problem.

We have today found that our economy is stagnant, lagging, not going. We find that because, in my opinion at least, the "free enterprisers" have not done the job that they have professed to do over the many years in the past. They have not found markets; they have not tried very hard; and I hope that the efforts of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) will be fruitful, because they have to play their full part in getting the markets that are there.

I listened, Mr. Speaker, with deep interest to the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer). I will say I thought it was a good speech. I listened and I got to the point where I thought it was good, but it is a little heavy on platitudes and I wondered when we were going to get down off cloud 9. But then I apologized for my thoughts to myself, because the hon. leader of the Opposition finally admitted in his speech that this was a long-range programme. I am sure the way he said it he believed it himself. He could not see what was envisaged however. In regard to his approach to labour-management co-operation, on page 61 he talks about, and I quote:

I suggest, therefore, that the owners and operators of industry consider the formation of an association of employers authorized to speak for management as a whole and empowered to consult with government and labour to negotiate master agreements governing the economic ground rules of our society.

Mr. Speaker, thus far I have been discussing what may be called the long-range aspects of labour-management relations. There are a number of more immediate problems which require attention if the proper climate is to be established for the growth of industrial co-operation on the grand scale.

Then I thought he was going to tell us, Mr. Speaker, what we should be doing now to start and bring about this new attitude, but he stopped cold right there. I am sure that in coming to some of his conclusions he read the report on the federal government's national productivity council, the labour-management government mission to Europe. It is a very good report.

I might say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that in 1954 I had the privilege and honour of being selected as one of 5 trade unionists from Canada to visit the Scandinavian countries, Germany and England on a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization tour. I have on my bookshelves reports almost identical to this. I am glad that the hon. members have the report, and I am sure they will find some inspiring and helpful attitudes in this report that they can strive for over the years. I would say that if we ever get this sort of attitude in this province, in this country, it will be under a New Democratic Party government.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the main point in this report, and I think it is about all we have to deal with today, is spelled out on page 12, section 65, under union recognition:

There is no question of union recognition in Sweden. Swedish employers not only approve of their employees belonging to unions but they welcome it because they believe it results in greater orderliness in management-labour relations. SAF—

That is the employers' organization:

—SAF officials stated that employers favour the existence of strong and independent unions because they were in a position to make a useful contribution to social and economic progress and also because they played an important role in maintaining labour stability on an equal basis with strong union organizations, Swedish employers say. You can make agreements with them and they respect them. All of which adds to the stability of the labour market.

Now this will come about, but in a different atmosphere than what we have at the present.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I say, to talk about this new atmosphere and the attitude that is necessary to develop labour-management co-ordination, a lot of things have to change in this province and in this country. I will admit that some of the responsibilities are going to be those of the labour leaders in the country as well as management and government. But we have not found the approach from management yet to justify an impetus to thinking for the trade union movement. We had the thinking of the hon. leader of the Opposition, we had the thinking of economists, we have had the report from the commission, but only from very few, two that I know of, have we had any support for the programme of Europe on management in this country. So we are a long way yet from starting to develop this sort of thing.

Let us get back closer to home. I am sorry the new hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) is not in his seat, because I think he is the one who could have done the most at this particular time by starting to lay the groundwork to work towards this new atmosphere and new attitude.

I would have thought that because he did sit, as chairman I believe, on the select committee investigating The Labour Relations Act established in 1957 and reported in 1958, that he would have at least made a very, what might be considered necessary and fundamental, declaration when he received the portfolio of the Minister of Labour. If he had said to the public in the province of Ontario that he did believe in the encouragement of workers going into unions of their choice, and that they would receive his support and blessing, and that he would immediately get down to business to revise The Labour Relations Act to bring this into being, then I think we would have been on the way of doing something about it. I would say a few things that have been said before, but I think they need repeating, in regards to The Labour Relations Act, because sometimes we forget too quickly. I will not have to detail them because the hon. Minister of Labour, I see, is in his seat now and I am very pleased. He will know what I am speaking about when I refer to the sections of the Act.

I am sure the time has come to overhaul our antiquated labour laws that were born in the emergency of war and therefore reflect the lack of freedom that was necessary and

acceptable at that time. It seems to me that the industrial climate is now ripe to remove many of the restrictions and allow the parties involved in industrial relations freedom to quickly adjust themselves to the ever-changing production measures.

I would point out some of the problems The Labour Relations Act needlessly creates. Take Section 13 of the Act. It states a union negotiating committee must contain employees. Why? If a union is a building trades union and it is merely asking that the employer who employs two or three tradesmen sign an industry-wide agreement that has already been negotiated; why have this restriction in this provision? There is no equivalent requirement for management, and many agreements are signed in a company lawyer's office. It is quite possible a person wants a union to represent him but has no ability or desire to sit on a bargaining committee. Here is a stupid interference with the free collective bargaining process.

If we intended, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the hon. Minister of Labour, I would say that if we intended that no agreement be signed without first being submitted to the employees for ratification, why do we not just say so, but get rid of all of this unnecessary interference? The same principle of restriction is contained in the exclusion clauses. All sorts of occupations are excluded from the Act despite the fact that the Act says in its opening statements that every employee should be free to belong to a union of his own choosing. Surely the choice of whether a person does or does not want to belong to a union should be a personal one. The fact that he may not choose to exercise that right is only begging the question.

In Ontario, as I understand, I have not any proof of this, but I understand from my discussions with members of the federation that in Ontario there are certain engineering personnel, such as rate setters, who have been ruled ineligible for union membership by a Supreme Court decision; and that our labour Act prevents security guards and watchmen, who may have spent 20 years on the production line, from being represented by the union that represents his fellow workers. There are companies providing guards and allied services with hundreds of employees and these employees are paid as low as 90 cents and less an hour. Yet our labour Act denies them the services of any union affiliated with the Canadian Labour Congress to assist them in bettering their wages and working conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of government intervention through compulsory arbitration and conciliation procedures also needs to be reviewed. Certainly those hon. members of the House who were on the select committee know that there was some agreement in this area. The matter of government intervention certainly needs looking at.

Time-consuming and wasteful conciliation machinery is sapping the efficiency of the conciliation department to do the job that was originally intended. The select committee was unanimous in suggesting changes in this section of the department. A mediation service to replace costly and delaying conciliation services was instituted.

To my knowledge, to date there has been no attempt by The Department of Labour to give this new method a fair try and it is lying literally unused on the statute books. The first change here, and I think it is a reasonable one, is that the government should pay for this service as it does conciliation, so that it applies to those small groups who have not finances to carry it out, that they may have some service in settling a dispute.

Even the election machinery in the Act makes a mockery of our generally accepted democratic procedures. Under section 7, a simple majority is not enough to decide whether or not a union may be certified. The applicant union must gain a majority of all those eligible to vote. If this rule was followed in political elections, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that no member of the provincial Legislature would be able to retain his seat. Surely the time has come for some rethinking and sensible amendments that would place labour relations in this province on an equal footing with other democratic practices.

There are other areas where the time for change is due. We have waited too long. The check-off was recommended by the committee. Certainly in this day and age, once the union is certified and by a majority decision employees decide they want to pay their dues through a check-off, there should be some obligation on the company to do it. Because hon. members know as well as I do that if we had to collect our income tax, and the PSI by going around every month individually and collecting it, we would be in a chaotic mess. This should be looked at immediately.

There is the building trade problem. I understand that the hon. Minister has had meetings with them and that there may be fruitful results from it. I certainly hope so,

because here is an area where we have to revamp our thinking to develop and help that area of our industrial workers.

Now, sir, the Throne speech indicated that the government of the day was giving some thought to a minimum wage. I notice that in addition to the provisions they suggest in the government contracts, there may be some move made in the way of minimum wages in other areas. I would think that, in the usual tradition, we are going to be somewhat disappointed in this area; there is not much hope. But, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. leader of the Opposition came down from cloud 9 and his management-union council co-operation, and informed the House of his minimum wage bill, it was obvious that the Liberals were also running true to form.

The bill would provide for a minimum wage for men in the metropolitan areas of Ontario. Why in the metropolitan areas of Ontario only? Why discriminate against females? What an approach in this day and age by a party which expects, or is trying to tell the public, that they are going to be the government of the day, to take this kind of a measly approach to one of the most important problems of our economy when people have not got enough money to buy the things they need.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that for thousands of workers talk about a high wage economy is more than debatable, it is just sheer mockery. While some of their more fortunate countrymen are worrying—and rightly so—about how to raise a family on the manufacturing average wage of \$1.90 per hour, thousands of Canadians are facing the same living costs with only about a third of the income.

The government of Ontario already possesses the statutory power to implement realistic minimum wage schedules through executive action and should do so at once. Canadian welfare workers and administrators agree that substandard wages are second only to unemployment as a cause of family hardship and mounting cost of public assistance. A minimum wage for male and female workers of \$1.25 per hour with time-and-half rates for over 40 hours per week would provide a substantial flow of new consumer spending where it is most needed. Of course, we are going to be faced with the wail and cry of opposition that prices will rise, unemployment will increase and new industry will be discouraged. Well, we have heard that before. I would say on the contrary, Mr.

Speaker, that studies on the effects of the U.S. minimum wage have shown that this is dire nonsense.

As you know, there was a minimum wage of \$1 in the United States in 1956; they raised it to \$1.15, last year, I believe, and it goes to \$1.25 in 1963. So here is an area where certainly there can be some move to help the people who are working for what I term substandard and exploited wages.

The ultimate approach to this problem is to change The Labour Relations Act. Let us encourage those people to get into the unions of their choice and let the trade union movement collectively bargain for them in an orderly manner. This will be an ultimate objective in industrial relations, but until that time we might even have both—we might have some encouragement to them and we might have legislation, but certainly we should have legislation in the meantime.

Mr. Speaker, I raised before the orders of the day a week ago last Monday, through the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), the question of him interfering with the establishment of increases in PSI. The 20 per cent rate increase for PSI Blue Plan effective January 1, 1963, does nothing more at this point than provide more income for physicians and surgeons, who already represent the highest paid profession in Canada. No good explanation has been offered of why an increase was necessary, nor any justification for the amount of the increase. The medical society instead simply announced that they would like more money and then the collection agency PSI obediently sets about increasing its rates in order to meet the wish of the medical profession.

The public deserves government representation in the face of such a small but powerful minority and the hon. Prime Minister of the province should use his utmost influence to bring about a rescinding of the announced increase in rates at least until there has been a full public review of all relevant considerations to the need for such an increase.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gisborn: He made reference to it not being the responsibility of the government to interfere in the scale of changes of these organizations, the private organizations; and he made reference at the same time to the trade union movement—that this would mean that he would have to interfere with a trade union movement in their bargaining for an increase. Well, if anybody has to present, be-

fore public scrutiny, their justification for a wage increase the trade union movement has to do it. Nobody can tell me otherwise.

They have to go before conciliation boards. If they do not, management will make sure that the public get the story and we will have to face public opinion as to whether we are going to get it or not. Certainly the argument is weak—to say it would be an infringement. I think it is up to the government to inform the public whether they are getting a square deal in all areas that apply to our economic life.

The increase in costs for prepaid medical plans, the high cost of drugs and dental care, the move to high-cost specialized medical care have brought about a popular demand for a universal comprehensive medical care plan for Canada. The Liberal Party in Ontario say they are in favour of a government plan while the Liberal Party in other provinces are opposed. The big question is: Who will fight all obstacles for the implementation of a Medicare plan? Some 40 nations of the world now have comprehensive health insurance plans. Only Canada and the United States lag behind these nations in this regard.

The last study by the International Labour Office shows that on the basis of the percentage of the national income which governments spend on health and welfare, Canada ranks seventeenth and United States twenty-fifth. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that there are grounds for some improvement here.

Mr. Speaker, there have been words said in the last few months about the Liberal Party borrowing the programme of the New Democratic Party—

An hon. member: They just borrow the words; that is the trouble.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, I would say, Mr. Speaker, if—and some awful things happen sometimes—if the Liberal Party, through some quirk that cannot be understood do become the government of the province of Ontario—

An hon. member: And it is going to happen. Thanks very much.

Mr. Gisborn: —and they implement 50 per cent of the programme that they have borrowed from the New Democratic Party, I assure you I will say that all has not been in vain.

An hon. member: The trouble is that they will not do it.

Mr. Gisborn: But this is going to be the issue in the coming election, Mr. Speaker. I am sure it is not going to be the make-up of the programme of any political party. It is going to be a record, a credit to the programme of that party which has the record of fighting all obstacles to bring about the programme that they have designed for the people. And there is going to have to be an awful change in things of the past, if any of the old line parties can find any proof or justification that they will do just this. The New Democratic Party is dedicated to carrying out the kind of a programme that they present through democratic measures and will be working on that for sure.

When I talk about the Liberal Party borrowing the planks and programme of the New Democratic Party that is one thing, but I wondered sometime ago in Hamilton if the Conservative Party had not had a pre-peek at the development of our programme. Because some months ago in the Hamilton paper—

An hon. member: Which one? Is there only one paper there?

Mr. Gisborn:—there was a story about the proposed study sponsored by the Ontario government in conjunction and co-operation with the city council and surrounding councils in Wentworth county in regards to regional planning and development in that area. This kind of a programme was in the books of the New Democratic Party some 18 months ago and under study.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: I agree wholeheartedly with the programme of a study for the Hamilton area in conjunction with the surrounding township. I am certain that the gentleman from the OMB, Mr. Cummings, will certainly do the job that needs to be done.

An hon. member: Hear, hear! The hon. member is making an election speech.

Mr. Gisborn: It has not come too soon, Mr. Speaker, because part of my riding—the township of Saltfleet—8 by 4 miles, starts on the edge of Hamilton and runs to the Lincoln County line. It has been one that has suffered through annexation and lack of planning. They have had more than their share of septic tank problems, poor development, no drainage, no sewers, bad ditch problems, pollution; but some few weeks ago there was an announcement in the *Hamilton Spectator* that the Ontario municipal board has ap-

proved Saltfleet's \$539,000 sanitary sewer plan and I quote:

SEWER PLAN CLEARED OFFICIALS OVERJOYED

The planned sanitary sewer system, the first in Saltfleet will serve the western fringe of the township.

"It is the greatest thing that has happened to Saltfleet since I have been here," says Councillor Richard Simpson, industrial chairman. "Several major industries are inquiring about township factory sites," he said. "I am sure some of them will take up their options now."

Now I do not disagree that the councillors should be overjoyed but why in this day and age did this small township have to suffer what they have suffered right on the fringe of a great industrial thriving city like the city of Hamilton?

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, one city block from the boundaries of Hamilton, in Saltfleet township, the water was cut off because it was contaminated and it was condemned and the people had to cart their water from service stations. But if you walked two short city blocks you had the fresh water through the city's system, which indicates a great need for a new look and approach to municipal problems.

The extension of our cities through annexation of surrounding townships is resulting in present municipal boundaries becoming completely out of date and there is an increasing tendency towards regional units for specific purposes, such as planning, conservation, development, education, health, welfare aid and so on. These regional units are growing without any real thought being given to the whole picture. It is just a sort of haphazard approach.

There is, therefore, a danger that in the present confusion the municipal administration will become even worse. Moreover, elected municipal councils will lose more and more of their autonomy as they are forced by events to delegate their powers to other bodies, most of which have no direct responsibility to the electorate.

The answer is to establish regional governments responsible for a full range of municipal services in areas large enough to permit effective local government under modern conditions, and rapid transportation and communication. The new region should be at least as large as the present counties and districts and in some cases even counties should be combined. Cities, however, should not be separated from the region as they

are now from the county. On the contrary, each regional government should have revenues from both urban and rural assessment for the development of the entire region. It should be able to plan on a regional basis to prevent urban sprawl, prevent bad land use and all the other evils that arise from conflicting and overlapping jurisdictions.

The New Democratic Party believes that a systematic programme should be developed where the provincial government, in consultation with municipal representatives can come into effect over a period of years. Here again we say that this is the type of thing that we will fight for in the days to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say what I have said this afternoon. I will raise other questions, more or less important, during the budget and the estimates of the department.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow we will continue with the remaining estimates. The estimates of The Department of Mines will be brought forward on Monday. Tomorrow we will deal with the departments left here, the provincial auditor and so on; my own department and the Lieutenant-Governor. We will also take such bills as there are on the order paper in committee, and then the Throne debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:55 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Friday, December 14, 1962

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962

CONTENTS

Friday, December 14, 1962

Election Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bryden, first reading	325
Co-operative Loans Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	325
Estimates, Department of the Provincial Auditor, Mr. Allan	326
Estimates, Office of the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Robarts	339
Estimates, Department of the Prime Minister, Mr. Robarts	340
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Price, Mr. Quilty	340
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to	344
Notices of motion	344
Conditional Sales Act, bill to amend, reported	345
Investigation of Titles Act, bill to amend, reported	345
Custody of Documents Act, bill to amend, reported	345
Partnerships Registration Act, bill to amend, reported	345
Crown Attorneys Act, bill to amend, reported	345
Parks Assistance Act, bill to amend, reported	345
Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act, bill to amend, reported	345
Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill intituled, reported	345
Interpretation of an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario with respect to the collection of income taxes, bill respecting, Mr. Allan, second reading	345
Inspection of meat for human consumption, bill to provide for, Mr. Stewart, on second reading	345
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	349
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts	350

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1962

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery and in the west gallery students from Parkdale Senior Public School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ELECTION ACT

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Election Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CO-OPERATIVE LOANS ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): I might say, Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this, that it is a simple amendment providing for the making of the guarantee on behalf of the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers Marketing Board.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) is now in his seat and I have a question which was directed to him some time ago; it has almost become a *cause célèbre*.

This question has to do with one of the few waste products that is not now being made use of in the lumber industry of province. The November *News Letter* of the Ontario Research Foundation discloses that research indicates that extracts from spruce bark, hitherto a waste product, make tanning

agents. Naturally this information was a filip and a tonic to anyone in the House who is vitally interested in any way in industry in northern Ontario.

My question to the hon. Minister is this: What research, if any, is being conducted by one of the agencies of the hon. Minister or some other agency of government over which he has control or affiliation with, to solve the economic problems involved herein?

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): I would say to the hon. gentleman, firstly, that I do not recall ever having received a copy of his question and for that reason I am not in a position to say what the Ontario Research Foundation is at the moment doing. I shall however be very happy to obtain the information and see that it is made available to him.

Mr. Troy: I thank the hon. Minister. It is unfortunate that this linking of communication in government departments is not too good.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a supplementary question here—for the consideration of the hon. Minister when he is looking into this.

When we were up north we saw one mill outside Cochrane which debarks the log before it is cut up, therefore removing the problem of having the bark in the chips. If the bark is in the chips they cannot be used for any purpose. I wonder if research has reached the stage where it is possible economically to debark all logs so that what was great waste of chips in the past might now become available as a by-product of the waste product and add to the income of our forest industries?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, if the hon. member would permit me, I would do some research into that also. When I answer the hon. member for Nipissing, I will include that information.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day and in order that everything can be

kept regular: Though the hon. member for Nipissing is making quite a show, he knows what the answer is. He is just putting on a little show as if he did not.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker, I cannot reveal the source of my information. I respect the remark of the hon. Minister but he knows, as a lawyer, that I cannot reveal sources of information.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day—and I have not given the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) any notice of this—I have had an opportunity this morning to look at the London *Free Press* and a headline which is of great consequence, and I am not talking politically. The suggestion here is that there is a fantastic waiting list in hospital admittance in that city. I intend to ask the hon. Prime Minister about this at the beginning of the week and I would hope that he might take the opportunity to assemble some information in respect to this particular matter and the inquiry that will follow.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Tenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

On vote 1601:

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to acknowledge again the splendid services rendered to this province by the provincial auditor. The provincial auditor occupies a unique position of independence and impartiality within the provincial administration. His primary duty is to audit and report upon the conduct of the business of government on behalf of the elected representatives of the people and his objectivity is buttressed by the statutory provisions assuring him tenure of office.

In day-to-day operations the provincial auditor carries on a continuous examination of all expenditures from the consolidated revenue fund and, in doing so, countersigns all cheques, and certifies that there are funds available and legislative authority for each such payment.

In addition, his staff is continually making audits of revenue accounts and the records of the consolidated revenue fund.

In addition to his duties in connection

with the audits of the government's transactions, the provincial auditor conducts audits of such boards, commissions and Crown instrumentalities as may be required by various governing statutes and directives. The results of the operations for each fiscal year are set out in the public accounts which are prepared under his direction and delivered by him to the Lieutenant-Governor for presentation to the Assembly within the first 10 days of the first session held in the following calendar year. The auditor's report upon the accounts is appended to the balance sheets in the public accounts in reference to his formal report which takes the form of a separate publication entitled *The Provincial Auditor's Report*.

In his report, the auditor endeavours to see that the results of the government's operations are clearly stated so that they may be readily studied and their full significance appreciated. While he is required to report on the scope of his examination, treasury board orders, special warrants issued and other matters, he is also free to comment on whatever he may desire to bring to the attention of the Assembly. This is a prerogative he has not hesitated to use, and it forms a further check-point in our system of financial control and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, the estimates of the audit office are unchanged from those of the current year. However, as I said last year, if the auditor needs more money to ensure that government spending is checked as efficiently and as thoroughly as possible, I believe this House would wish me to assure the auditor that whatever money he needs for staff and expenses he can have. In other words, I think the House would wish me to assure the auditor that he can write his own ticket to ensure that he does his immense job properly; and if the \$520,000 set aside in the estimates for the coming year is not enough, then more will be made available. I would like to add one further statement and that is to say that it is always a pleasure for the Provincial Treasurer to work with the provincial auditor. I think that he and his staff although efficient are found to be intensely co-operative, and I believe this is the experience of all departments of government.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, with reference to the work of the provincial auditor, I would like to make one or two inquiries with regard to the public accounts committee. This I think has an important role in the whole procedure of auditing the accounts of the various departments of government of ensuring that there is adequate

investigation of everything government departments spend.

The public accounts committee has now been set up for the current session. A new, and I think constructive, development has taken place in that the committee consists now of only 9 members rather than the very large number which was the case in the past.

There are, however, some inquiries I would like to make regarding the intentions of the government, if the hon. Provincial Treasurer or the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) will see fit to answer such inquiries.

First of all I would like to know if it is intended that the committee will be called together before the Christmas recess. And secondly, I would like to know if the government has given any consideration to adopting a procedure which is followed in other jurisdictions including, I believe, at Westminster, of having a member of the Opposition as the chairman of this particular committee. On the latter point I may say that a few years ago the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) offered himself as chairman of the committee—

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): He would have made a fine chairman.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for York Centre says he would have made a fine chairman; I believe that to be true. Now, unfortunately, he did not get elected on that occasion. I wondered at the time, if we had put on a better campaign, if we might have succeeded in electing him, but it seemed that the cards were somewhat stacked against us. I am wondering if the government might consider this procedure now, in view of the fact that they are obviously prepared to consider an entirely new type of committee with probably new functions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not really know whether the public accounts will be available before the Christmas recess. In any event, time is getting a little short, as far as the Christmas recess is concerned.

I have not given much consideration to the appointment of an Opposition member as chairman of this committee. I do not think that is necessary. We are making some departure in the set-up of this committee and the functions it will perform, and I think we will proceed, for the time being, and see how it functions. Then if this proves to be necessary in the future we can give it consideration. I do not see any pressing

reason why we should do so at the present time.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to get into dispute with the hon. Prime Minister. I would merely say, with regard to the chairmanship, that I hope he might give it further consideration. Since this is a committee which, in effect, is a watchdog on the government, in the manner in which it spends the money voted to it, I think there is an argument in favour of having a chairman from the Opposition side. I do not think the government has to worry at all; the majority of the members are still from the government side; but I think there is a point in having a chairman from the Opposition side.

On the other matter of when the committee will meet, the hon. Prime Minister has said he is not sure the public accounts will be available before the Christmas recess. I would, however, point out to him that some of them are now available; some of them have already been put on our desks. Quite apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is going to have to spend some time in considering its procedures. There are such questions, for example, as to whether or not some or all of the meetings should be held *in camera*. I personally do not favour that procedure but I am aware of the fact that there are some quite strong arguments in favour of it. I think the committee should have an opportunity to consider that matter before it gets into the really heavy job of reviewing the accounts.

I think also it might be useful if the committee now, or before the recess, could draw up an agenda, so that during the recess those departments which the committee might wish to hear from after the recess could be warned and given an opportunity to make such preparations as may be necessary. I think for that reason alone it would be useful for the committee to meet before the recess. Let us get the thing started at least; let us get it constituted; let us have, at least, a tentative agenda for it, and let us have, at least some understanding as to the procedures that the committee is to follow.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a very few words in respect to these estimates.

I am again very disappointed that we are being asked to vote on these estimates. I realize they are a very small portion of the overall budget of this province and I realize that it is necessary for the government to get some work through in the fall session. I

have raised this before, I raise it again today, yet we are being asked to vote; perhaps it is only half a million dollars—we have not even got the last report of the provincial auditor.

It may very well be that this report, when it is forthcoming, will bring forward matters which hon. members of this Legislature would like to pursue in this House. Yet these estimates will be passed today and an opportunity will be gone for questioning the department with respect to the report which will be forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, I should like again to raise my voice in protest in the strongest way that I can. I suggest to you, sir, that it is absolutely absurd to ask us to vote on these estimates today without even a picture of the last year which ended on March 31, 1962. We are going to be asked to vote on the estimates for the forthcoming year and we do not even have the details of the year which is now well past.

Mr. Chairman, how, in conscience, the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Provincial Treasurer can expect the hon. members of this Legislature to intelligently deal with the problems affecting the department and only give us half the information is beyond my comprehension. We were told when we raised the issue before that these were small departments and in the overall picture they did not have much relation. Then the government comes to the House with a Throne Speech which is full of legislation which could have been presented to us before the Christmas recess and could have been dealt with intelligently without affecting the overall financial picture of the province. They were matters of statutes and legislation to be brought forward.

I suggest to you, sir, that it is absurd. The hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Provincial Treasurer cannot expect to receive honest, intelligent criticism as long as these are being brought forward in this manner.

I sent across to the library and requested a copy of the latest report of the provincial auditor. Mr. Chairman, this is the same report we had last year when we were here to deal with this matter. Yet we are given half the information and are asked to come here and deal with the matters of this province intelligently—particularly in matters of money, which affect every citizen.

Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, any executive of any organization being asked to work on the next year's budget and not even being given details of the year that has just passed? I suggest to you, sir, that it is absolutely

absurd; there is no reason for it; and these estimates cannot intelligently be dealt with as long as we are going to have this stuff railroaded through in this manner. It makes me wonder if the department is worried about what the report will bring forth, because there were some very valid criticisms in the provincial auditor's report of last year. I do not know how any intelligent member can honestly deal with these estimates in this manner.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, it may be worth making some reference to the fact of geography in this chamber when these estimates are presented. When a Minister of a department pilots his estimates through the House, his advisors, the deputy Minister and some other selected advisors, sit in front of him, to assist him when questions are raised concerning the administration of his department. The deputy sits at a table provided by the Clerk of the House or the Speaker, in front of that Minister. We observe this morning that the provincial auditor sits in front of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, whose responsibility it is to pilot his estimates through the House.

However, sir, it might be of some importance to draw to the attention of yourself and the House that if the provincial auditor sits in front of the hon. Minister, the relationship between them is quite different than that which occurs between a deputy Minister and his Minister. In fact, if we wanted to be absolutely accurate about it, perhaps it would be better for the provincial auditor to have his table out in the centre of the Assembly at the end of the desk upon which the mace lies; that would draw attention to the fact that the provincial auditor is in no way beholden to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, is not one of his advisors, is not here to assist him. The provincial auditor would indicate by his geographical location the true facts of the situation and its history, that the provincial auditor is a servant of this Assembly. He reports to this Assembly.

I do not know how many hon. members have read The Audit Act, but The Audit Act says in its early clauses that the provincial auditor shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor and shall hold office and may only be removed for cause upon the address of the Assembly. It would be very difficult, knowing the provincial auditor as we do, to have him removed because this Assembly would have to move an address to the Lieutenant-Governor to show its cause, and the Lieutenant-Governor would then remove him.

It is all very fine for the hon. Minister

to get up, as he did, and call attention to the devoted public service that Mr. Cotnam has given this province, and with that we all unhesitatingly agree. But when the hon. Provincial Treasurer goes on as he did and refers to the independence of his office, then one must pause and say: "Well, if one came here 4 years ago as an idealist, then most of that idealism has been eradicated. Much of it has been eliminated in observing the actions of our honourable friends opposite".

And when he talks about the independence—I will not go into this in any detail—but will just sum it up in this remark: this government will turn for advice to where it can get it; when it is fumbling along and it finds itself in trouble then it will begin to look around and say: "Who can advise us in that?".

If they feel the provincial auditor can give them some advice, then we have evidence to show that they do not hesitate to turn to him and ask for his advice. And in getting his advice, then they put him on the spot. To the extent that he is responsible for giving advice to the government, to the Treasury Board, then that mitigates and detracts from his independence, because a man can neither be a watchdog and an advisor at one and the same time. These have to be independent capacities.

It is the responsibility of the Treasury Board, an organization we never know much about—but although I think they have about 3 of them grouped together now, on the front benches, the Treasury benches. We never know exactly who is on it, but it is the responsibility of the hon. Treasurer and the Treasury Board to go to every length to ensure that the office of the provincial auditor is kept absolutely independent of government.

If I may turn to one other thing. Two years ago, I guess it was two years ago, it might have been three, the Prime Minister of the day (Hon. Mr. Frost) moved in this House for the appointment of a committee, a select committee, to inquire into the organization of government in Ontario. That committee was, and still is, under the chairmanship of the person who at that time was the Attorney-General of the province, who is now hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts).

I do not know, looking from the outside as I do, whether the duties of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests are more onerous and complex, require more attention and devotion and time than do the duties of the office of the Attorney-General. I cannot tell. My friend says that Lands and Forests is a routine job. Well, all right, I will accept

what he says, although as hon. Minister of Lands and Forests he has a great area of four-fifths of Ontario on which to keep an eye, north of the French. But he was the Attorney-General at the time—

Mr. Chairman: It is the office of the provincial auditor that we are dealing with now.

Mr. Sopha: I am getting around to this. I do not want you, Mr. Chairman, to confine me within any strict limits because I am a member of the Opposition. Confine those people, not the Opposition.

Mr. Chairman: I do the same for every private member.

Mr. Sopha: One of the things we looked into on that committee was the office of the provincial auditor. Mr. Cotnam gave us very valuable assistance, guidance and advice on that committee. One of the things we discovered in the operation of his office was that there were certain large emanations from the Crown which were not under his surveillance as provincial auditor.

One of the largest of those emanations, in fact the great monolith of them all in this province, if not this country, is Ontario Hydro—an organization, mark you, that owes more money than does the government of the province of Ontario. It has more bonded indebtedness than the whole government of Ontario. That gives some indication of its size.

The provincial auditor does not inspect its books. They hire a downtown firm in the city of Toronto. I notice in section 7 of The Audit Act, having taken the trouble to read it, that it says:

Every department of the public service shall furnish the auditor with such information regarding its powers, duties and activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business, as he from time to time requires.

Perhaps the lawyer in Hydro reading that notes that it says: "Every department of the public service" and accordingly that means, no doubt, to him and to Hydro, that it must be a government department. Hydro is an independent commission created by Acts of this Legislature. Accordingly, I suppose they say that since it is not a government department it is not compelled to do those things that section 7 says it must do.

In any event, so far as we are able to discover in that committee it does not; it hires a private firm of auditors. It just seems to me—and I am trusting my memory—that

there were other important organizations, emanations from the Crown, that are not audited by the provincial auditor either.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): The Niagara Parks Commission.

Mr. Sopha: The Niagara Parks is another one, my hon. leader says. And there were others in addition to that, but I just cannot put my finger on them now. They do not submit their books to the searching scrutiny of the provincial auditor. They get somebody else.

How does it work out? It works out that if a man is a servant of the Legislature, such as the provincial auditor is here, and can only be removed in the method I have outlined, then such a person can approach the auditing of the books of an emanation from the Crown with complete independence.

However, if you hire a firm of chartered accountants from among many that are available, and they do not do what their employers want them to do, then this year it might be "X" firm that is auditing the books of Hydro and, if they do not satisfy their employers, next year it is "Y" firm. There is nothing to prevent that at all.

I believe I have to hand the interim report of the select committee, Mr. Chairman—and I see the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has again taken his seat—I do not know, I forget whether we dealt with it in the interim report; we have not got around to our final report. I think the last time we met was shortly before the blood bath at Varsity Arena, or shortly after, and we have not met since. We did not meet all this summer and we did not meet this fall. We have sent the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests some communication, not directly I think, but we sent communications to him through others whom we would think would give them to him, asking him when we are going to meet. Perhaps we will renew this examination of the duties of the provincial auditor.

Before I sit down let me put this on the record: in our investigation of the surveillance of the financial transactions of the government of Ontario we had the invaluable advice and assistance of Watson Seller, who used to be the Auditor-General of Canada. He journeyed down from Ottawa, spent a couple of days with us, and prepared a brief to let the record disclose also that the Provincial Treasurer himself is a member of this committee, this select committee, as well as some of the other hon. members of the Cabinet. They were not members of the

Cabinet when they joined the committee; there may be some correlation there. But they are members of the Cabinet now and we still have two or three who are hopeful to make the grade.

As I say, I just wanted to muster for the House, for you, Mr. Chairman, and for the House, the nature of the assistance we got in this very vexing problem. There is nothing that the public of Ontario probably is more concerned about, so far as the financial structure of the government is concerned, as to ensure that there is proper supervision of the collecting and spending public moneys, and that includes moneys of Hydro. It just seems to me one of the other organizations, of which he does not inspect the books, is the workmen's compensation board. I am not entirely sure about that but I suspect I am right on that score.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests would call that committee at some early time so that we may get on with the important business. I would ask that the government take the necessary steps to make sure that the provincial auditor looks into the books of all emanations from the Crown, be they department, commission, or anything else.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Might I ask a question, Mr. Chairman? Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer advise us whether or not he has received the provincial auditor's report for the year 1961-62?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have not.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer advise us when it will be available?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member had listened to my remarks, he would know it would be presented within 12 days of the opening of this Legislature after the new year.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer would tell us why it takes so long to have this report brought forward when it is such an important function to this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have just listened to a long and cumbersome dissertation on the independence of the auditor. I have not asked him why the report has not been available before this time. He is independent and I treat him as an independent officer.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I agree that the auditor is an independent person and I think—

An hon. member: Not according to the colleague of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Of course, we do. I do not think there is anybody who has more respect for Mr. Cotnam than we have, but it is our respect for the principles of this Legislature that causes us to bring these things to the fore.

I say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, sir, that he is perfectly right; he has no right to tell the auditor to bring his report in at a given time. That is the auditor's determination. But the hon. Provincial Treasurer's responsibility is to hold these estimates until such time as we have that report. We cannot in all integrity, in all honesty—and I appeal to the good sense of the hon. Provincial Treasurer as a man interested in government in Canada—hope to deal with these estimates consisting of one vote only when we have not had the advantage of the report.

The report is certainly the essence of the observations and the thoughts of the provincial auditor. And, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that my hon. colleagues are making these observations in a light way. I think they are genuine. I take great exception to the criticisms and remarks that are directed against them. I think our comments are part of the very essence of the position and the independence of the auditor.

If we are going to argue this, let us argue it on the proper basis. There is not one of us who does not admire and respect Mr. Cotnam; I think, frankly, that we are arguing for his person, really, because how can anybody be expected to do a legislative job and be subject to the position in which he currently finds himself? This report certainly should be before us at the time we are considering these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If the report contains anything that you want discussed in this House when it is tabled, I would be more than happy to put it on the order paper as a subject for debate and you can go through it and make any comments you like.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, I take exception, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is this a point of order or a point of privilege?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Yes, sure, the hon. member gets up and makes a lot of observations—

Mr. MacDonald: I was just going to note the clerk's memo to us and find out whether the hon. leader of the Opposition thought it was a point of privilege or a point of order.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): What difference does it make?

Mr. MacDonald: I know from him it makes no difference because you boys do not distinguish.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make two points. There is no man on the other side of the House for whom I have greater respect and even affection than the hon. Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Chairman, but I think he was just a little off par this morning when he permitted himself, as a result of the criticisms of the Opposition, to say that because the auditor is of independent status and responsible to this Legislature, that he would go so far as never to ask him when his report is going to come in.

I submit to you that this is—I was going to use the word “nonsense”—and there is an interjection over here “silly”. The provincial auditor's position can be independent; he can be a servant of this Legislature; yet the hon. Provincial Treasurer can—and because the auditor is the servant of this Legislature—we in the Opposition can ask personally, why it is not possible to have the report at an earlier date if we, the Legislature, feel that it would serve our purposes to have it at an earlier date? I just wanted to make that small point, and I leave it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to a point that the hon. member for Sudbury was making previously. I thought he was going to put this on record when he was referring to the comments and testimony of Watson Seller before the select committee on government organization.

At one point, Watson Seller was stressing, with great emphasis, the desirability, in fact the imperative need, for all agencies of the Crown to be audited by the provincial auditor rather than some outside firm. And there was the suggestion in his tone that perhaps if it was done by some other body, some licensed auditing firm, that it might not be as fearless an audit as you would get from the provincial auditor.

The chairman of the select committee—this is the very point I want to make—the chairman of the committee, the now hon. Minister of Lands and Forests intervened and with

his display of self-righteousness and unctious that he is capable of on occasion, he in effect said, "Now, are you suggesting that this licensed firm of respected auditors would violate their integrity by not bringing in a completely fearless report?" And Watson Sellers said, "That is precisely what I am suggesting".

It is on the record, and if the chairman wants to doubt it, let him get the record out here. He said, as the hon. member for Sudbury was indicating, that if a firm is in effect working for a client, that firm is going to be something more than human if it does not meet the needs and the desires of the client. Therefore, it will be something less than fearless in its auditing. And therefore, said Watson Seller, it is extremely necessary, in fact almost imperative in his view, that we should have the auditing of agencies of the Crown done by the provincial auditor.

Now with the testimony of a man—and I submit to this House there is no man in this country—

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): How about the Canadian National Railways and the method of auditing it? Mr. Sellers has a lot to do with it.

Mr. MacDonald: I did not get the beginning of the interjection, I was dealing with the principle. If for some reason other governments at Ottawa are not following Mr. Sellers' advice, that is irrelevant. The principle that he was enunciating was that all the agencies of the Crown should be audited by the provincial auditor. Let us not drag in some red herring about some exception at Ottawa, and that presumably because they do wrong we should do wrong down here. Two wrongs, in the view of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests are going to make a right—presumably. This is his approach, I agree.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this testimony from a man who achieved a reputation that is almost unique in Canada in terms of the job he did as Auditor-General of Canada, is the kind of testimony that we in this Legislature should not ignore. Since the government is the only group at the moment in a position to do anything about it, I submit to the hon. Prime Minister that we should move as quickly as possible to insist that the auditing of the agencies of the Crown shall be done by the provincial auditor. This will undoubtedly mean, particularly if he takes on Hydro, that there will have to be an increase in the staff of the provincial auditor. But the principle is valid and let us implement the principle.

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Chairman, is it not so that the real purpose of appointing an auditor for this board or that is to have the opportunity of handing out what is known as a "plum"? Now in other places—I mean it is not anything strange—the large companies have one auditor auditing all the books of the holding companies and everything they own.

If you would wake up you would find that in many states they have what they call a board of auditors and under this board of auditors comes the auditing of all boards and departments of the government. So I think that probably it would be wise if we could work out some ways and means whereby the auditor, our auditor, would be the man in charge of all the auditing in the whole of the province, every board of the province, the commissions of the province.

Now we are not being unkind to the auditor. We are the one party which thinks that we have a very perfect man as our auditor, but we do say this: that the auditor's hands are being tied. I feel certain that there would be no one person any happier than he if the government of the day would put all the auditing of the province under him. If he has to have more help, well then, indeed, give him more help.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: He certainly did not say so when he was in front of the committee.

Mr. Reaume: Well now listen, I just want to say something to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests for a moment. There is one thing about him that I have watched. He is vying, I notice, to the left. My advice to him is this: do not let those people over here push him any more to the left, because if they do he will wind up right out on the street.

He will end up there, he need not worry. I am just helping him, if I can to keep an eye on them because very often he has plenty of opposition right in the ranks of the Cabinet.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Reaume: Well, the hon. Minister is not far either, he is almost out. A man who has to have the hon. Prime Minister every once in a while reprimand him should put a button on his lip. He is just a small person now.

An hon. member: How big is the hon. member for Essex North?

Mr. Reaume: I am bigger than the hon. Minister, does he want to bet?

Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to say was this really, that I think it would be wise and I think it would only be common sense and certainly it would be only following the practices of good business, if all the auditing of the province would come under one board or one man.

Now most of the hon. members of the Cabinet have been doing a lot of travelling in all parts of the world. If they could stop for a moment, they could just ask this one question: in many states of the United States, and including the state of Illinois, in which the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) was the other day, he will find in that state, for instance, that the auditing of that great state comes under one board.

In the House of that state, men and women who actually are occupying seats of importance in the House, that form the government or the Opposition of that state, can ask a question without getting a bunch of abuse. You can ask questions of people who can answer them, which is very important if the Opposition is going to operate in the fashion that it should. If you people over there do not know the proper functions of the Opposition, I want to say this to you, that it will not be long now before you will know.

And so one last appeal, and this has come up before, it is ancient stuff now, but the Opposition year after year have asked this one point-blank question: is there any reason why we here in the province cannot have one auditor who can speak for all the departments of government? This question has been asked year after year now for probably 8 years; and we have yet, we have yet to get the answer from you.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Prime Minister wants to be fair and there has been a great improvement in the atmosphere of the House since he became Prime Minister in the method of doing business. We want to be fair too, but I would say to him, and I want to put on the record the precise wording of section 20, subsection 2, of The Audit Act that governs the operations of this office: "The report of the Auditor shall be delivered to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and laid before the assembly within the first 10 days of the first session held in the following calendar year."

Now if the fiscal year ended last March 31, then it has got to be in the first 10 days, I assume, of 1963. Accordingly, it is only good common sense, it is an exercise of fairness,

that these estimates be delayed until that statutory requirement is carried out.

Some hon. members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Sopha: You do not need to tell us, the hon. Prime Minister never needs to tell us as he told us last week—please do not ever tell us again—that we need to expedite the business of this House. We would not care if these estimates came on in the month of May, we would be here. We are content to sit here all summer, if necessary, to transact the business of this province. That is part of our duty. But we are also conscious that the Treasury benches do not like Legislatures; that is only natural, it is historic, part of our parliamentary democracy. They do not like the Legislature to be in session because it is a place of embarrassment, of scrutiny, of criticism, of inquiry, and they like that part of the calendar year when the Legislature is not in session. But do not get up and preach to us about having to hasten the business of the province of Ontario because let the record declare for all the people of the province that we will sit here for 10 months if necessary to do the province's business.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that when that particular section of the Act is read this difficulty we are discussing today arises from the fact the Act was designed when fall sessions were not considered, were not part of the procedure in this House. Perhaps it might be necessary to change the Act to provide for the time when these reports should be filed; and not only this Act—there are other Acts having statutory requirements for filing of reports that are effective as far as the spring session is concerned but are not effective as far as this fall session is concerned, because statutes were passed in the days when fall sessions were not contemplated.

Of course, that is one of the difficulties that we have had in the procedure of the House. I can tell you quite frankly I am not convinced in my own mind that fall sessions are really necessary. This is the third year we have had a fall session and it may be that some other change in the procedure could be instituted at some time.

It may be that we will have to examine some of these statutory requirements for filing reports to ensure that the statutory requirements fit the sittings of the Legislature. As for the absolutely gratuitous comment of how the Treasury benches of this government feel about the Legislature being in session, I can assure the hon. member for Sudbury

that I was never happier than when this House is in session and I can stand here and debates the issues of the day with the Opposition. I would say this: I would be a little happier if some of the personal abuse which is thrown from that side to this side were eliminated. It serves no purpose; it does not do anything to help the business of the House.

Mr. Bryden: Quite a lot comes from that side over there.

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If you have one, state it.

Mr. Reaume: All right. I think that the hon. Prime Minister has made a charge; and I think if the hon. Prime Minister of the province wants to use those type of words, I think he ought to indicate where the personal abuse comes from.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, all right, then, you are on a point of privilege.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am quite prepared to say that when you intimate and say in the House that a member of this government is going to be pushed out into the street, that that comes under the category of abuse. Justify it, if you can.

Mr. Reaume: I realize that you are obsessed with the fact that you are going out of office and that your skin is getting pretty thin, and I want to say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reaume: You bunch of echoes! You bunch of ghosts! There goes the choir.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Chairman, there was no personal attack.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There was a point of order raised here. Is there a point of order?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reaume: I have put my point of order.

An hon. member: Sit down then.

Mr. Reaume: Well, I just wanted to explain it now, if the hon. member does not mind.

Mr. Chairman: Sit down! The hon. member's point of order has been answered.

Mr. Reaume: Well, am I in order or not?

Mr. Chairman: Sit down! The member's point of order has been answered.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I would just complete my remarks. As I was saying, I would like to set the record clear that we, in this government, in the Treasury benches, are delighted to be here. We are delighted to debate. We would be a little happier if we had some of what I call debate, rather than some of the things to which we have to listen.

On the other hand, we are patient, and we will sit here and listen; we have lots of time. In conducting the business of the House, I will keep the House together until everyone has said everything they want to say, and I just want to say, in answer to the hon. member for Sudbury's comment that this government did not like the House being in session, that I deny that statement completely and absolutely.

There may be some adjustments that will have to be made in various procedures as a result of the fall sessions but as I have said, if you want to debate when the report of the provincial auditor is available, if there is anything in it that you want to discuss in this House or any questions you want to put to the government concerning the operation of the Provincial Treasurer, I just repeat that I would be delighted to put the report on the order paper where it can be debated. I would simply say that I feel the office of the provincial auditor is available to individual hon. members and to the government. I do not think this reference to geography—and the inference there, I suppose, is that the hon. Provincial Treasurer sits above the auditor—can be drawn. The government uses the provincial auditor for advice and for guidance. We accept his decisions and rulings; I think this is his function and we are delighted to do so. He is completely independent, of course, and the question about the geography of where or how he sits is, I think, an inference that cannot fairly be drawn.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, through you, sir, would not the hon. Prime Minister draw a distinction between a query to the provincial auditor—how should we do this? How should we do this, and get his advice? Or leave off the adverb "how" and say: Should we do this? Clearly, the adverb makes the difference between it being a policy decision or administrative advice that is being sought. If the government asks him: "Should

we do this?" in relation to the raising of revenue or the spending of it, then they are putting the provincial auditor in the position of an unqualified adviser to the government. That was my point.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the hon. gentleman that advice that is sought from the provincial auditor is advice that might be asked of any auditor of an auditing nature; it has nothing to do with policy. And so far as the geography is concerned here, the whole purpose of the provincial auditor being where he is this morning is because I am anxious, as the Minister who brings these estimates to the House, to be able to provide any information for the hon. members of this Legislature, to whom the provincial auditor is responsible, that they might like to have.

I am still willing to do that. I am very happy to inform the hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, that he is misinformed when he states that the provincial auditor does not audit the Niagara parks commission accounts, because he does. I am sure that he will be pleased to know that such is being done.

Mr. MacDonald: When did that start?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Is it two years ago? This is the first full year.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1601.

Mr. P. Manley (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the pleasant exchanges back and forth this morning, from one side of the House to the other, and I want to say that we in the Opposition are in a state of confusion here in regard to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Manley: Just a moment now, Mr. Chairman.

We are in a state of confusion owing to the fact that we do not know what the financial position of our province is, whenever we are called here. It seems to be that it is the pattern now that we do have fall sessions. The question that I wanted to put before the House this morning is: "Why cannot we change our calendar year? We have our calendar year ending on March 31; if we are going to continue to have fall sessions—or the fiscal year, pardon me—I was wondering why we could not change our calendar year to September 30. In that way we would know, when we are called in here in Novem-

ber or in January, what the financial position has been regarding the various departments.

Now the first year that this would be brought into operation we would have a 6-month period. After that we would go on in an orderly fashion and have a 12-month period. I think it would be beneficial to the government and to the Opposition as well, because we would know what our financial standing was and we would be in a better position to deal with the estimates and we would have the necessary information before us. As I have said, we would not be in this state of confusion that we are in as regards to the financial position of the various departments and I would like some comment on that if I could, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There is very definitely merit in what the hon. member says. I think all these questions are bound together. The question raised, the question of when the Assembly sits, the question of certain statutory requirements based on situations that no longer exist, I think they are all part and parcel of the same question and certainly will be given consideration.

I do not really know, nor am I able to comment this morning upon what the technical difficulties might be in making such a move, but these are matters which can be looked at.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a couple of questions to the hon. Provincial Treasurer with respect to last year's provincial auditor's report which I have in front of me. On page 17 of the report, attention of the hon. members has been drawn to the very serious problem in connection with the teachers' superannuation fund in which it was pointed out that the amount of the actuarial deficit of the fund had reached the sum of some \$203,886,000, and that 4 years previously it has only been \$178,314,900. It goes on to point out that on interest alone the deficit in this fund is going to grow by some \$8 million per year.

The paragraph which I wish to read into the record and ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer about is this:

This is a serious situation both with respect to the amount of the deficit and the fact that it is apparently increasing each year. It is recommended that immediate steps be taken to place the fund on a sound actuarial basis.

Mr. Chairman, since we do not have this year's report, I do not know what the auditor

will say, but my question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer is this: Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer advise what steps have been taken to correct this situation?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would just point out to the hon. member for Wentworth that each year during the past number of years the supplementary estimates have included an amount of \$1 million which is for the purpose of strengthening this fund.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, of course this is not an answer at all, because the report makes mention of this special \$1 million grant which has been given each year. Notwithstanding the fact that that grant has been given, the report indicates that there is an \$8 million a year increase in the deficit.

Now my question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer was, what steps have been taken to correct the situation? I am afraid he has not answered it yet.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the hon. member that this matter is being studied and the action that I have stated has been taken up until this time, which does not indicate the action that will be taken as a result of the studies.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, this report, I would point out to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, is two years old and there is a recommendation from the auditor. Do I understand from the hon. Provincial Treasurer that no steps have been taken to set this in order?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I have already answered the question twice.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I suggest that he has not answered the question, because the hon. Provincial Treasurer told me that steps had been taken in the supplementary estimates to provide \$1 million in a grant; and I point out to him, sir, that the auditor says, and I quote:

The \$204 million deficit in respect to the contributions existing in 1958 will continue to grow quite apart from any inflation. At 4.5 per cent interest per annum, less the special annual grant of \$1 million made by the province each year, the growth of this deficit at interest will thus be of the order of \$8 million per year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, our auditor has told us that this situation is serious and has recom-

mended that immediate—and I repeat the word immediate—steps be taken to place the fund on a sound actuarial basis. Now to say that we are simply giving \$1 million a year in annual grants of course is not the immediate steps that have been suggested. My request is, what steps have been taken?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have only this further statement to make and that is that consideration has been given. Certain changes will become known at the proper time, Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to state their nature today.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I only underscore what I said earlier in this debate, that the action which is being given and the answers which have been given here, in my opinion, are an insult to the Legislature and the people who sent us here to deal with this problem. This is a serious matter, we are sent here to take care of the affairs of this province collectively. We are today debating the estimates of the provincial auditor. And since the government has failed to act on the advice of the auditor, it seems to me that it is almost unreasonable to vote for these estimates, because we are just simply not following the advice supplied by the man for whom we are providing the funds.

I think this is terrible. I do not know how to say it and still—the hon. Prime Minister has suggested that we should be careful of the words we use in this House, and I am endeavouring to do that, sir—but I am trying to point out that here is a situation where we have not done what we were supposed to do. We do not have this year's report to find out what the auditor's recommendation will be for the forthcoming year, but we will look with keen interest to find out what has been done. As nearly as I can find out here, we have not done anything, the situation is going to continue to grow, and is going to get worse. We are creating chaos.

Now surely we are charged with the responsibility of conducting the affairs of the province in a businesslike manner and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not businesslike.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I can speak about the teachers' superannuation fund. There is an actuarial deficit. The teachers' superannuation fund is set up under a separate Act. The government contributes so much to the teachers' superannuation fund, the teachers themselves contribute so much. There is an actuarial deficit there which I believe, if my memory serves me correctly,

on a projection, would not become effective until some time in the year 2000.

In other words, if actuarially you project the demands that can be made upon the fund from those teachers who are presently contributing to it and will in fact be in a position to make demands upon it when they become of pensionable age, this actuarial deficit will become what might be termed in a layman's language a practical deficit some time in the next century.

I believe the deficit arises because the pensions as established in the Act were based upon salaries a good deal lower than the salaries teachers are receiving today, and there is no limitation, of course, placed upon the pension a teacher can get from the teachers' pension fund. We have a fund built up and I believe predicated—now I am not an auditor, nor am I a statistician or an actuary—but this is, as I understand it in layman's language, in any event, the contributions to the fund over the years were based on low salaries and consequently low pensions.

In the meantime the salaries have increased, and of course the pensions have increased because there is no limitation on the pension in the fund. This creates an actuarial deficit when you, as I say, look ahead to the time and anticipate what would happen if all the teachers who required pensions, and who had contributed and were entitled to pensions, got them at the same time. However, Mr. Chairman, this situation would not occur.

It is a very technical question: I would suggest it could be raised and be more fully debated—if you wanted the exact answers, so far as the teachers' superannuation fund is concerned—during the estimates of The Department of Education. The teachers' superannuation fund comes under that department. As to how this can in fact be rectified unless the government is prepared to put "X" amount of money into this fund to bring it into actuarial balance is a very involved and complex matter. Of course, if we were to do that we would be subsidizing the teachers' pensions to the amount put in to balance the fund. Whether that is in fact the responsibility of the government is a good question.

On the other hand, over the years, additional contributions other than those made to match the teachers' contribution into the fund have been made in an effort to bring it at least into some better position and to prevent this imbalance from increasing as rapidly as it would increase if we did not in fact add the additional million dollars that

has been added from time to time over the years. That is the story of the teachers' superannuation fund.

The auditor in his report last year—and I have no doubt this year—drew to the attention of the government that this fund is actuarially unsound; this we know. We also know that it is a very complex problem—I tried to indicate some of the complexities for the government to solve—and therefore it just simply is not a question of correcting it tomorrow. We are aware of the problem; of course we are aware of it. We are aware how it came about but we are not necessarily aware of an easy answer to it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, if I might pursue it, and I thank the hon. Prime Minister for having given the outline of the fund, most of which has been done here before. He suggested perhaps this might be discussed under the estimates of The Department of Education. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, and I would be prepared to do that, but I would point out to the hon. Prime Minister that he suggested that to put this on a sound actuarial basis would require subsidization. I suggest that, in the million-dollars-a-year grant we are giving, we are in effect subsidizing the fund.

But the thing that concerns me, Mr. Chairman, is that if we were holding even then I would say that eventually this thing would have to balance out. I make no claim to being an accountant; I am a layman, as the hon. Prime Minister has suggested, but the point is that the provincial auditor has told us that interest alone is taking this fund into a further deficit to the tune of \$8 million per year. I do not think it is sufficient to say that by the year 2000 this will correct itself, or that it will become even less of a problem at that time, because we do not know what the future demands will be from this fund. It could very well be, with the increase in salaries, that the situation could get worse by that time rather than better.

It seems to me, sir, that it must be put on record that this has been brought to the attention of the government, because with great sincerity I say to you that it appears to me that we have failed to deal with the problem that has been brought to our attention. The recommendation is clear; it is in very simple language that anybody can understand, and it simply says that immediate steps be taken to rectify the situation. It seems that we have not taken any steps, Mr. Chairman. I have asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer what steps—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Is my word not accepted in this House?

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): He said he had taken steps.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would accept the word of the hon. Provincial Treasurer anywhere; let me make that clear. If I have in any way suggested to him that I do not take his word—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The hon. member says nothing is going to be done.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Treasurer let me finish? If I have in any way suggested that the word of the hon. Treasurer was not good, I here and now publicly say to him that I will accept his word and any other hon. member's word in this House. Let us get that clear once and for all. But surely when I stand here and criticize the policies of the government it does not resolve itself down into a matter of taking the hon. Treasurer's word?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Did not the hon. member for Wentworth say that nothing was going to be done? He certainly did.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am sorry that the hon. Provincial Treasurer did not hear me, and I will repeat for his benefit. Nothing appears to have been done in accordance with the report of the provincial auditor almost two years ago. That is what I have said, and this is enough, Mr. Chairman, to condemn this government for not taking action on the reports that are before it. Unless the hon. Provincial Treasurer will come here and tell us what concrete steps have been taken to rectify this situation, I suggest that nothing has been done in accordance with this report.

He can interpret it any way he wants to; that is his privilege. But I interpret it, Mr. Chairman, that unless the hon. Treasurer can tell us what has been done up until now—not what will be done in the future—to ensure that this \$8 million per year that we are going into deficit has been wiped out, then I suggest to him that he has not acted on this report. And I suggest, with great respect—

Mr. Chairman: This is getting to be a repetition. I believe the member has now made this point two or three different times and it appears to be a repetition of what has been previously said.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, if I might go on, I shall give my assurances I shall endeavour not to be repetitious—would that be satisfactory, sir? Surely there should not be an attempt to throttle the members of the House when they are pointing out discrepancies. I merely suggest—and I appreciate the comments of the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman. If he wants me to stop, I will. There is another matter I wish to deal with under the same principle here. I merely suggest that the explanation which has been given by the hon. Prime Minister was helpful and useful; but it has not met the problem and we have not faced up to it.

The other thing that I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. Provincial Treasurer is on the same report, on page 17. It says:

No actuarial valuation of the public service superannuation fund has been made since March 31, 1952, and as a result the amount of the existing actuarial deficit is not known and will not be known until the next actuarial valuation has been carried out.

Would the hon. Treasurer tell us whether or not a further actuarial valuation has been carried out in connection with this fund?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to inform the hon. member that such a valuation is being carried out.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Treasurer be able to tell us when the results of that valuation will be available?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not able to give the hon. member a definite date at this time. It will be available as soon as it has been completed.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, is this a valuation that will require years or is it one that can be carried out fairly quickly?

Hon. Mr. Allan: It will not require years. It will require probably a good part of one year, but it will be available within a reasonable time. Just to set the record clear I want to say that my statement with respect to the teachers' superannuation fund was that sums have been provided, \$1 million each year in the supplementary estimates, to strengthen this and that before this session of the Legislature is completed there will be provision for the further strengthening of this fund.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I can appreciate that this is a

problem that is always, I am sure, in his mind, it is that the cost of government operation, in common with all other costs, have increased in each of the last several years, but not all non-tax revenues have increased correspondingly. I am thinking of non-tax revenues, sir, such as receipts from privileges and licence fees and so on. I am asking, sir, whether the hon. Provincial Treasurer has done any study in connection with non-tax revenues and the increases on these; and who did the study if he has had one done?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the member is out of order. This is not the Provincial Treasurer's department but the provincial auditor's department. I think that questions of revenue and expenditure should be directed to the Provincial Treasurer on his own estimates.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to answer that question. All departments of government have been asked to review their revenue from various licences and fees and an effort is always being made, so far as is possible and still have these fees reasonable, to collect sufficient money to pay for the administration in connection with them—in spite of the great objection by the hon. member for Wentworth to the fees presently in effect.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer probably recognizes that I am reading from the provincial auditor's report in which it is suggested that a special study should be done by the Treasury. He is saying that each individual department does this study.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The hon. member is getting technical. The Treasury has requested the individual departments to do this and they are working with us.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, before we pass this vote I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister for his personal undertaking that when the provincial auditor's report is made available there will be a free and unimpaired opportunity to discuss that report in conjunction with the significance of these particular estimates, just as we would have had if the report had been available at the time we were discussing the estimates.

Mr. MacDonald: He has already given that commitment; he said so.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now, just a moment. The hon. member for York South is not the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MacDonald: I never will be.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think I have made it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I would make the report available.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Just on a point of clarification, I would just like to know that we will have the opportunity to ask and receive answers to questions relating to that report in the same manner that we would have done had the report been here before the estimates were passed. I realize we will have the opportunity to discuss it, sir, but what I would like is to have the assurance that we will have the opportunity to receive answers to those questions in the same way we would under the normal estimates. Is that the undertaking of the hon. Prime Minister?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I said that I would put the report on the order paper for debate. I will put the House into committee to debate it so we will not be bound by the formal rules of debate as when Mr. Speaker is in the chair.

Vote 1601 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: That concludes the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Auditor.

ESTIMATES, OFFICE OF THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR

On vote 1201.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, a few years ago the government was in receipt of a bequest representing a future residence for the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario. Would the government be in a position now to state what the status is of that development and what the further outlay beyond the acquisition of the property will mean to the public treasury?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): No, I could not tell you, Mr. Chairman. The property is presently being looked after by The Department of Public Works. There have been no sums expended on it to date. What its final disposition will be has not yet been decided and therefore I am unable to say what demands will be made or will not be made on the Treasury in regard to that property.

Vote 1201 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: That concludes the estimates of the office of the Lieutenant-Governor.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIME MINISTER

Vote 1501 agreed to.

Vote 1502 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: That concludes the estimates of The Department of the Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity of saying a few words in the Throne debate.

Since we last met the House has suffered a great loss in the passing of Stanley Hall (Halton) and Harry Lyons (Sault Ste. Marie). Both men made an excellent contribution to the provincial life of Ontario and to their constituencies. I join with the other hon. members in paying a tribute to both these outstanding men and in expressing my condolences to their families.

Mr. Speaker, once again it is a pleasure to see you presiding over the affairs of the House as in previous years. No one is better equipped than yourself for the position.

The deputy Speaker and chairman of the whole House, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox, Mr. Whitney, will be a great asset to you in conducting the business of the House smoothly and judiciously. I congratulate and extend my best wishes to him as well on assuming this most important task and legislative responsibility.

It has been a pleasure to see some of my hon. colleagues elevated to Cabinet rank. I know they will attend their various offices with distinction.

I welcome the new hon. member of the House from Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). No

doubt we will be hearing from him as he enters into debate in due course. I wish him well as he takes up his parliamentary duties in the House.

To the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris) and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) I extend my congratulations on the manner in which they moved and seconded the motion in reply to the Throne Speech. The way is now paved for a lively and productive session.

The Throne Speech has been variously called, by members of the Opposition parties, a pre-election address and a catch-all document. To my mind it is the best address of its kind to be presented to this House since 1955, or perhaps ever. It is truly a comprehensive document containing hints of much new legislation that is of prime concern to us all. Many of the issues raised have been dealt with by me in the Legislature.

I suppose it was no surprise to some members of the House that the government is conducting a study of Medicare.

We all recognize that a large number of our people are already covered by some form of prepaid medical care insurance, but the people we are most concerned in reaching are those who are unable to obtain coverage because of a pre-existing health condition, those who cannot afford the premium, or those who for other reasons are uninsurable or unprotected.

A committee very properly is being established to investigate all aspects of the subject. Our Medicare proposal must not only be comprehensive but within the financial means of our people.

Mr. Speaker, in January 1961 I spoke in this House against crosswalks. In the intervening months I have become more opposed to the crosswalks than ever. Sir, they are nothing more than a death trap, and we must bear part of the responsibility for permitting this situation to exist.

I propose the following changes to the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Auld) in order to make crosswalks as safe as possible:

(1) I would suggest that they be made double the present width;

(2) That we install overhanging signs three or four times larger than those presently used;

(3) Double the present lighting capacity and install an overhead flashing amber light at each crosswalk;

(4) Install pedestrian-actuated lights where crosswalks are used mainly by school children.

Just a word, sir, about education. As legislators we are all aware of the tremendous

cost of education and the crippling burden it places on the home owners, especially those who are retired and living on a fixed income.

I believe that the federal government should permit, as a deduction for income tax purposes, that portion of the home owner's bill for education. This type of tax relief would at least be a start in helping those who need it most, where it is most needed, namely in the pocket book.

One important suggestion I would like to make to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) concerns sales tax. Sir, I would urge you to make all sales under \$1 tax exempt. This would eliminate the source of much trouble, nuisance, and inconvenience to both the public and the storekeepers.

We of the Conservative Party are proud of the accomplishments of the government. Among the accomplishments since I took my seat in the House are the establishment of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, creation of the Water Resources Commission, the parks development programme, legislation to promote student loans, and the provision of a \$50 million loan to the TTC to speed up subway construction.

Mr. Speaker, as a candidate in the 1955 election I supported hospital insurance, Medicare, expanded low rental housing construction, and portable pensions. To be fair, Mr. Speaker, I do not minimize the contribution made by the Opposition parties toward the attainment of these goals but the fact remains that Ontario's hospital insurance was established under a Conservative government, Medicare will be introduced by a Conservative government, more low rental housing will be built by a Conservative government and when portable pension legislation is enacted it will be by a Conservative government.

This I believe is no mean programme on which to go to the people of Ontario in a general election anytime.

Mr. L. Quilty (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the Throne Speech debate, it gives me great pleasure to bring greetings to the legislative assembly from the Ottawa valley. At this time I would like to bring season's greetings to the House from the Ottawa valley. I would be remiss in my statements if I did not add season's greetings, because as I came into the House this morning the approach to the legislative chambers was decorated with beautiful flowers, and I might say that the nicest decorations adorning this stairs were the children from Parkdale senior public school.

In rising to participate in the Throne Speech debate, Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to pay tribute to you, sir. You have been most fair in your rulings and it is with sincere respect that I acknowledge the chair each time I leave or retake my seat.

I assure you, sir, that we of the Liberal party do not at any time intend to scalp you or steal your wig. After the next election we merely intend to move the hon. member from seat No. 51 to the Speaker's chair and in this way change the colour of the Speaker's hair.

This was the first Throne Speech that I heard and I hope the last that will be written by this government. My immediate reaction was "too much, too late."

This was a speech comprised of studies, evasions and the promise of innumerable commissions. Why does a government in power for 20 years still need such intensive study before action on medical health insurance; Department of Lands and Forests to study needs and plan development of shore line and other lands that will be acquired over the years—"other lands" I say is a very definite statement—survey of marine resources, agriculture, Rehabilitation and Development Act; producers, processors and consumers' food council to advise the government?

Excellent advice, but will the government take advice? Or will it do as it did with the recommendations made last session by the commission on portable pensions? The Opposition pressed in committee last session for action on portable pensions, as we have since 1959, but 1962 was only by-election year and not general election year—I would say that the Liberals certainly profited there, 4 out of 6.

At this point, I would like to digress and welcome to this House the youngest hon. member of the Legislature, the 27-year-old, good-looking hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). We have something in common, we have been the first to break the Tory hold on our respective ridings in a by-election.

The government is also doing something that it maintained was impossible last spring, ensuring the inspection of all meat and poultry produced and sold in Ontario. A very commendable move but according to the government impossible last session. How an election year changes the thinking of a government too long in power!

Even physical fitness, long advocated by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) gets attention. The junior

ranger work of The Department of Lands and Forests is mentioned under physical fitness. There is a group of boys who really need physical fitness.

In the education field we have another group of committees and study groups. And I must compliment this new hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). He is at least trying to take action. But what we really need in education is a group of qualified practical teachers to advise the department in regard to curriculum, text books and methods.

Mr. Speaker, one very important point that we must remember in education is that the most important item in education is the teacher. All the fancy classrooms and buildings in the world will not make us educated. It is the ability of the person in charge of a classroom to impart knowledge that we must call teaching, and the real test of whether we are getting proper teaching is the practical application of this knowledge by the pupil.

This seems to have been forgotten by The Department of Education and until the members of The Department of Education come down out of their ivory towers and face the problems of education in a simple, factual and straightforward way, our children are going to suffer along with our pocket books. It is time that the hon. members of the House decided who runs this Department of Education. Is it the elected representatives or the publishing companies?

I was pleased to note in the Throne Speech that more assistance would be given to the care of the mentally retarded. During the past month I had the opportunity to visit the hospital for the mentally retarded at Smiths Falls and, Mr. Speaker, I would advise all hon. members of this House to visit such a hospital. Never in their life will they be so thankful to God for their good health, physical and mental, as when they leave such an institution.

Those in charge of the hospital told me that they were pleased to have the members of the Ontario Legislature visit them so that we might see the overcrowding. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, this hospital is overcrowded, and I would like to make this observation to the House. Please keep hospitals out of politics. It is our obligation to look after the sick and whether we support the New Democratic Party, the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party, we must close ranks and in one united Ontario voice support the building of institutions for the sick.

I would like to pay my respects—I do not see him here—to the fiery hon. Minister of

Health (Mr. Dymond). It has been my pleasure since elected to co-operate with the hon. Minister and our local hospital boards—to point out one, the continuation of the nurses training school at Victoria Hospital, Renfrew.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to tell the House that I was sorry to see the former hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Spooner) transferred to The Department of Municipal Affairs. I told this House last session that I considered him to be a real gentleman and after dealing with him during the past months, my opinion has not changed. I only hope that the new hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) and I will be able to continue to handle the various problems that arise in Renfrew South in the same business-like manner, without political interference.

I do not agree with The Department of Lands and Forests' wolf policy. I was into Algonquin Park last summer, on invitation from the department, to look over the study on wolves.

I had a lovely trip, I saw beautiful country, flying both ways. I had two wonderful meals, but I still have not changed my mind that dead wolves are the best kind. I still receive numerous complaints from the farmers living close to Algonquin Park that their livestock is being killed by wolves. My hon. colleague from Renfrew North (Mr. Hamilton) gets the same complaints and he told me that while hunting this fall he saw two timber wolves and instead of deer, he chased four brush wolves from a swamp. He did not tell me his count on deer.

If the department has learned anything by these studies, apply it and cut down on the wolf population or else shelve the wolf programme.

It was also interesting to note in the Throne Speech that we are going into orbit and studying the snow cover for deer survival from satellites. I hope this approach from a higher plane is more successful than the approach from a lower plane on the wolf situation.

I repeat the plea that I made last session for access roads into my riding. We still do not have a good highway leading into Renfrew South from the east, the south or the west. Without these roads we cannot get our share of industries nor can we begin to develop the great tourist potential of our riding, summer or winter.

We need desperately the reconstruction of Highway 41 from Denbigh to Dacre, particularly the section from Denbigh to Griffith,

and we need Highway 62 into the Combermere-Barry's Bay area. We need the improvement of Highway 11 from No. 7 into Calabogie, thence to connect with No. 17 at Renfrew. This road is recommended specifically in a brief from the eastern Ontario development association. And once again my plea for No. 17 from Renfrew to Ottawa. Not just a resurfacing, but build a road that the British-American Oil Company, the Howard Smith Paper Company and the *Ottawa Journal* will not be ashamed to show as the alternate northern Trans-Canada route when they print maps of the Trans-Canada Highway.

This northern route was not shown as such on these publications when the Canadian Prime Minister officially opened the Trans-Canada Highway on Labour Day. I say this is a disgrace because, when Champlain tried to get across Ontario, he followed the now historic Champlain trail, not No. 7 Highway, to Lindsay and the heart of Tory Ontario.

I sincerely hope that under the plans of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) we will be able to bring new industries into the riding which I represent.

The town of Renfrew is to be commended on the appointment of an industrial commissioner. I know that he has been working in co-operation with our provincial Department of Economics and Development, but so far according to the unemployment office figures for October, unemployment in Renfrew has gone up about 100 persons during the month of October.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a few remarks toward the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. I do not see him in his seat either. I am amazed that his own party showed such lack of recognition in their leadership race, by placing a hard-working man like him in third position. Just another example of typical Tory hindsight instead of foresight.

He is to be commended, he is at least trying.

I am firmly convinced that the programme under The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act might get some results if it had some economic planning and positive action instead of being a programme as described by federal Agriculture Minister Hamilton, speaking to the Canadian federation of agriculture, when he stated that he was willing to stake his political career on the success of ARDA.

Let us put ARDA above politics, let us

make ARDA work by facing it as an economic development, as a planned rural community. This is the place for more study and foresight, this is the place for a provincial coordinator who will place the welfare of ARDA above the welfare of a party. Give us some action on ARDA, Mr. Speaker, or forget ARDA.

I was interested in the remarks made by the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) the other day. In fact, he paid the Liberal Party a great tribute by attacking the Liberals instead of the government. He recognizes that the Liberals are the party to contend with in the next election.

He accuses us of policy changes. We live in a changing world and policies have to be adapted to suit existing conditions. This is one of the arguments that we have with the present government. That government accepts the truth only after the truth is forced upon it. Certainly the Liberals have made mistakes and we will probably make more mistakes, because we intend to be around for a long time, but I would like to point out to the hon. leader of the NDP that his greatest mistake was in joining the CCF. If he wants to make any mistakes he had better make them in a hurry because he certainly is not going to have any place to go with this party.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased on Tuesday, December 4, when this House decided to get down to work. I live about 250 miles from Toronto and it was most disheartening to sit each day for a few moments and it was most disgusting to have the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) stand in this House on December 4 and accuse the Opposition for the lack of action. This is nothing, sir, but downright gall and it does not matter to me who makes this statement, the hon. Prime Minister or anyone else. No person has the right to bring 95 members from all over this province to twiddle their thumbs because, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister, and he alone, is responsible for the order of the proceedings of this House. He is in charge, or should be, and he knew on Wednesday, November 28, that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) was going to speak on the Throne debate on December 4. This, Mr. Speaker, is further proof that we need leadership in this House, we need leadership in this province.

Truly it is a perfect sign that this government is going one way—out. I repeat my opening remarks on the Throne Speech. Too much, too late! It is too late to take action

on problems that have been brought to the attention of this government for years. It is the time for a change, the time for a real Liberal administration.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I should think the hon. member might not wish to embarrass his hon. leader by raising this question again, but I asked the hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, if he would proceed with the Throne debate on Monday. I asked him the previous, either Wednesday or Thursday, and he said he wanted more time than the weekend in which to prepare his remarks. To accommodate him I made arrangements for Tuesday; of course, we had to adjourn a little early on Monday because—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would never have mentioned this, Mr. Speaker, were it not for these rather pusillanimous remarks coming—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Prime Minister is making such remarks as he has just made, I would like to remind him about the time that we had to wait because the hon. Minister of Economics and Development did not have his bill ready.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the House now resolve itself into committee of the whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee of the whole; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: The government notice of motion No. 2, by the hon. R. W. Macaulay,

Resolved,

That, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make arrangements for supplying the money necessary to fulfill the requirements of any guarantee under The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, 1962-63 and to advance the amount necessary for that purpose out of the public funds of the province,

as provided by Bill No. 2, An Act to authorize the guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario.

And notice of motion No. 3, hon. L. P. Cecile,

Resolved,

That, grants for construction of buildings or additions, for acquisition of buildings and for subsidizing operating and maintenance costs, as set out in sections 5, 6 and 7, respectively, of The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-63, shall, until the 31st day of March, 1964, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 14, An Act respecting Children's Institutions.

And notice of motion No. 4, hon. Mr. Cecile,

Resolved,

That, grants for construction of buildings or additions, for acquisition of buildings and for maintenance of persons in charitable institutions, as set out in sections 5, 6 and 7, respectively, of The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63, shall, until the 31st day of March, 1964, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided by Bill No. 15, The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63.

And notice of motion No. 5, hon. J. N. Allan,

Resolved,

That, where an individual resided in Ontario on the last day of a taxation year and had income for the year that included income earned in a country other than Canada in respect of which any income or profits tax was paid to the government of such other country, he may deduct from the tax payable by him under The Income Tax Act, 1961-62 for that taxation year an amount as prescribed in The Income Tax Amendment Act, 1962-63,

as provided in Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. Mackay), having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them for the consideration of this House.

Resolutions concurred in.

THE CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 5 reported.

THE INVESTIGATION OF TITLES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Investigation of Titles Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 6 reported.

THE CUSTODY OF DOCUMENTS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Custody of Documents Act.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 7 reported.

THE PARTNERSHIPS REGISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 8 reported.

THE CROWN ATTORNEYS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 9 reported.

THE PARKS ASSISTANCE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Parks Assistance Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 18 reported.

THE LAKES AND RIVERS IMPROVEMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 19 reported.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-62

House in committee on Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 26 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

COLLECTION OF INCOME TAXES

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill No. 27, An Act respecting the interpretation of an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario with respect to the collection of income taxes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MEAT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 25, An Act to provide for the inspection of meat for human consumption.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Stewart): Is this bill to go to the agriculture committee?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question I would say no. I would like to give an explanation of this bill, the intent of the bill and the general principles, in moving second reading. The matter of meat inspection for human consumption in Ontario has received our closest study for several months. We have given close attention to the recommendations we have received from the many interested groups. It is quite apparent that in general the public feels that a co-ordinated policy for meat inspection is most desirable. At the present moment federal meat inspection is carried out by the federal Department of Agriculture; however the federal government is only obliged to inspect

those plants with meat moving into inter-provincial or export trade. Presently I am advised that 82 per cent of all meat and poultry sold in Ontario is under federal inspection.

To introduce a provincial inspection policy which would be administered solely by the province would not only result in high per unit costs of inspection but, as well, two grade standards—one provincial and the other federal. Since this appeared to be most undesirable, an approach was made to the federal government with the suggestion that the province would introduce a provincial meat inspection Act which would provide for an agreement to allow the inspection work to be done within the province by federal inspectors, with the province compensating the government of Canada for the service. This suggestion met with the approval of the federal officials. I believe I am correct in suggesting this is a completely new approach to meat inspection in Canada, which as been taken at the initiative of the province of Ontario.

During conversations, the federal officials suggested that, while there could be an orderly absorption of plants into inspection, by necessity some time must elapse before there could be complete coverage. It was pointed out that it would take a period of time to acquire and train the staff necessary, and plants would have to be given some period of time to meet the required federal standards for inspection. The federal officials recommended that this period would have to be at least two years.

Again, however, I want to emphasize, that it is hoped that, as soon as this Act becomes law, there will be as little delay as possible in absorbing, into meat inspection, plants which are already waiting for such a service. It should also be pointed out that it is not the intention of the province to absorb any of the cost of plants already under inspection by the federal authorities. Our agreement is that the cost of meat inspection in plants presently under federal inspection will continue to be borne by the federal Department of Agriculture, and that all Ontario plants coming under federal meat inspection, after January 1, 1963, will be the financial responsibility of the province.

For purposes of inventory and check, it is proposed under this bill to license all plants which are not under The Meat Inspection Act of Canada. Once a plant makes application and is accepted as an establishment under the federal Meat Inspection Act, then it will no longer require a licence under the

provincial Act. Eventually, by this process, all plants will be under federal supervision without any necessity for provincial licence, except in the case of any particular situation which may warrant an exemption. This meat inspection policy envisions an orderly transfer over a period of time with all due consideration being given to the problems of the plants concerned, as well as the full cognizance of the public interests.

Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out the regulations with reference to plants and meat inspection provided for in the bill, will be regulations concurrent with federal regulations similar to those in existence for other products, so there are uniform grades and standards. The inspectors who may be appointed under this Act will be federal employees who will receive a provincial appointment for the purposes of the provincial legislation, and here again this is similar to policy already in existence with other products.

It will be noted in the bill, as well, that recognition is given to the medical officer of health, or like persons, within a municipality, as ex-officio inspectors under the legislation. The purpose of this particular section is not to require the local health officials to be concerned with the general field of meat inspection but rather to give them some authority in case of some infringement of the Act and regulations within their municipalities.

The bill provides that an exemption from the Act or the regulations may be made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council to any person or class of persons, animals or class of animals and meat thereof, and prescribing the terms and conditions upon which any exemption is made. We believe the concern of the consumer is that she has the knowledge that any meat or poultry which she may purchase is of good quality and comes from a reputable source.

Throughout the province of Ontario, over the years, direct contact has been built up between farmers and consumers. These consumers buy from the farmers directly because they have a first-hand knowledge of the person who is selling the product and the conditions under which it was produced. This relationship, and others which may be similar to it, should not be disturbed; any disruption of this, we believe, would not be acceptable to the consumers concerned nor to the farmers who have made a business practice of selling meat and poultry in this way. We believe that flexibility in the initial stages of this Act is most advisable.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we feel that this bill, which makes provision for one standard of meat for sale in the province; for more efficient and less costly administration through having the job done by the federal government; and for an orderly adjustment through inspection of all meat and poultry not now under federal inspection, is realistic legislation and will be of benefit to the agricultural industry of this province.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to hear the hon. Minister of Agriculture, sir, say that this bill would not go to the agricultural committee for study. I would think that this is one bill the government would be anxious to give to the agricultural committee for their perusal and for whatever amendments were agreed upon in the judgment of the committee members. This is a new piece of legislation, breaking entirely new ground; he is feeling his way, he is not sure himself whether this is the correct answer or not. It seems to me that if ever there was a government measure that should be examined by the committee on agriculture, this is it!

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Oliver: Yesterday we had before the agricultural committee the ARDA bill, the rehabilitation of rural areas bill; a bill of equal magnitude and equal importance. How does my hon. friend justify sending Bill No. 10 to the agricultural committee and flatly refusing to send this bill to the agricultural committee? How does he decide what is to go and what is not to go? If I had my choice of saying which one of these bills would go to the agricultural committee, it would be the one that we are discussing this morning rather than the one we discussed yesterday.

An hon. member: And amended yesterday.

Mr. Oliver: I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), in all sincerity, that for the good of all concerned this bill should certainly go to the agricultural committee and have the benefit of discussion that will arise in that committee.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Oliver: Before saying anything more on it, I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he will not agree to the suggestion that this should go to the agricultural committee?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the reason why I would like it not

to go to the agricultural committee is that I feel this bill is of great concern to all the hon. members of this House.

Certain hon. members of this House sit on the agricultural committee, and there are certain hon. members who do not. Basically, perhaps, the legislation sent to the agricultural committee concerns the agricultural industry alone but here we have a bill which concerns every urban member of the House as well as every rural member. It is my thought and suggestion that if the discussion that would take place normally in the agricultural committee took place in this House, in the committee of the whole House, then every hon. member of the Legislature would have the benefit of that discussion; whereas if the discussion takes place in the agricultural committee it is more or less limited to the hon. members of that committee who have a particular interest in things agricultural.

We can have just as complete a discussion of this bill in this House, in the committee of the whole House, as we could have in the agricultural committee; and those people, like myself, who are interested in this bill but do not sit on the agricultural committee, will have the benefit of hearing the discussion.

Frankly, I am after the same thing as the hon. member is, but I think it can probably be more fully achieved for the benefit of everybody in the House if the discussion takes place in the committee of the whole House. You see really we refer bills to committees for purposes of permitting perhaps a technical scrutiny, but here I think the discussion that will take place on this bill should be heard by all hon. members of the House.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend's argument is at one and the same time very unconvincing. What he says is that the bill will be better discussed in the committee of the whole House. Well, it will be discussed in the committee of the whole House in any event. What I am suggesting is that there should be a particular discussion on this bill in the committee on agriculture.

My hon. friend let fall a statement just a moment ago in which he said that bills are sent to committees in order that technical advice and information might be provided. That is exactly why we want this bill to go to committee. That sort of information cannot be provided in the committee of the whole House. What we want to do with this bill is give it a minute examination in the committee on agriculture and then report back to the

House to the committee of the whole House for their examination. Surely that is a reasonable request? I am not convinced or persuaded at all by my hon. friend's argument.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I can state the reasons why, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the bill in this way. I know, and you know that, if bills go into committee, when they come back here their treatment in committee of the whole House is pretty much in key because they have been checked out and discussed very thoroughly in the committees concerned.

I want the benefit of that discussion to be available to all the hon. members of this House and I think we can achieve it by having a discussion. After all, there is not one hon. member in this House who does not know that this bill is going to be discussed very thoroughly in this House in the state of committee. I do not know why we have to make such a to-do about it; it is a very simple matter, and I want everybody to have the advantage of that discussion.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister wants everybody to have the advantage, then I suggest the ideal thing is to send this to committee where the hon. members can attend—where experts can be called in to make their observations as is always the case, and then with that additional information we can come back here.

While it is true that as a result of the informality, the lack of technical ruling that has normally taken place in the committee discussion has been limited in the House; it does not necessarily follow, Mr. Speaker, that every hon. member of this House has the opportunity to discuss in committee of the whole.

I think what the hon. member for Grey South really wants, sir, is the normal procedure that is followed in conjunction with important legislation. I do not think that I would be accused of being suspicious when I say, Mr. Speaker, that we wonder why, in this very important piece of legislation, the normal procedure is not pursued. And the normal procedure certainly is to send this very important piece of legislation to the committee on agriculture where it can be discussed by those who are on the committee and listened to by those who are not. The advice and consultation and assistance of others will be made available to us.

Mr. Speaker, there is no emergency about this in terms of time, and I just cannot understand why the government has taken this particular extraordinary stand in conjunction

with a piece of legislation that is of vital concern, as the hon. Prime Minister has said, not only to the agricultural community but to all.

Mr. Speaker, I must say with my hon. friend to my left, that the hon. Prime Minister's observations this morning are unconvincing; quite the contrary. If he wants to accomplish what he says he wants to accomplish, then surely the procedure would be to send this bill to the committee on agriculture and after that discussion let it come back here where it can be discussed in the committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, I support wholly the observations of the hon. member for Grey South.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out the all the members that at the present time the House is discussing second reading of Bill 25. Now there are certain rules of debate which are to be followed in this case. We cannot enter at this point into a second discussion, as to whether the bill should go to committee or whether it should not. We should proceed in orderly manner with the debate on the second reading of the bill.

Several members have already spoken and I presume will expect to speak again on this bill. But under the rules of the House in second reading a member speaks only once. We are actually proceeding with the debate on the second reading of Bill No. 25, and at this point the member for Grey South has the floor.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals already have made two speeches on second reading of this bill. I assure you it was my intention to direct myself entirely to the principle of the bill, and I would like to advise you, sir, that I would like an opportunity to do that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one always faces a difficulty in dealing with a bill of this kind. It is often hard to know, simply from reading the bill, what exactly is involved. So much depends on the administration of the legislation, and on the nature of the regulations that may be passed. I would like to state, Mr. Speaker, that as far as this group is concerned, we were in very considerable doubt about the adequacy of the bill when we saw it simply as a bill.

I would like to add, however, that after having listened to the hon. Minister's explanation this morning on second reading, we feel very much reassured. We believe that, on the basis of what he has said, which is unquestionably a firm statement of government

policy, this bill is a constructive and necessary step forward, and this group will be prepared to support it.

I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, that the government has, apparently, reversed its policy on this very important issue. We can remember that in previous years there were some rather lively and, perhaps, even acrimonious debates on the question of meat inspection.

Even at last session, in the early part of this year, the government firmly maintained that its Dead Animals Disposal Act plus the amendments brought in at that session, which one could probably describe as the charcoal bill, would adequately deal with the situation. We on this side were quite satisfied that that was not the case. The government has apparently come to the conclusion that something more than The Dead Animals Disposal Act is needed, and I congratulate this government, Mr. Speaker, on having changed its policy in the light of the realities of the situation.

I think it is a little regrettable that they could not have taken a more positive attitude last session. However, I will always give credit to any person or any government that has the courage to change its mind and abandon a policy which in experience has been found to be inadequate.

I am also very happy to note, Mr. Speaker, if I understood the remarks of the hon. Minister correctly, that the government has not accepted the proposals that were made to it during the last session by the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party argued vehemently in favour of what I would call a second-grade type of inspection. What they were asking for was legislation which would give a sort of a quasi stamp of approval to the products of plants that simply could not qualify under the federal inspection system.

We in this group objected to that proposition. I may say we were berated at great length and very loudly from the Liberal benches for daring to do so, but we took the stand, and are still of the opinion, that there should be one standard of inspection, that all meats inspected in the province should be subjected to the same standards, both as to the meat itself and as to the conditions applying in the plants where animals are slaughtered. This, as I understand it, is what the government now has in mind.

We in this group advocated that policy quite strongly last year and we are glad to see that it is now being adopted. I can

understand the hon. Minister's suggestion that it cannot be accomplished overnight. Obviously there are difficulties involved. I suppose—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, may I just say I would not at any time wish—if the hon. member wants to continue he may adjourn the debate and we will resume.

Mr. Bryden: I will just be one minute. I was just going to say, I can understand that there are difficulties. Undoubtedly one difficulty is to get an adequate staff of inspectors to handle the situation. However, as long as there is an intention on the part of the government to proceed to establish the system that the hon. Minister has outlined this morning with all reasonable haste, then this group is satisfied, and we will support this bill on second reading.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the debate, I might say that we on this side have listened with great interest to the words of the hon. Minister of Agriculture by way of explanation. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I personally agree with the front bench members of this party in regretting that the bill will not go to the committee on agriculture because it appears that we must discuss it without the professional advice of the deputies in The Department of Agriculture and The Department of Health. And probably what is more significant, without allowing those who are going to be put out of business by this bill from having the opportunity to appear before the committee on agriculture and state their case probably better than I will be able to do so.

But certainly the outstanding thing that appears from this bill as we presently understand is that those who are operating small operations throughout this province are going to be put out of business.

Certainly it will be our duty to see that their interests are dealt with fully. Sir, because I have more to say on this and the hour is getting late, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Nixon moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, if I may just say, in regard to this, certainly our wish on this side of the House is to have a very

frank discussion of this bill and to ensure that everybody has an opportunity to comment. I am not yet convinced how discussions will take place. It is one thing to call the agricultural committee together and then say all the members of the House can attend. It seems to me a much simpler matter to have all the members attend the debate right here.

However, we are very broadminded on this side of the House and I will just take the weekend to think this question over. Of course, there is the question raised by the hon. member for Brant, Mr. Speaker. We are not

really intending to put anybody out of business, but if there is such a group perhaps we should take action to see they are reassured. I will give this some thought over the weekend.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Mines.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.15 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Monday, December 17, 1962

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Monday, December 17, 1962

First report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Morrow	353
First report, commission on distribution of the electoral districts of the province, Mr. Robarts	353
Inspection of meat for human consumption, bill to provide for, Mr. Stewart, second reading, continued	355
Estimates, Department of Mines, Mr. Wardrope	358
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	374

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1962

The House met at 3:00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. H. Morrow, from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr1, An Act respecting the city of Oshawa;

Bill No. Pr4, An Act respecting the village of Bath;

Bill No. Pr6, An Act respecting the Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec;

Bill No. Pr7, An Act respecting The Presbyterian Church in Canada;

Bill No. Pr8, An Act respecting the city of Belleville;

Bill No. Pr9, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting the Chatham community Young Men's Christian Association;

Bill No. Pr36, An Act to incorporate the university of Windsor.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on the following bills:

Bill No. Pr6, An Act respecting the Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec;

Bill No. Pr7, An Act respecting The Presbyterian Church in Canada;

Bill No. Pr36, An Act to incorporate the university of Windsor;

Bill No. Pr35 of 1961-62, An Act respecting Laurentian University of Sudbury.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): If we could revert to presenting reports by committees, I beg to present the first report of the commission on distribution of the electoral districts of the province.

Mr. Speaker, if I might just speak to this for a moment; the first report of the commission on distribution of the electoral districts was received by me late on Friday afternoon and this is the report I have tabled. It is a relatively short report. I made arrangements to have it duplicated or reproduced over the weekend and copies will be distributed to the hon. members.

If the House will recall, on April 18 of last year, the commission was appointed by order of this assembly. These are independent recommendations which have been made, and which the commission has sent to the Legislature for study by the hon. members of the House. I am therefore proposing that it be referred to the committee on privileges and elections to be considered before it is brought back here to the House. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I was wrong in moving its adoption when in fact what I wanted to do was table it so that it could be referred to the committee on privileges and elections.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether he expects a further interim or a final report before the end of this session?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I could not honestly answer that question. The report will be self-evident when the hon. member receives a copy of it. I do not know whether it has been distributed yet or not, but it will be. The commission states it has further work to do but it does not say when the final report will be in, so I really could not tell the hon. member whether there will be another report before the ultimate adjournment of this House or not. Certainly there will not be anything in before we adjourn for the Christmas recess.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister when the privileges and elections committee will meet?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say as soon as possible. We have not a great deal of time between now and the time we will rise for Christmas, but a full opportunity will be given that committee to consider this report in all its aspects.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question that I originally intended to submit to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), but in view of the fact that he is not in his seat, perhaps I could direct it to the hon. Prime Minister. It is as follows:

In view of the depressing reports by 16 clergymen regarding housing conditions in large sections of the central area of Toronto, is the government prepared to make any announcement regarding a large-scale programme of public housing and slum clearance to be undertaken in co-operation with the municipal and federal governments, and if so, when may such an announcement be expected?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have had no notice of this question and I could not answer it. I will see if there is a reply available for the hon. member tomorrow.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I should like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). The question is: Would the hon. Minister inform the House whether it is a fact that his department issued a licence for a summer camp to Wolf Cub packs, A and B, for the operation of a summer camp at Windy Lake in the district of Sudbury as No. Sc-62-716; which licence was issued on December 5 to expire on December 31, 1962? If the answer is in the affirmative, would the hon. Minister care to inform the House what was the reason for the delay?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the answer is in the affirmative but this was a matter of form. We received the application, which was dated June 18, in the office on June 20; the camp was to open on June 29. On June 26 we wrote to the director of the camp, Mrs. Bowdidge, authorizing the opening of the camp on the basis of a satisfactory application pending inspection. It was stated that the licence would be issued when a satisfactory inspection report was received.

On June 27 the department wrote to the Sudbury and district public health unit requesting an inspection and report. The camp was therefore operating and opened on the date it was supposed to open on the basis of a letter of permission. On December 3 we received a satisfactory report from the Sudbury and district health unit. The licence therefore was issued on December 5.

It is our practice, Mr. Speaker, to issue licences for all qualified camps, although it is not always possible to issue them before the camp opens, so that any who wish to apply for grants under regulation 86 of The Department of Education Act, may do so. Section 2(c) of this regulation makes the holding of a licence under The Public Health Act one of the qualifying conditions for grants.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the camp did operate. It received a letter of permission. Unfortunately the district health unit for some reason or other did not submit their satisfactory report to us until December 3, and so that the camp may qualify, as it has a right to do so, for grants under The Department of Education regulations we issued the licence on December 5.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask a supplementary question—whether the operators of the camp are subject to prosecution by the hon. Minister's department, if they do not display their licence?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not if they have a letter of permission.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question which I would like to direct to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Haskett), a copy of which I have sent to him.

When will the resignations of the superintendent at Galt and of the assistant psychologist at Bowmanville become effective, and will these positions be filled by replacements from the present staff of the department or by hiring new professional staff?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I have the inquiry from the hon. member for York South: when will the resignations of the superintendent at Galt and the assistant psychologist at Bowmanville become effective?

The superintendent at the Ontario training school, Galt, has accepted a position in The Department of Welfare having advised the Deputy Minister that he desired a change on account of his health. Under date of

October 16, 1962, he wrote our Deputy Minister and I quote:

At the end of this year I shall have completed four years in Galt and I think that this is as long as one person should spend as superintendent of a girls' training school of this size. I have enjoyed, and still enjoy, the work here, but I find it so demanding that I am becoming concerned about my health. Therefore, I feel that I should look for another position within the Ontario Civil Service.

Before making any move towards a transfer, I have wanted to let you know what I intended to do and my reason for doing it. It has been pleasant working with you and under you, and I am confident that you will understand how regretfully I contemplate a change.

His formal resignation, dated December 4, 1962, reads, and I quote:

I have made known to the staff my intention of accepting a position with The Department of Public Welfare.

I do not think it will be possible to make arrangements for a new superintendent to take over before the end of January. However, I am very anxious that the most suitable person that can be obtained succeed me in this position; and I am quite willing to remain until the end of March, or even later, if you should require that much time and if the Deputy Minister of Public Welfare is agreeable.

I am sure that you are aware that I wish the change in superintendents to be accomplished with the minimum amount of disturbance for the department and the school, and that I shall be happy to do anything you suggest that will achieve this effect.

No date has yet been set.

The assistant psychologist at Ontario training school, Bowmanville, has accepted a transfer to The Department of Health in London for personal reasons. The date of transfer is January 11, 1963.

The second question is: Will these positions be filled by replacements from the present staff or by hiring new professional staff?

The position of the superintendent will be advertised—I believe it has already been posted for advertising—by the civil service commission in the usual way, with applications invited from persons within and without the department.

The position of assistant psychologist at Ontario training school, Bowmanville, may be filled by transfer or recruitment.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question which has been directed to the hon. Prime Minister: will the hon. Prime Minister advise this House whether The Department of Health has investigated an alleged shortage of hospital beds in London and whether the government proposes to take any action in this matter?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, this arose from a newspaper report shown to me on Friday by the hon. leader of the Opposition and I have asked for a report on the situation.

It was a newspaper report arising out of a report to the board of trustees of Victoria hospital in London. Therefore, there are several jurisdictions involved in this. I have asked for a report and I will attempt to have an answer to this question here by tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention at this time to recall order No. 13, the adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 25, which we were debating on Friday afternoon at the time the House adjourned. I have given this matter some thought over the weekend. In view of the fact that it appears there may be some people who might like to appear before the committee itself to make representation—and this could not be done, of course, if we had the debate I was really looking for in this House—but if there are people who wish to make representations to the House concerning this bill, we should be very pleased to give them this opportunity. So the bill will be referred to the committee on agriculture and I will ask that the committee be called to sit on Wednesday morning to deal with any representations that may be made.

INSPECTION OF MEAT

Clerk of the House: Thirteenth order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 25, An Act to provide for the inspection of meat for human consumption.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, when the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) moved the second reading of this bill, he gave us quite a complete explanation of how it would apply. And I first would like to say that it appears in this session of the Legislature, in my limited experience, that the bills presented by The Department of Agriculture for our consideration have been notable in the fact that they include what the departmental officials would refer to as "great flexibility".

We are talking about the meat inspection bill itself and, on reading the bill, it is very difficult, even with the hon. Minister's explanation, to understand what is fully intended. We now know that it is intended that the meat processing plants and the slaughterhouses in Ontario will eventually all come under federal inspection. But there is an "out" in that, by order of the Lieutenant-Governor, I understand, or on recommendation of the hon. Minister, certain people

having to do with slaughtering animals may be exempted from the legislation. Is this correct?

According to newspaper reports, this usually refers to farmers who are going to kill chickens and deliver them door-to-door, and I am certainly glad that the hon. Minister, sir, has seen fit to provide for this exemption. But all of us know that in the rural areas of Ontario there are large numbers—and I am not prepared to say how many, but I know in my own area there are probably 11 or 12 small slaughterhouses which can never be expected to come up to the standards of inspection under the federal Act.

No one is questioning whether or not these people are providing a product which should be put up for sale in this province. The product is excellent in quality but unfortunately the size of the operation does not permit the owners of these slaughterhouses to comply with all the regulations concerned with federal inspection—such as, I understand, the plastering of all the rooms, having 10 employees, and a number of other regulations of this type which would preclude a business that is presently operating with perhaps 3 employees or, in some cases, the owner and perhaps one employee. These would preclude them from operating under federal inspection as I understand it, unless it has been amended since I last read the Act.

These people are the ones who are going to be put through the process of either being eliminated from the market or being forced to expand to meet federal inspection over the 2-year interval that the hon. Minister referred to.

It seems to me that it would be quite possible for the regulations that are prepared in connection with this Act, to be written in such a way that these small operators can stay in business, can produce the product which is of undoubted high quality, but without being forced to comply with all of the regulations for federal inspection, which of course, were set up for interprovincial and international trade, not for the farmer who has some beef cattle in his field and who has a small slaughtering operation and sells in the local market. On the other hand, the publicity that associated itself with the meat scandals earlier this year has moved many municipalities to pass by-laws forbidding anything but inspected meat to be sold in the city—I believe Hamilton, Kitchener, Woodstock are cities of this type. No inspection is provided, for these small operators, that will give them what is called inspected meat which can be sold in the cities. There has

been great pressure put on them, and many have folded since we last met in this Legislature and when this difficulty was brought to the attention of the government.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, there was some confusion as to whether this was the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Agriculture or the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). There was additional confusion as to whether this might not be referred to the hon. Minister of Health for Canada and there seemed to be some difficulty to get co-operation. Certainly it was stated by the government that inspection was impossible at that time.

My impression of the present legislation is that further pressure will be brought to bear upon these small abattoirs, although they will be given a 2-year limit before they will be forced into federal inspection or forced out of business. It is on behalf of these people that I speak because certainly no one in this party, or certainly myself, would doubt the government's anxiety to have legislation that will provide only top quality material for consumption by the people of this province. But they also have a responsibility to these small business men, some of them farmers, who would not be able to keep on in the business as it might presently be.

I might also say that it is questionable in my mind whether or not these people could be ready to represent their interests by Wednesday morning. I will certainly undertake to get in touch with them by telephone so that if they do want to appear before the committee on agriculture they could attempt to prepare a brief and be here Wednesday morning to speak to the agriculture committee at that time. It is questionable in my mind whether they would find the time available sufficient to prepare the brief that would be required. It is Christmas week; we are approaching the holiday season; and the slaughterhouses would certainly be in full operation this week.

With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I might say that the Liberal Party certainly is aware of the need to provide this inspection for a number of reasons.

1. The consumers are to be safeguarded.
2. The small abattoirs must have some sort of an inspection.
3. This inspection must be at a reasonable level so that the product they sell will be inspected and therefore can legally be offered on the markets in the cities to which I have previously referred.
4. We also feel that we must look out for the interests of the small abattoir, and we intend to do so.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would reply to what the hon. member has said. I appreciate his concern because it is well founded. Certainly we on this side of the House as well as our hon. friends on the other side are concerned with this very matter which he raises. Quite frankly we have worked unceasingly, shall I say, since the last session of this Legislature, to come up with the type of bill we are now introducing.

The very facts that the hon. member has brought out here, pertaining to a modification in the standards that might apply to slaughter-houses operated by small operators, are the very things that we were concerned about last year when it was proposed that the province should introduce, on its own, a provincial standard of inspection. We then could be accused in the province of Ontario of having two standards of inspection, one provincial and one federal, and I think that this could be very well exploited in the trade if it was so desired. I do not suggest that it would be; but it might be.

I think that if we recognized the fact that, in the regulations of the federal meat inspection Act, and they are many in number, ample provision is made for certain exemptions that might take place under the federal inspection which might apply to the smaller operators. At the same time I think we have to be sure, and I am sure my hon. friend would agree, that the stamp of approval placed on any carcass, or any kind of meat that does receive inspection, is a stamp of approval that will mean that that particular carcass or piece of meat has passed the same standard of inspection as has the piece of meat or carcass that may come from one of the larger inter-provincial or export packing houses.

These are the things about which we are concerned. We have had representations from several operators of small packing plants who are concerned because of the fact that without inspection they may be shut out of certain markets in the province of Ontario. It is to protect them, and provide them with a continuance in business, that we have introduced this legislation—as well as to provide the public with a reasonable degree of assurance as far as inspection is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Well, no. I would like to ask one or two questions, if I may. I received quite a few phone calls over the weekend from people

who are in the chicken business; they are small operators, but they have been in this business for quite a number of years.

In the city of Windsor, and also in Ottawa I believe, they have their own municipal inspection. They are concerned whether, under the new set-up, the municipal inspectors will be done away with; would they have to conform with the new regulations of the province or the city regulations? If that is going to be the case they are afraid that they are going to be forced out of business. Therefore I would like to know what is going to happen to the municipal inspectors.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If I interpret the hon. member's question correctly, he is concerned about The Department of Health's inspection which is now in operation in the various municipalities. The Department of Health inspectors, as I understand it, are concerned with the product when it becomes food and is placed on the shelf or the counter of the store that sells that particular product. This is where their concern rests, as I understand it.

We are concerned in this bill with providing inspection of the product before it reaches that particular stage; so there really is not a great deal of conflict, as I see it, between the two. One is concerned with the aspect of the product as food; we are concerned with it as a raw product being processed for food, and that the product must have certain health standards in coming into processing for this food product.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, which of the two—will the municipal by-law have precedence over this if it is the more stringent?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. Newman: The city of Windsor has a meat by-law which is quite a stringent by-law; which of the two will supersede the other?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, if the hon. member will look, I believe it is in section 7 of the proposed bill which is now before the House for second reading, he will see that the provisions of this Act and the regulations of this Act shall prevail over any local legislation.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would point out to all the members of the House once again

that we are in second reading at the present time discussing the principle of the bill. The question of the various parts and points of the bill would be done during committee stage.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MINES

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, may I, before I start my estimates, make a reference to how overjoyed I am to see my old friend, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Daley) in his seat after a bout of illness from which he has fully recovered? We hope that he will continue for many years in this Legislature to contribute further fine work as he has done in the past.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting the estimates for The Department of Mines for the coming fiscal year, I propose to adopt a procedure which, I hope, will meet with the general approval of this House. Until the end of the present calendar year it will not be possible to present this House with any very definitive figures on production, or on staking activities, or indeed, on many of the facets of the great industry with which my department is concerned.

All this data will be made available in full detail early in the new year when The Department of Mines' annual review is presented to the House. At that time hon. members will be given every opportunity to compare the present year's activities with what has transpired before—and I am confident that they will agree then that in most respects 1962 was a good year for mining in Ontario.

I am sure that hon. members will agree that, since the estimates we are considering are for the year ahead, any résumé of the current year can well wait until information is complete, and that reference to any events that transpired in 1962 need be only by way of comparison with what is planned for next year.

During 1961 Ontario's mineral industry produced about \$950 million in new wealth. Presumably—and at this stage we can only presume—the 1962 total will not be far above or below that figure. In any case we can be very certain that mining is, and will remain, one of the keystones of our industrial economy in this province.

I have pointed out before, that from the point of view of production, the mining industry is just about the leading producer of revenue among all of Canada's primary industries. In Ontario it has, for many years, been a close race between agriculture and mining as to which has first place as a dollar-earner.

There is one phase of the mining industry in which, I confess, I would like to see a much greater activity. That is: in the search by prospectors for new mineral deposits. Though much has been done, there are still many areas of this province, Mr. Chairman, in which the tap of the prospector's pick has never yet been heard, and I hope that in the years ahead there may be a resurgence of the activity that, in 1955, led to the staking of more than 57,000 mining claims throughout the province. However, even in this connection, although nothing comparable to the major rushes of the first years of this decade has occurred this year, it is pleasant to be able to say that the number of claims recorded to the end of November is about 400 greater than it was at the same time last year.

That, Mr. Chairman, is all I intend to say in general terms at this time, although I will have certain comments to make in connection with some of the individual votes in my estimates.

In total, the money I am asking to conduct the operations of the department for the coming fiscal year—both ordinary and capital expenditures—is \$3,275,000. This is, I think, a modest appropriation considering the volume and diversity of the work which my staff is called upon to perform. It is an increase of \$170,000 over the amount voted last year, but this increase can be accounted for almost entirely by two projects whose importance far transcends their cost to the public of Ontario.

The main office of the department is the centre of the administrative services. It handles all operations that are not otherwise allocated to specific branches, including accounting and mine assessment, personnel administration and publicity. The total vote I am asking for this part of my department's operations is \$454,000. The difference of \$71,000 over last year's main office appropriation can be accounted for by two special research projects which will together cost \$80,000, and a reduction of \$9,000 in routine operations and maintenance. The two projects will be carried out on behalf of the department by the Ontario Research Foundation.

One of them which is very interesting, and for which \$50,000 is earmarked, is a programme to do further work on a method of jet-smelting of iron ores using natural gas as a reduction agent. This project is of inestimable value in that it is designed to develop a direct reduction process in which natural gas could be used economically to reduce iron ore to a melted product similar to the product of a blast furnace, which requires the use of coke coal. With the discovery of many low-grade iron ore deposits in northern Ontario within reach of the trans-Canada natural gas pipeline, it is imperative that economical methods of smelting be developed for future markets. In addition to its importance to the iron ore mining industry, the perfection of this process will make possible the use of a fuel which Canada has in abundance, thus, potentially, saving millions of dollars on our international trade balance.

This process I might say, has been a dream for many years, and I think I may say that, as a result of the work that has already gone into it, it is now not far from realization. Since northern Ontario is immensely rich in iron ore resources, as yet undeveloped, a breakthrough such as this, which will cut the cost of ore reduction and beneficiation, will go far to make these resources competitive in price with the other available sources of supply. It has been conservatively estimated that the known iron ore reserves, not yet touched, total about six billion tons.

The other project calls for the expenditure of \$30,000 to be appropriated for research in general ore dressing techniques. This work will also be handled for the department by the Ontario Research Foundation. It is designed as assistance to provide a continuing stimulus to the mining industry.

The work of the geological branch is absolutely essential to the well-being of the mining industry, as you can well understand. Therefore, I have no hesitation whatever in asking for an increase of \$99,000 in vote 1302 to finance these operations in the coming fiscal year.

Most of this added appropriation, Mr. Chairman, will be devoted directly to staff increases. The need for a greater number of highly skilled geologists in government service has been recognized for a good many years, and it was finally pointed up sharply after an exhaustive survey, made early in 1961, showed that if it was to be possible to complete the geological mapping of the province within 30 years, 20 more highly qualified men must be added to the permanent staff as quickly as possible.

Consequently, during the fiscal year 1961-1962, three geologists were added to staff. So far in the present fiscal year we have obtained the services of two more, and another three will be taken on before April 1. It is our intention to add to the geological staff four more qualified men in the coming fiscal year.

The results of this augmented staff are already showing up in increased activity in the field. During 1961 the department had 15 geological field parties at work. This year there were 17 and we propose to have 20 units at work in 1963.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to give the hon. members a quick summary of this proposed field work so that they may judge just how widely spread it is, and how important it is in relation to the development of our mineral resources.

In the far northwest part of the province at Muskratdam Lake we propose to begin a five-year programme of mapping favourable prospecting areas. These are adjacent to the route which will be followed by the extension of the road from Pickle Crow northwest to the Manitoba boundary. These areas have never been mapped and the work is extremely important and long overdue.

Work is planned at Red Lake and at Rickaby Lake in the Kenora district. Four parties will be at work in the Thunder Bay district. Two will be working in the Algoma district; two in the Sudbury district; two in the district of Cochrane; two in Timiskaming; and five projects are planned for southern Ontario.

Lest there be any doubt as to the value of this field work, let me point to just two results that are so far apparent from the 1961 programme. Within a very few weeks of the publication of the report on the Big Trout Lake area, 400 claims were staked and a lot of valuable exploration work was done in the area. Final results of this exploration work, of course, are not yet available.

Then, in the Red Lake area, following detailed studies made by one of our geologists, there was a renewal of exploration work throughout this great gold camp; several additional discoveries were made. The mining companies give credit for this resurgence of activity directly to the findings reported by the geologist.

In this context I should say that each of the resident geologists we have, in six strategically located centres, will be fully engaged in his routine duties or completing a field project, and so naturally will not be available next summer to lead a field party—as some of them have done in past years.

I should also point out that the production of geological reports and maps is a function controlled by the geological branch and financed out of the geological vote, number 1302. It would be futile to have all this field work done if the information derived from it is not made public without delay. We have also been expanding the staff of the cartography section to permit a broader range of work and a greater output of maps.

We plan to appropriate \$150,000 of the geological vote as Ontario's share of the fourth phase of the federal-provincial airborne magnetometer survey. During the last three years 130,000 square miles of Ontario's northland have been flown over in this great co-operative enterprise, and a great many promising anomalies have been indicated. During the coming year we expect to cover another area of about 35,000 square miles. This, in total, represents an area greater than that of the states of New York, Michigan and Wisconsin combined. When the project is completed the entire province of Ontario will have been flown over and mapped.

What I have just said notwithstanding, it is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that mineral exploration is just now at a comparatively low ebb in Ontario; and to me it is a worry and a bit alarming. Several large mining companies appear to be transferring their major exploration efforts to other provinces, such as Quebec and British Columbia. This situation, I am sure, will not improve until Ontario's own mineral potential is brought forcefully to their attention. The only way in which that can be done is through an accelerated field survey programme. It is a fact, I am afraid, that geological mapping of the province of Ontario has been lagging behind that of the other provinces.

We now come to vote 1303, which calls for the expenditure of \$323,000 for the operation of the mines inspection branch. This is the same sum that was voted last year.

To carry on the important work of this branch is the duty of highly qualified professional engineers. The inspection branch is responsible for safety regulations and other factors connected with the actual operation of mines. In addition to the headquarters staff in Toronto, the department maintains engineers at seven other points in the province convenient to the mining areas.

All these men are under the direction of Mr. Bawden, the chief of that department. He has had many years of wonderful service and has brought in a great safety record; but it was pointed out to me quite forcibly last year—I had said with pride that our deaths

were down to 26, which was much lower than previously, when to my horror a few days afterwards another accident occurred taking two more lives—that we can never let up on this safety programme or in trying to better it and save the lives of those men who work in our mines.

Included in the inspection branch estimate is \$1,000, set by statute to maintain an account to defray the costs of mine rescue stations. We are obliged to have that \$1,000 in there by statute. All monies expended for this purpose are refunded directly by the mining industry.

The cable-testing laboratory, which is the most important operated by the inspection branch, provides an important and highly specialized service to the mining industry. The Mining Act requires that lengths of all cables used in mine hoisting be subjected twice yearly to tests in this laboratory to ensure that their strength is such as to provide a sufficient margin of safety for the loads they are called upon to bear. The cost of operating the laboratory is included in the vote for the inspection branch. Since a fee is charged for each test, most of this cost is recovered directly from the industry.

For the last few years The Department of Mines has collaborated with the Ontario Mining Association in a research project having to do with the non-destructive testing of wire ropes. This electromagnetic process—I have seen it myself, it is a great advance—has now been brought to the stage of perfection where the department feels that its use under certain controlled conditions may safely be permitted.

The operation of two laboratories is covered under vote 1304. It is estimated that it will cost \$97,000 to maintain the provincial assay office which is located in the tower of the east block. The assay office provides a vital service to prospectors and to exploration and mining companies in giving an accurate assay of the mineral content of rock and mineral specimens submitted for analysis.

Although fees may be charged for this work according to a fixed schedule of charges, by far the major part of the work is done free of charge on the basis of coupons issued upon the recording of claims and the performance of assessment work. The details of this coupon system are set out in The Mining Act. The slight increase in the estimated operating costs for the coming year may be attributed to the proposed purchase of equipment and the fact that the volume of work has increased somewhat in recent years.

Also covered in vote 1304 is the operation of the Timiskaming Testing Laboratories at Cobalt. For many years the TTL has provided an important service to the cobalt and silver mines of the historic mining camp. Ores are sampled and their mineral values are determined in the laboratories. Subsequently the ore or concentrate is shipped to smelters on behalf of the producer. The operating costs for the coming year are estimated at \$82,000. About 60 per cent of this money will be returned to the Treasury by the mining companies in the form of fees for services.

It will be noted that, under vote 1305, there is a reduction in the estimated cost of operating the office of the sulphur fumes arbitrator. In any case these operating costs are recovered directly from the companies concerned and so are not really a charge upon the government. The reduction in assessment was made because in recent years the total cost has been less than the total permitted under the Act. The three most important points that we have to deal with are Welland, Port Maitland and the Sudbury basin.

The job of the arbitrator, as set out in The Damage by Fumes Arbitration Act, is to investigate all claims of damage allegedly caused by fumes emanated by smelters and similar operations. After an inspection and appraisal of the damage he arranges, if possible, to settle the matter without a formal hearing. Nearly all claims are settled in this manner, but he does have the authority to arbitrate and assess damages. In the event his finding is disputed either party may appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board.

The final item of ordinary expenditure is \$354,000, which we expect will be sufficient to operate the mining lands branch for the coming year. This expenditure is covered in vote 1306. The mining lands branch administers The Mining Act insofar as it pertains to the disposition of Crown lands for mining purposes.

The province is divided into 14 mining divisions for the purpose of handling the work related to the staking and recording of mining claims. Mining claims inspectors are located at six points throughout the province. Their principal function is to assist the recorders and carry out inspections of mining claims as required. The mining lands branch is responsible for the collection of a part of the revenue paid into the Treasury by the department.

Mr. Chairman, I have covered all the ordinary expenditures that are foreseen by

The Department of Mines for the next fiscal year. There remains one item of capital expenditure to be dealt with. That is the \$1 million that is set aside for the construction of roads in northern Ontario.

We propose that this appropriation be divided in the ratio of \$750,000 to be spent as Ontario's share in the construction of roads to resources and \$250,000 for mining and access roads. The cost of the roads to resources is, of course, matched by the federal government, and in some cases by individual companies that might be in a position to gain very direct result and benefit. The mining and access roads programme is entirely a provincial matter, except that here too, in some cases, companies might be asked to share the cost.

In 1959, with the signing of an agreement with the Canadian government, a whole new concept for the road programme was seen. Generally speaking, roads built under this intergovernment plan are designed to open, not only specific areas, but whole sectors of the north to access and development.

It is, I suggest, one of the most forward-looking pieces of co-operative enterprise that this province has yet been engaged in. Already a great deal has been accomplished and the fruits of the several projects will be made increasingly available in years ahead.

Altogether, since 1951, more than 1,050 miles of roads have been built under provincial and federal-provincial auspices, or they are now under construction. To date 61 mining and access roads have been constructed. Three of the roads to resources have been completed and three others are in various stages of construction.

During the past summer I was privileged to join with the hon. Walter Dinsdale, Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, in the formal opening of the Spruce River road, which now runs from Port Arthur due north for 55 miles, and which will eventually strike through 75 miles of rich timber land. The 60-mile road from Foleyet to Chapleau was completed this year, giving direct access from Timmins to Highway 17 at Thessalon. Traffic is now moving over the road from Savant Lake to Highway 17, although the finishing touches have yet to be added to this road, which will give the public direct access to Pickle Crow mines.

Survey work was started this year on the biggest, and perhaps the most important project of all. This is the 260-mile long road which is to run from Pickle Crow northwesterly to the Manitoba boundary at Lingman Lake. The first contract for 10 miles

has been let and construction will be underway immediately. The road will run through potentially rich mineral area which hitherto has been virtually inaccessible. And I have information so far that two very promising finds have already been made up in that area. What will happen to them, of course, none of us can say.

As I said a few minutes ago, my department plans a continuing programme of geological mapping of this area, so that full advantage may be taken of the road facilities as soon as they are completed.

Mr. Chairman, I have given in only the most general terms, an outline of what my department is doing and what we plan to do in the months and years ahead. We have scaled down our financial requirements to the bare minimum necessary if this work is to be done satisfactorily.

I am confident that the highly skilled staff of my department will make sure that every dollar that this House votes for their work will be spent to the best possible advantage.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, you will recall that the other day, when we were dealing with the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions, that I was moved to comment to you, Mr. Chairman, how much I regretted that the present hon. Minister of Mines had been removed from that department. I hasten to say, Mr. Chairman, that it gives me a great deal of pleasure to meet him in his new capacity, as I do today, representing in a very real sense the vital interest, a pre-eminent interest, of the whole of northern Ontario.

I was struck by his last comment. His last comment was that: "We have scaled down our requirements to the bare minimum of what we will need to carry out the duties of this department." Translated, sir, that means merely that this government is not spending very much on mines. And it is not spending very much on mines because I say—with no disrespect and no innuendo to the hon. Minister—but I say that The Department of Mines in the concept of this government of course, is a very inferior, a very second-rate and a very unimportant department of the government.

What testifies more clearly as to how you assess importance, Mr. Chairman, than the amount of money you are ready to spend on the activity or on the enterprise? Two years ago, in the year ending March 31, 1962, this department spent about \$200,000 more than is required for the fiscal year 1964. The prime reason for that, of course, was that

there was a very drastic reduction in the budgeted amount, or the amount that was asked, for the building of access roads. And perhaps I might defer some more specific comments on that matter to a little later on.

First I think it is important to draw something to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), who was not in his seat when the comment was made by the hon. Minister of Mines—in fairness I point out that it is not very often that the hon. Prime Minister is out of his seat—no one attends more religiously than he to the deliberations of this House. However, during the few moments that he was out of his seat, the hon. Minister of Mines expostulated something to this effect: "We can't present all the information about this department at this time." He said, "A résumé can wait", and the hon. Minister is well known for the precision and sophistication of his language.

"A résumé," he said, "can wait until the annual report of The Department of Mines is available in the new year." He continued: "In most respects we think 1962 was a good year. We produced \$950 million in value of minerals in 1961. The 1962 total will not be far above or below that amount."

Well, what does it all boil down to? It boils down to a convincing proof of the proposition that the hon. Prime Minister ought not to require this House to consider the estimates of any one government department, and an important department like this, until all this information is available.

That, I think, is a very reasonable request and I do not want to occupy the time of the House and stand in my place in the House and belabour the hon. Prime Minister about it. But I for one see no necessity for voting public monies, voting the revenues of this province for the administration of a department, until we have all this information before us. Perhaps he did not want to admit it, perhaps at this Yuletide season he wanted to appear as optimistic as possible, but I dare say that the hon. Minister is going to find that the revenue—I should not say revenue—the value of minerals produced in the province, is going to be somewhat below that of the record year of 1961.

If he will think about it for a moment, Mr. Chairman, I think that he must agree with me that such is a fairly gloomy prospect because the mines at Elliot Lake are closing, a number of them have closed. Some others, important producers, are scheduling their closing at some time fairly early in the new year. We achieved almost \$1 billion in

mineral production in this province because of the entry into the mining picture of the great producers at Elliot Lake, which of course were the beneficiaries of the contact with the American government for the supply of uranium.

The walls of this House certainly have echoed with enough assertions about that unfortunate catastrophe that struck that fine community, that very vigorous community, that very well planned community, in the preceding two or three years that I do not need to belabour them, save to say this: Dr. John Convey, I believe it is, and the hon. Minister—without making too unreasonable a request—the hon. Minister might have dealt with this important aspect of the problem, Dr. John Convey of the federal department, it is called the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, I believe, at some time in the past went to Elliot Lake and he informed the people there and those interested in the continuation of that community that progress by way of research had been made in the utilization of uranium as an alloy in the steel-making process.

A great deal of discussion and interest was displayed as a result of his announcement; I believe it was last year that he made it, I do not keep too careful a track of the dates of such things, but it was not in the too distant past. Since that time the town fathers of that community and its press have been much exercised about what prospects such a utilization of the uranium product in the steel-making process will mean for the continued economic health of their community. I have before me no less than four editorials of the Elliot Lake *Standard* in which they display that keen—well, curiosity is not a strong enough word—that keen interest in whether there is some goal on the horizon for the continued production of those mines that have closed down or are about to close down.

One of them I look at, and let this go into the record, sir: "Government could create uranium demand by using uro-steel on own projects."

"Time for action on hand but pessimism won't help," says another one.

A third proclaims: "Uro-steel won't progress if government dismisses problems as too difficult."

Now, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, apparently, so far as this House is concerned, the hon. Minister of Mines is not too interested in this because he didn't take any opportunity during the presentation of his estimates to make any reference to it whatsoever. We

know the plight of that community. I observed it only a week or ten days ago when I saw a deputation sitting in our public galleries. They were sitting under the Speaker's gallery at the west side of this chamber, and familiar faces they have been here, very familiar. I do not know any citizen of this province who has been around the legislative building while the legislative assembly has been in session, more than Mr. Jack Gauthier of Elliot Lake, a man connected with the chamber of commerce, a businessman and a man whose enthusiasm for the rescue of that community is not surpassed by any other citizen on the improvement district. I do not even know what his politics are. I doubt whether he supports those who sit in these benches with me. But aside from that, he and his deputations—and I see another editorial here

PROPOSED VISIT TO TORONTO COULD BE VERY SIGNIFICANT FOR THE FUTURE OF THE COMMUNITY

Well then, Mr. Chairman, does it not boil down to this, that if uranium can be used in the steel-making process is the hon. Minister not obliged to inform the House, to inform the hon. members here, to inform the citizens of the improvement district of Elliot Lake, to tell us whether this government can do something; and is it not extremely timely to remark that when you are talking about the possible utilization of an ore that we find in abundance below the 2,200 ft. level in the sedimentary deposits under the pre-cambrian shield at Elliot Lake, is it not timely to connect it with the crusade of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) who in latter months has been talking about the manufacture in Ontario of the products which the people of Ontario use? One wonders—aside from the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Mines in this regard—one wonders what interest the hon. Minister of Economics and Development is addressing towards the problem of an exploration or a development that could restore the vigour and health, the hopes of the several thousand people that live in that fine community in the improvement district of Elliot Lake.

Let me leave it at that point. Perhaps we will hear from the hon. Minister some time before his estimates are approved by this House, just what the status of that matter is.

Now, a thought comes to my mind, moving from that community some distance to the east, the thought comes to my mind that when he was talking about the Timiskaming Testing Laboratory at Cobalt he might have announced to the House—and here this is

a matter of rather intimate and personal interest to me because I had some connection in yesteryear with Cobalt. That is the only thing, so far as I know, that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) and I share in common; each of us had an association with Cobalt. The hon. Minister ought to have informed the House that the Keeley-Frontier mill goes into production, does it not, perhaps it is today, December 17, or it might have been over the weekend—Keeley-Frontier, of course, being one of the leading producers at Silver Centre.

Many hon. members might not even know where Silver Centre is, but one of my earliest recollections is of 1931 when I stayed in that little community on the shores of Lake Timiskaming to the southeast of Cobalt and the Keeley and the Frontier. Two separate mines and separately owned, very rich producers were operating at that time, soon to close down, soon to close down with the plummeting of silver prices in the 30s. Both operations have now been revived by the intervention of interest of people in Toronto, I believe, but employing the residue of labour that still exists in the Cobalt camp, that has never left it, has never let Cobalt down. They have combined both the Keeley and the Frontier and have built a mill which I believe will produce some 150 tons a day or will mill 150 tons a day, and which, as I say, has either gone into operation or will go into operation shortly.

There are some, if I might dwell on Cobalt for a moment, of course there are some—my father was one of them—who never gave up hope for the resuscitation of Cobalt. I remark that it has always been my opinion, being no geologist whatsoever, that the incidence of mineralization being as it is there, that is to say, in veins that are sometimes very wide and sometimes very narrow indeed, and very erratic, wending their way through the rock, perhaps it is a situation that the mother lode, so to speak, from which all this mineralization came has never been found, but will be some day. Of course, the mining of silver has become an economically feasible operation once again with the increase in the price of that precious metal.

The hon. Minister very gloomily, very gloomily—and this is not unrelated to my observations of the amount of money that this government, the Treasury board, allocates to the operation of this department—pointed out to us that mineral exploration is at a very low ebb in the province. He said that

geological mapping is lagging behind the other provinces. I wrote those things down, I always pay careful attention to what this hon. Minister says, whether he is talking about his department or something else. In fact, to show the extent of my research, my interest in this hon. Minister, I went and read some of his speeches of yesteryear even during the time when he was only a private member of the House. I read about his interest in The Department of Mines as far back as when, I believe, Welland Gemmell was the Minister. That is what he reports to us today, Mr. Chairman; that is his gloomy synopsis, résumé, he calls it; they do not use that word résumé in my part of north-eastern Ontario.

Well, I can recall—and I have not been here very long—the former member for Kenora, the late dear and revered Albert Wren, exercising his larynx in this House and expostulating that this government should get around to some form of subsidization of the full-time prospector. I remember Mr. Wren got even more specific than that. He said this government should set about the organization of prospecting parties with three or four young recruits—novices, and one experienced prospector, because so far as I am aware there is only one way to find a mine in the pre-cambrian shield and that is by prospecting over the surface.

In my limited knowledge, I think I am correct to say that electromagnetic or magnetometer surveys will disclose the presence of magnetic rocks or might even point out anomalies, for all I am aware. But the actual finding of the mine must be done by the person who strikes through the bush and finds the outcropping or the exhibition of it. Certainly that is the way Manitouwadge was found. Mr. Barker—Roy Barker of Geraldton was it?—and his partners, set down in their plane in Manitouwadge Lake and struck up through the bush and discovered that great deposit that now finds its crystalization in Geco and Willroy mines.

My late friend Albert Wren, used to say that; he said that three or four years ago. It might get through if one begs the indulgence of the House, Mr. Chairman, to repeat it. That if mineral exploration is at a low ebb, and those are the hon. Minister's words, then perhaps something can be done about it if this government will adopt that friendly advice given by Albert Wren and which is repeated to this government in a friendly and courteous fashion today.

I recall as long ago as three or four years when the then Minister of Mines, the late

James A. Maloney, told us about the geological mapping. I think some research into the pages of *Hansard* of the session of 1960 would reveal that he said at that time that the geological mapping was going on apace and it would shortly be completed and maps would be made available. It seems to me, and I might not be correct, I have had occasion to look at some of the geological maps of northeastern Ontario and those I did look at are in reference to the Gowganda area; those maps are made available by the federal department—whatever it was called in those days, and I would not even want to guess what they called it in the first decade or two of the 20th century—those maps were current and still in use by prospectors. I also recall that in our 1959 platform when we sought the mandate of the people of this province that our leader at that time undertook to carry out a complete geological and geophysical survey of the northern part of the province. I suppose that will have to wait until the next test at the polls when we this time get the mandate in order to carry out that promise made for the last election.

The hon. Minister did not tell us anything about the port at Moosonee—and how does the port at Moosonee get into these estimates, Mr. Chairman? Now, before you ask me, I will go on quickly to tell you how it gets in. It was two years ago when we last discussed it in the estimates, I believe. There is a very large deposit of iron ore in the Belcher Islands that lie in Hudson Bay—yes, I believe it is Hudson Bay, I am just trying to picture it in my mind, the map—it might be James Bay; certainly those islands do not belong, I found out somewhat to my surprise, to the province of Ontario, though they abut very closely the shores of our province. They do not belong to the province of Quebec either. I am informed on a map that I have, that all islands lying in Hudson and James bays fall in the Northwest Territories for purposes of jurisdiction so we have not got the right in fee simple, so to speak, of the Belcher Islands.

I am told, never having been there, that there is a large deposit of iron ore in those islands.

Indeed, the islands are virtually all iron, so I have heard some people describe them, and one of the things that the late—that is not right, not the late, the former Prime Minister, thank heavens he is not late—the former Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) used to talk about, of course, was the development of the ocean port at Moosonee. We have all heard him; we heard him eloquent when he

was in this House; we have never heard him at more superb heights of his eloquence than when he was talking about the port at Moosonee. I do not exaggerate when I say that a tear used to fall out of the corner of his eye when he talked about that port, and the future of northern Ontario.

Of course, one of the reasons for the development of that port was for the extraction of iron ore in the Belcher Islands and bringing it down to Moosonee, hence over the Ontario Northland Railway and down to the industrial centres of the province. But since the departure of the member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Frost)—and one does not see as much of him as one would like to see—one does not hear very much about the port at Moosonee.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): And you won't.

Mr. Sopha: And you won't, says my hon. friend from Nipissing who keeps a very close touch on these things. You won't of course, because the long and the short of it is that it has been abandoned. The federal government and its technicians, their geologists and their engineers and various other experts told this government that it was not feasible to construct that ocean port, and this government has kicked it under the rug, out of sight. They do not tell us. And now we have a new economic direction. No longer are we looking northward, no longer do we look northward to the great future that lies in James Bay and the development of an ocean port to make us a maritime power. No, now we look inward and we are off on another economic tangent that will come up under other estimates, Mr. Chairman. But perhaps there is still some hope for the development of that port at Moosonee and perhaps the hon. Minister, if he is going to speak again of these estimates, will tell us something about it.

The next thing that naturally comes to mind is the question of access roads. I think I have already pointed out—if I had not, perhaps you will permit me to say—that in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1962, this House was pleased to vote—I had better be correct, Mr. Chairman, as our words are recorded—yes, this House was pleased to vote the sum of \$1.55 million under item 1307, the same number as it has today, the capital disbursement for the construction of mining and access roads. In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963 that amount was reduced to \$1 million. And again this year we see it at precisely the same figure, \$1 million.

Now that programme, of course, the programme of access roads, was devised by the late Welland S. Gemmell, a man who I am happy to say was a very devoted public servant of this province, and I am very happy to relate that he of course was a predecessor of mine in the seat that I have the honour to hold in this House. And in the year 1952, I believe it was, this government and specifically Welland S. Gemmell, who was charged with the responsibility of running this department, inaugurated this programme. In their publication, *New Horizons*, in 1958, the report of The Ontario Department of Mines, they made reference to the inauguration in this way:

The programme was instituted during the ministry of the late Welland S. Gemmell, with the specific purpose of opening up potentially rich mineral areas for prospecting and development. However, when it was shown that these same roads served a number of additional purposes of great value to the development of the entire northland the programme was expanded so that the maximum good could be accomplished. To that end an interdepartmental committee was set up in 1955 to decide on matters of policy and to determine the locations and priorities of the proposed roads. Cabinet members of this committee are the Ministers of Mines, of Lands and Forests, of Public Works and of Highways.

That is the end of the quotation from the book, Mr. Chairman.

Whether that committee is still active or in existence we have not heard from the lips of The Department of Mines. I have often wondered how the decisions were made with respect to priorities in the building of these roads. Mark you, I was given cause to wonder, when I remember the day I was in the town of Kenora, attending upon the nomination of our respected colleague from that riding (Mr. Gibson) back in early January—no, early December of 1961—and the committee that is referred to there were having a meeting.

They must have had a meeting, because on the day of the nomination meeting we were holding they announced that they were going to build a road from the town of Kenora to the Manitoba border. Unknown to me, four of those Cabinet Ministers must have been in town, at the leading hotel in Kenora, where they decided this thing.

I say, somewhat more seriously, that I wondered how these priorities were determined. Being of only a healthy suspicious

mind, I suspected that other considerations entered into the determination of where and when these roads were built.

I have made reference in the past to the fact that every organization within my community, amid its chartered purposes or its goals of achievement, has in view the economic destiny of my community, the great metropolis of Sudbury. They have for many years now, since 1924, evinced a great interest in the construction of the road to Timmins. And I have made reference to the fact that, amid this atmosphere of reasonable suspicion, this government, carrying out the priorities that are referred to in this report, saw fit to build the road from Chapleau to Foleyet first—Foleyet being connected with the city of Timmins, which is represented in this House by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner).

I have said also, Mr. Chairman, and I beg leave to repeat to you, that I thought it boiled down to this: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, formerly the Minister of Lands and Forests, perhaps exercised more influence at the council table or in the Treasury board than did the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Belisle) who I observe today is not in his seat—he must be engaged in government business elsewhere.

I said to the government, when I urged them to build that important highway link—and they can do it under the estimate 1307 or at least they can make a start on it—"I do not want you to build a road for me at all." If there is something in our political texture, or the way we do business in this country, that prevents the government from building a road at the request of a member of the Opposition, then my reply is simple. I do not want them to build a road for me at all. I merely want them, Mr. Chairman, to build a road for the hon. member for Nickel Belt, who has loyally supported this government through thick and thin since his election to this chamber in 1955.

He is a very fine fellow and he is a good friend; and I do him no disservice when, in a moment of reflection, I ask what has this government ever done for the hon. member for Nickel Belt, or his people? I do not know. I do not know what there is about him that he cannot persuade his friends. I would expect that, when we make that vault to the other side, and if I go to those in power and say: "Let us get that road built," the graders and the bulldozers would be on it the following week.

That is no idle protestation, because I have heard the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr.

Wintermeyer) say, when he was speaking to the people of Sudbury—and they listened to the hon. leader of the Opposition very closely there—that he treats the building of that road from Sudbury to Timmins as a matter of absolutely top priority in the economic development of northeastern Ontario.

What in good common sense, what in logic, can be the justification for linking up Thessalon and Chapleau, Chapleau and Foleyet, in preference to two communities not far distant, one of which has a metropolitan area containing 140,000 people, and in the other there reside 40,000 or 50,000 people?

Last year, some 29,000 tourists came to our booths in the chamber of commerce. Twenty-nine thousand of them stopped there to make inquiries. Had that road been built, as it should have been built a decade ago, those people could have gone on to explore the wonderland, the green verdure of that area between the two communities. Who knows what untapped wealth there is in it, contiguous as it is to the greatest mineral deposit in the whole of Ontario, the Sudbury basin? And yet, for some reason that has never been explained in this House, they decide to build that road from Foleyet to Chapleau, two very small communities where, I think, there are more moose than there are people.

To listen to The Department of Lands and Forests, one would think that the whole of northeastern Ontario is abounding with moose; I have hunted for eight years and I never have fired a shot in anger at a moose; I have never even seen one. But there it is. And when it comes time to explain my stewardship to my people, when the moment of truth arrives, when I have to explain what I have been doing with my talents down at the legislative building, then I will have to say to the people: "Well, I did not get the road to Timmins, a matter of first interest to you."

But I will have to admit, trying not to smile, trying not to blush in embarrassment, that this government has been pretty good to our community, it has been pretty good. As I point to those schools, those hospitals, I will say: That is my stewardship. I did not get the road, but I will tell you good people how we will get it. We will turn this government out; we will turn them out, and we will get somebody down there that has more influence in the Treasury benches than does the new hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, former Minister of Lands and Forests.

Things change so fast around here that you have to keep a glossary of who the

personalities are. But I always suspected that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs had the ear of somebody, and he said: "Give me that road. Give me the road."

Mr. Troy: He told us so.

Mr. Sopha: He told us that, the hon. member from Nipissing says.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is he making your speech, your hon. friend from Nipissing?

Mr. Sopha: Anything my hon. friend from Nipissing ever says by way of articulation, when he is in his own place, or by way of interpolation from where he sits, is always very useful, very helpful, and worthy to be listened to. And besides he always says nice things about me.

One other matter, with your leave, Mr. Chairman; the mines profits tax. The hon. Minister again—almost all my remarks have dealt with things the hon. Minister did not tell us about—did not make reference to the mines profits tax at all. I suppose, with the decline in the value of minerals produced, there will be a consequent decline in the mines profits tax. As near as I can recall, if we said that the mines profits tax equated about \$12 million annually, then, Mr. Chairman, we would be pretty close.

I hope I may be forgiven in not being able to tell you, off the cuff, precisely what the amount is because the mines profits tax is a matter that has always been shrouded in the greatest secrecy by the Treasury. If you ever looked at the statute under which it is collected you would see that if the mines assessor, I think he is, tells you anything about the mines profits tax he is in danger of being sent to Devil's Island; that is how secret they are about it.

The mines profits tax, for the benefit of the hon. members who do not think about it daily as I do, is a tax over and above the ordinary corporation taxes paid by mining companies who are fortunate enough to make a profit. We know they all pay a tax of 52 per cent, I believe it is the corporation tax, to both the federal government and the provincial government. Over and above that, of course, there is the mines profits tax. This is calculated upon the tonnage produced at the minehead, and based upon that tonnage they have to make a payment to this government.

As I said by way of introduction, this is a payment over and above the ordinary corporation and income taxes. So far as I am aware, and I think there is no dispute about

this proposition, the mines profits tax is paid in recognition of the principle that the mines are often situated outside the dormitory municipalities which must provide all the services, education, fire and police protection for the miners who work in those mines. Therefore it becomes important to realize that this tax, Mr. Chairman, is related to municipal institutions. I have had occasion to say in this House before, and I will say and repeat as long as I am privileged to be the steward of the community of Sudbury, that the payment from the mines profits tax that is made back to the municipality is unrelated, almost entirely unrelated, to the amount that they levy by way of this tax.

I recall, two years ago, a large delegation from many of the designated mining municipalities—that adjective “designated” relates to the fact that they are paid certain extra payments based generally upon the number of miners that reside in those communities—from Sudbury and Timmins and the township of Teck, and I believe there were some from Red Lake, waited upon the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and asked that certain rearrangements be made in connection with the appropriations made to those communities from the mines profits tax.

Let me put it in this context. Mr. Chairman, there is the very real problem that arises from the fact that, unlike any other industry, the people who work in this industry generally live in municipalities adjacent to it. How does this arise? It is historically accurate for me to say, and to put on record, that many of the large mining companies, in the early days of their formation, insulated themselves, put themselves within the cocoon of a municipality which they controlled; and that situation still exists in this province.

The mining company controls the municipality in which it is situated, in which it carries on its operations. Its workers reside in another municipality that is some distance away from the scene of the operations, from the mining enterprise. I know of no other industry in this province where that obtains in the high and marked degree and emphatic degree that it obtains in the mining industry. Of course, these dormitory municipalities, of which my city is the leading one, must provide for the workers in those mines, they must provide education and all the other incidental benefits that flow from residence in an organized municipality in this province in this year 1962.

Now that is one side of it. There is the heavy expense. They have not got the right

to tax, they cannot levy the municipal requirements by taxing those industries; and I am not advocating it. I am not advocating that mines by reason of their very special and risky character should be subject to municipal control. I am not prepared to go that far. The establishment of a mine is a very uncertain proposition, its success or the prospect of its success, is a very tenuous thing. Perhaps mines, unlike manufacturing, ought not to be subject to or hobbled or controlled by municipal, elected municipal officials.

The other side of the problem, of course, Mr. Chairman, is that the provision of services in the pre-cambrian shield is utterly unlike—since we are dealing with unlikenesses—the provision of those services in other parts of the province and in particular in the southern part of the province. It is only necessary for me to say that it is a vastly different proposition putting in a water main in Sudbury than it is in the county of Norfolk. And I selected a good one when I said Norfolk because they do not have in that county the problem of digging through clay. As I remember the county of Norfolk, they just scooped the sand away—it was sand, just a light sand—and put down their water main. In Sudbury and in every other municipality in northern Ontario you find the hardest rock in the world, the pre-cambrian shield formed by divine providence more than 450 million years ago.

At one time a great range of young mountains, now eroded down into what I think the geologists call a peneplain—that is where our mineral is found. We are very fortunate that providence put it there. But then consider the cost, Mr. Chairman, of putting a water main or putting a sewage system through the pre-cambrian shield; conceive the cost to us citizens of Sudbury just recently when we built a five-mile sewage tunnel through the Ontario Water Resources Commission. Being unable to tax the industry that gives us sustenance to provide for these services, not having a Ford motor company as some other more fortunate communities have, the burden of taxation falls upon residential taxpayers. I do not need to get excited about this, you know, Mr. Chairman. It is a mistake, it is a mistake for me to do it because I have said all this before to them; I have said it to them all before. They have heard it from delegation after delegation of very fine people from my community, delegations from every one of the 50, I think it is, of designated mining municipalities, that have told them this. But with some people, some people, you just cannot strike home.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): You have to be a crusader around here!

Mr. Sopha: Yes, my hon. friend, the member for Wentworth says if a person takes on the role of a crusader, perhaps by repetition some day the light will dawn. The light will dawn and finally even the blind will see as if it were a revelation they will say: "We must do this. We must do this for those communities." You see, as far as I remember, they give my community from the mines profits tax—you are unable to tell, Mr. Chairman, you cannot tell how much is paid by each individual mining corporation, but of the \$12 million about \$6 million, of that I have no doubt in the world, is paid from mines in the Sudbury basin. We produce over half in the Sudbury basin, I venture to say.

We have no figures in front of us because these estimates come up at the wrong time, but I venture to say we produce one half of the mineral wealth of the province of Ontario, being as we are the supplier of 70 per cent of the free world's nickel, and vast quantities of copper. Did you know that we are one of the world's leading suppliers of platinum? No, the hon. Minister did not tell you that; we are. I am informed, or I think, they have a vein there at Frood mine, a vein of platinum, that mineral, which is a precious metal but is not in much demand; but when they need a little bit of platinum to make a lady's wristwatch, or whatever they do with platinum, they go and extract some of the platinum from that vein at the Frood mine and put it through their precious metals refinery and sell it on the world market where it commands a fantastic price per ounce, I forget how much now that they get for it. We produce a creditable amount of gold and silver at Sudbury, and all these things are looked upon by us as rather unimportant because of the vast quantities of nickel that we ship to all parts of the world.

But there the problem remains and it becomes more exacerbated as the years go on because this government has so far turned a rather deaf ear to the pleas of our community for an increase in the grant under The Mines Profits Act. The problem will not ever be solved, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, hoping I am reaching the front benches—the Treasury benches over there—until a very realistic look is taken at the whole situation and some rectification is made.

Just one other thing and I hope I will not have to feel called upon to participate in these estimates again, but I noticed in the public accounts that there was some refer-

ence last year to a sulphur dioxide committee that had expended a considerable amount of money. Forgive me if there has been a report published that I have not seen. The hon. Minister made reference to the incidence of sulphur fumes at Sudbury—which, of course, is a very enervating and a very bothersome thing in our community—at Welland and Port Colborne. I think he said three places. I saw in the public accounts that they have a committee that is interested in these things. I hope that I have not missed the report. Perhaps, if there has been such a report the hon. Minister would apprise us of it. I cannot even lay hands on the place in the public accounts where I saw it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The information will be found on page 71 of our preliminary annual report. Have you got this book?

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes. Page 71. Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your indulgence and that of the House while making these remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to the main office estimate, there are four matters of policy that I would like to touch upon, two of which have been dealt with at some length by the hon. member for Sudbury who has just taken his seat.

The first is in relation to the mines profits tax. It will be a strange day if we discuss the estimates of The Department of Mines without getting back to this hoary old issue but I would just like to underline, without belabouring this issue unduly, two aspects of it that seem to me so grossly unfair that I am puzzled as to why this government cannot be persuaded to reconsider its position. I am not certain that I go along with the hon. member for Sudbury in his contention that he thinks it would be unfair to levy municipal taxes on mines because they are a risky business.

It seems to me that this alternative procedure that has been adopted here, of the mines profits tax, as an alternative to a municipal tax and then a rebate to the municipalities, means that you place mines in a position where they are not meeting their fair share of the services provided in the communities where they are situated, or in the neighbouring communities where their workers are living. The net result is that if they are not providing their fair share, then other businesses and the workers have to pick up that portion which is not provided by the mines themselves. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that we are now going to be

moving into a position where this unfairness in the mines profits tax approach is going to be reflected, because we are now in a period where some mines are not making as much profit. The net result is then that they will be paying little or no mines profits tax, so smaller rebates will be going back to the municipalities.

But I do not need to tell you, Mr. Chairman, these municipalities are still going to be providing services, they are still going to have to provide the services for the mines and these municipal services costs are going up and up every year. On some mysterious basis mining is put in this unique position: Here is a little storekeeper along the main street, or here is another industry which is having a tough time, may even be going bankrupt, but it cannot operate for a month, without paying its taxes when the end of the year comes, without getting into some difficulty. But the mine, if it runs into difficulties, and is not making a profit is in effect freed completely of its share of the municipal taxes in the roundabout circuitous way in which it is handled. I can see no justification for this, Mr. Chairman, and I would submit once again to the government that they should take a look at this and put the mining industry on the same basis as other industries, other businesses in the community, and the home owners.

Still related to the mines tax, Mr. Chairman, to my mind what is almost proof of the fact that the government feels that the mines profits tax is not a very defensible proposition is that they refuse to give details to the public. I cannot for the life of me see why we should suddenly take one sector of revenues which are being paid into this government and say that the hon. members of the Legislature or the public at large are not entitled to know what the detailed figures are.

But, as the hon. member for Sudbury has indicated, sir, this is all shrouded in secrecy. We have an overall figure, but we have no breakdown. It seems to me this is just underlining once again the position of the mining industry as being a darling of government down through the years, down through generations, having been given concessions and privileged positions which no other industry gets.

The second point with which the hon. member for Sudbury dealt, and which I would like to touch on particularly, in light of the plea of the hon. Minister that prospecting is languishing at the present time, is that I do not see why this government does

not take a leaf out of the book of many other jurisdictions where assistance is given in staking prospectors. Indeed, prospectors' schools are held, so that the amateur prospector who sometimes is going to make as fruitful a contribution in terms of finds as a professional prospector, can be given some of the rudimentary information and knowledge that will be useful when he gets out into the field.

But, more particularly, he should be staked so that he can get out and do this pioneering job, because this is the forerunner for maintaining our mining industry. I hesitate to suggest some of the other jurisdictions because the mere mention of at least one of them that I have in mind usually creates quite a furor in this House. I will just suggest that the hon. Minister should take a look at what is done in some other jurisdictions and not ignore this area, particularly since he emphasizes that the prospecting industry is not thriving at the present time.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to two other issues that were not touched upon by the hon. member for Sudbury. One is the whole question of resources taxes. This is another hoary old issue that at least I have been raising every year since I came into this Legislature. In the hope that I might be able to impress the government a bit more I want to make my comments within this context.

I acknowledge that industries cannot be overtaxed or they will be driven out of this province in competition with others. I recognize that you have to assess carefully the burden that is placed on industry, both in absolute terms and relative terms. But I think we must face the fact that since you are raising revenues to meet the needs of the people of the province as a whole, if you have an industry which is producing close to \$1 billion in wealth—for the life of me I cannot annual report, the hon. Minister tells us that he thinks it will be approximately the same as it was last year, \$951 million, close to \$1 billion in wealth—for the life of me I cannot understand by what element of logic, other than once again wanting to treat this industry in a privileged and favoured position, they should not be contributing more to the coffers of this province. They are built upon a resource which is owned by the people of the province of Ontario and which is, in effect, rented by this government to them for the building of their industry.

I looked back at last year's budget and I discovered that, despite the fact that there is something close to \$1 billion in wealth being

produced in the mining industry, the last year for which we had full reports there was \$13.4 million raised in resources taxes; only \$13.4 million out of this close to \$1 billion in wealth that was produced. This is the raw material out of which the \$1 billion was produced and yet we, the owners of the raw material, got \$13.4 million in the fiscal year that concluded last March 31.

In the estimate for the year through which we are now going, the government even anticipated less—\$13.2 million. If it were just this and this alone, Mr. Chairman, perhaps one could ignore the issue for at least one year, but in the past year there have been a number of other developments which, it seems to me, make it all the more imperative that this government should raise a more equitable amount of money from this source—particularly since we find that the government is still running heavy deficits and has not got enough revenue to meet its expenditures.

For example, take the one company, Inco. That is the best one to illustrate our point because it is the biggest industry in the province, the biggest mining corporation in the province. We have had in the past few months the spectacle of an industry like Inco laying off 2,500 men on October 1 this year, laying them off so that they drew on our already bankrupt unemployment insurance commission and they drew on the local municipality which was picking up the tab for the basic sustenance of these 2,500 men and their families. Yet, Mr. Chairman, this one corporation had something over \$52 million in profit after taxes in the first six months of this year.

I just cannot for the life of me see how any government that is making any pretence of raising revenues equitably should ignore a situation like this. In fact, I doubt whether there has ever been a more callous act by a great corporation than this action of Inco in these past few months, to toss 2,500 men on the scrap heap of unemployment when the company is sitting on over \$52 million in profits for the first half of this year, more profits than they had last year. Not only do you have that, Mr. Chairman, but if you look at the record of Inco you will find that they now have accumulated depreciation and depletion allowances for last year of \$321 million.

All of this becomes even more pertinent, Mr. Chairman, from our point of view, because a few weeks ago in the federal House of Commons there were amendments made to the income and corporation tax laws. These amendments were made to give further tax exemptions and allowances to this industry.

The case was put by the government as a plea to meet the need for stepping up the natural gas and the oil industries; the plea that not enough prospecting and discovery work was going on to maintain adequate reserves for the future of the industry.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not in any sense an expert or knowledgeable about the natural gas and oil industries, so I am not going to discuss it. It is not a matter of major importance in the province of Ontario, but the significant thing, Mr. Chairman, is that in changing the corporation tax laws to provide these, what the government claimed were necessary incentives for the oil and gas industries to go out and do their jobs, the same laws apply to the mining industry. So here you have great corporations like International Nickel which are going to have even less tax burden at the federal level because of these more liberal amendments that have been brought in by the government at Ottawa with the support from the official Opposition, the Liberal Party.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me once again there is an even stronger case for this government raising a more equitable amount of money as our resource tax; and doing it, Mr. Chairman, because of something I sometimes think many people do not realize. Indeed, our good hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), a year or so ago, when we were discussing this in the House, had to be persuaded by the then Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) that it was the case—because I do not think he realized it—that the resources tax that a mining company has to pay is a deductible item on their federal corporation tax, so that if they pay it all to us we get it directly. And I think equitably. What we do now is we let it go to Ottawa and then this government, though it has got embarrassed into a silence on it, screams because it is not getting a fair share of the tax that comes back from Ottawa. Well here is one area where I think the common-sense approach is to raise it directly for yourselves instead of channelling it through Ottawa and you only get a proportion of it back.

So I repeat, Mr. Chairman, in summing up this point, it seems to me that the case for raising more revenue from the mining industry in terms of resources taxes is a clear-cut one, when you are getting something like \$13 million out of an industry producing close to \$1 billion in wealth, producing it on the basis of a resource that belongs to us. But when you have such things as the action of

International Nickel throwing its men out on the unemployment list, and the more liberal tax laws that are coming in in Ottawa, it seems to me that, once again, you have added reason for this government taking the necessary steps to raise revenues, because we need them and because I think it would be an equitable way of doing it.

Now the final policy item that I want to raise this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, is in the hope that I can get some clarification as to what this government's policy is on an issue that was raised last winter. It caused quite a storm and I thought we resolved it. Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Mines, in one of his voluble moments, raised the prospect of mining being permitted in the parks. After this comment, quite a storm broke.

As a matter of fact, I have rarely seen an issue in which southern and northern Ontario found common ground. It is surprising, and in fact, I think, it is encouraging, the number of people who live in the urban areas of the south and who really have a soft spot in their hearts for our northern parks and were shocked at the prospect that these parks were going to be, as they thought, desecrated by mining developments within the park area. Such a furor broke out that the hon. Prime Minister had to step in and resolve the issue. He said there would be no change in policy. Indeed, when he made his statement he underlined it with a sentence which I think sort of nailed the issue, we thought, once and for all. Said he: "Our park lands are a priceless heritage and it is our aim to develop them for the use of our people."

Now we all assumed this meant that the issue was ended, there would be no more discussion of it. Well, a few weeks ago I happened to be up in the Renfrew North area and somebody drew my attention to an article that originally was in the *Pembroke Observer* and then it was reprinted in the *North Renfrew Times*, which was entitled:

MINING IN PARKS
MAYBE, SAYS SPOONER

This, believe it or not, was not the hon. Minister of Mines, this was the Minister of Lands and Forests—which he still was at the time—and presumably would be the man protecting the provincial parks because they come under his jurisdiction. So we thought we had a firm policy laid down.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, you still have.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good. All I invite the hon. Prime Minister to do is to put this

on the agenda for a Cabinet meeting so his hon. colleagues will quit going out and giving the impression that the policy is weakening already. This, Mr. Chairman, is what the hon. Minister said:

Provincial parks could be opened to mines surveys and development without undue interference. Mr. Spooner said he did not think a withdrawal of restrictions against mining would harm the parks. His comments follow a statement by federal Mines Minister Paul Martineau from Pontiac county at a mines conference in Winnipeg last week—

that would be the latter part of September:—that he was opposed—

this is the federal Minister:

—to opening national parks for mining. The suggestion had been made by a number of provincial Mines Ministers.

But here is our Minister of Lands and Forests, the protector of our parks, coming and saying there would be no harm in it, and I will tell you how neatly he put it:

Mines are not very big, Mr. Spooner told the *Observer*, many are even smaller than farms. What's a few mines scattered around in the provincial parks?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to have the hon. Prime Minister intervene and say that his word of last spring is still good. But I repeat: I hope that he will put this on the agenda of a Cabinet Ministers' meeting and tell the rest of the Cabinet Ministers, as they go traipsing around this province, that they should not be making comments that cannot be interpreted as anything but that the policy is not very firm, and perhaps after the election is over, and there are four years in which it could be forgotten, it will be changed right away so that some of these fast-buck people who want to get in—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Chairman, I assure you it will not. I will be here to make sure it is.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am very glad to have that reassurance from the hon. Prime Minister. I must say I would sooner have it from him than from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, or even the hon. Minister of Mines, because their statements suggest that they really do not agree with the hon. Prime Minister. They think that he is protecting a heritage that is not worthy of protection, or something of that sort.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, their words are right there. However, perhaps when we get around to that "routine" department—if I may quote the Toronto *Globe and Mail* editorials—The Department of Lands and Forests, we will find out what the present hon. Minister of Lands and Forests feels on this when his estimates come before the House.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, under which vote do I ask a question about recording of claims and transfer of claims?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1306.

Mr. Troy: Thank you.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, the riding of Brant is not known as a mining riding but we do have a number of extensive gravel deposits and I wonder if this comes under direction of The Department of Mines, and under what vote might a question in that regard be asked.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Vote 1306.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Mines might tell me under which vote I might direct a question in regard to safety regulations?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is under 1303.

Mr. Sopha: I have one then that falls under only this vote and it is stimulated by the reference of the hon. member for York South about Inco's profits, a subject upon which he likes to wax eloquent every year. In each of the four sessions I have been here he has talked about Inco's profits. And I am going to put my view on the record too. I am going to draw the great distinction, the great contrast between the attitude of Inco to the community in which it mines its ore, and that of other people who have mined metals in northern Ontario.

You know, it is truth to tell, it is an impelling truth, that with the first gold brick that is produced from a mine, with the first ingot of copper that goes through the forges, the first production of an electrolytic cathode of nickel, the mine begins to die. At the moment of its birth it begins to die because providence has ordained that in that specific spot there is only so much ore that can be mined—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): And our resources die with it.

Mr. Sopha: Well, if the hon. member wants to put it that way. But first let us go to one

end of the scale, let us remember Harry Oakes. When Harry Oakes met his demise in the Bahamas where he had gone to use the great wealth that had come to him out of the Lakeshore Gold Mine in Kirkland Lake mining camp, when he met his ghastly death in the Bahamas, I do not think there was anybody in northeastern Ontario who shed a tear.

I never heard of the person who ever wept for the unfortunate departure from this earthly existence of Harry Oakes because whatever wealth he ripped out of the earth in northeastern Ontario, he took with him and he said at the time of taking, I do not like the tax laws of my native country of Canada—I do not think he was a Canadian, come to think of it, I think he was an American from Massachusetts who came here—and he left nothing. There is no hospital, there is no library, there is not even a children's playground so far as I am aware, there is no monument, there is no epitaph in the township of Teck or anywhere else in northeastern Ontario that testifies to the fact that this man came along, found this deposit of rich gold-bearing ore and organized its mining. He took it out of the earth and accumulated a vast fortune and a book could be written on how he organized that too, and a book could be written I guess in relations with the toughs, his partners in it—

Mr. Bryden: He left a big monument to himself in the Bahamas.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. He left a little bit to Niagara Falls, my friend who sits at the end of the bench here says; he did something for Niagara Falls. Nothing in the community which gave him that wealth. My father told me about Harry Oakes. Harry Oakes was a rundown prospector. He was on his uppers, as the English would say, he was down to his last five-cent piece around 1911 or 1912, before I was born, when he made the great strike at Kirkland Lake, and became a rich man.

There are others, too, in this province, who became rich men. That is one end of the scale. And come to think of it, I let my mind search the rest of northeastern Ontario as I know it and I cannot name anything else that has ever been left by these people who came and ripped the wealth out of the earth, as a monument to them.

But then we turn to Inco, the company that the hon. member for York South gets up, filling his lungs full of oxygen, and criticizes year after year. What did Inco do?

Mr. MacDonald: I am criticizing the government, not Inco.

Mr. Sopha: Well, the hon. member talks about their profits as if it is a sin to make a profit. He spits out the fact that this company makes \$52 million. He spits it out. In six months, he says. I want to compare what Inco does for our community in comparison to what this government does for it. This government gets, I said, \$6 million of its tax under the mines profits tax from Inco and yet this year, this very year, International Nickel Company pledged to Laurentian University the sum of \$2.5 million. At least there is \$2.5 million of its profits that is going to be spent in our community. That would warm the heart at this Yuletide season of my friend, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, Mr. Chairman, because it is a secondary industry that we are going to have. That, to my chagrin, the way they refer to it, some of the editors of the press when they are talking about the establishment of the university; they do not say a haven for idealism, a refuge for research, a shell for the protection of those who think about the eternal destiny of man, no, it is a secondary industry, they call it.

I wanted to put that on the record in conjunction with my hon. friend's comments about Inco's profits. And let me just hastily say, Mr. Chairman, that the gift of \$2.5 million to Laurentian University is only one of a number of projects that that company—

Mr. Bryden: Is the hon. member Inco's public relations man?

Mr. Sopha: If the hon. member wants to cast me in that guise, I am willing to accept the mantle, I want to be fair.

An hon. member: Did Inco ever do anything that was wrong? What about all the vegetation that was killed?

Mr. Sopha: Well, the hon. member should get up and make a speech about that. But I was not going to let the remarks of the hon. member for York South remain uncontested without, in fairness, putting on the record some of the positive achievements that that company has made and the positive contributions it has made to the development of our community.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Mines tomorrow. We will have a night session and we will continue the Throne Speech debate when we complete the estimates of The Department of Mines and anything else that may be on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.35 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, December 18, 1962

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 18, 1962

First report, standing committee on education, Mr. Carruthers	377
First report, standing committee on agriculture, Mr. W. E. Johnston	377
Telephone Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	377
Community Centres Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	377
Warble Fly Control Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	377
Drainage Act, 1962-1963, bill intituled, Mr. Spooner, first reading	378
Statement re committee to study over-all transportation requirements of Metro Toronto, Mr. MacNaughton	378
Statement re government policy on physical fitness, Mr. Davis	379
Statement re government policy on housing in Ontario, Mr. Macaulay	380
Statement re hospital bed needs in London, Mr. Robarts	381
Estimates, Department of Mines, Mr. Wardrope, concluded	383
Guarantees of the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario, bill to authorize, reported	398
Recess, 6 o'clock	406

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1962

The House met at 3.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham) from the standing committee on education presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Bill No. 23, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton) from the standing committee on agriculture presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with a certain amendment:

Bill No. 10, An Act to provide for the rehabilitation and development of agricultural lands in rural areas in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE TELEPHONE ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Telephone Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): I might say, Mr. Speaker, as a word of explanation of this bill, it is comprised simply of amendments; there are six in all. The bill will be referred to the committee on agriculture. It is intended to bring up certain of the sections of The Telephone Commission

Act to the recommendations that the commission has requested. They deal with membership in a quorum, for instance; amendments for penalty clause in one of the sections of the bill; the appointment of persons to succeed a commissioner who may retire from the board for one reason or another; dealing with the matter of termination of service of any subscriber who may not pay his telephone bills; another one has to do with the disposition of a telephone system to another telephone system or to an individual. And then there is provision in one of the amendments for the holding of a public hearing if, in the opinion of the commission, it is necessary to increase or decrease the rates that may be charged in any telephone system.

THE COMMUNITY CENTRES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Community Centres Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, as a word of explanation on this bill that the amendment provides for the appointment to the board of a community centre, of members others than those who may reside within the municipality in which the community centre is established, as is now the case. It means that where a community centre may serve more than one municipality, any municipality which contributes toward the community centre now has the right to appoint someone to the community centre board.

The second amendment will permit the Minister to make grants to councils of Indian bands to provide for the establishment of community centres on Indian reserves.

THE WARBLE FLY CONTROL ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Warble Fly Control Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE DRAINAGE ACT, 1962-63

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, The Drainage Act, 1962-63.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an explanation of the background of this Act. Earlier this year a special committee of Cabinet was named—composed of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) as chairman, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time (Mr. Cass), and myself—to bring in recommendations covering the matter of farm drainage and whether it might in all its aspects best be administered under one department of the government.

The main legislation dealing with drainage consists of six Acts, The Ditches and Water Courses Act, Interprovincial Drainage Act, Municipal Drainage Act, The Municipal Drainage Aid Act, The Provincial Aid to Drainage Act and The Tile Drainage Act.

The committee met and agreed that the various drainage Acts of the province should be studied with a view to consolidation, amendment and revision. We appointed a small advisory committee to the Cabinet committee, consisting of Professor R. W. Irwin as chairman, who is the assistant professor of engineering sciences at O.A.C. at Guelph; Colonel S. W. Archibald, who is an Ontario land surveyor practising in the London area; and Mr. R. D. Steele, Q.C. of Chatham. We chose these three men because of their wide experience in this particular field of activity and because they represented the various areas which would be affected.

We asked them to study these Acts relating to drainage with particular reference to (a) the advisability of consolidating all or some of the legislation, (b) reviewing the existing legislation to determine which sections are necessary to a new Act, which should be amended and which should be abandoned, (c) to examine legislation from other jurisdictions with a view to incorporating improvements in the new legislation, (d) suggesting supplementary provisions for problems not now covered by existing legislation, and (e) to consider the work of previous committees dealing with this legislation and to draft a proposed Act which would incorporate as many of the recommendations in resolutions received as appeared practical.

This committee met on many occasions during the summer and presented a report to the Cabinet committee this fall. During the course of their investigation the committee met with representatives of The Department of Highways, the conservation branch of The Department of Lands and Forests, and the Association of Conservation Authorities. We have had this Act drafted and we present it to the Legislature for consideration. The Act provides that the legislation will now be administered within The Department of Municipal Affairs.

I might say that approximately \$.75 million in provincial funds is paid out now each year under these various Acts. It is my recommendation that the bill be referred to the committee on municipal law, and the committee on agriculture; when we return after the New Year we will arrange a joint meeting of both legislative committees.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to announce to the House that the government has formed a special committee to study the over-all transportation requirements of the Metropolitan Toronto region—with particular emphasis on railway commuter services. This step follows upon the reference to the establishment of such a committee in the Speech from the Throne.

Limits of the area to be studied may be roughly defined as Oshawa on the east, Barrie on the north and Hamilton on the western end.

Because the initial study will be directed toward investigating the transportation problems of Metropolitan Toronto, the committee includes Metro representatives. It is expected, however, that similar studies may follow in other urban areas in the province and that the study may establish the pattern which can be adopted for such subsequent studies.

I have the honour, sir, to have been appointed chairman of the executive committee, which also consists of: the hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport), vice-chairman; hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs); and William R. Allen, Q.C., chairman, Metropolitan Toronto.

The executive committee will direct a technical committee which has already been appointed, consisting of representatives of the provincial government, Metropolitan Toronto, the Toronto Transit Commission, the Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific Railway.

Members appointed to the technical committee are: R. D. Cowley, traffic engineer, Ontario Department of Transport, chairman; W. Q. Macnee, traffic and planning studies engineer, Department of Highways; A. L. S. Nash, assistant deputy Minister, community planning branch, Department of Municipal Affairs; Eli Comay, commissioner of planning and secretary-treasurer, Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board; G. O. Grant, commissioner of roads, municipality of Metropolitan Toronto; W. E. P. Duncan, general consultant, Toronto Transit Commission; Eric Wynne, vice-president and general manager, Great Lakes region, Canadian National Railways; and G. W. Miller, assistant general manager, eastern region, Canadian Pacific Railway.

It is expected that the full facilities of those branches of government and the transportation industry represented on the committee will be available for purposes of the study.

While special emphasis will be placed on railway commuter services into and from the Metropolitan area, major urban transportation studies already completed or now in progress in the United States, Great Britain and elsewhere will also be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Haskett), notice of which has been given to him.

In view of the fact that St. Leonard's House in Windsor has been in operation for over six months and has made application for a grant, would the hon. Minister please advise the House if his department intends to extend a grant to this organization?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the notice of this question from the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

In view of the fact that St. Leonard's House in Windsor has been in operation for over six months and has made an application for a grant, would the Minister please advise this House if his department intends to extend a grant to this organization?

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville asked for this information last Wednesday and I replied at that time, solely from memory, that I did not think that St. Leonard's House was being opened until early next year. Indeed I have in my hand

an invitation to their official opening on February 5 and 6, 1963. I am hopeful that the programme of this House and the pressure of departmental business will allow my attendance. The department has no record of any request for a grant, confirming the information I gave last Wednesday.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question; I have a press release of December 14 which states that a request had been made well over six months ago.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day—as we are approaching the festive season of the year, I thought it might be appropriate to tell the House the policy of this government with respect to physical fitness.

The government of Ontario is aware of the values of a vigorous and fit population to meeting the challenges of a rapidly changing society.

The Department of Education, co-operating with the fitness and amateur sport directorate of The Department of National Health and Welfare, announces measures to expand presently available services and to provide new services to all citizens and organizations with interests in these areas.

The government of this province recognizes that the physical, social, creative and intellectual fitness of the citizens of this province is essential and proposes to take the following measures:

1. to appoint a co-ordinator within The Department of Education in order to ensure co-ordination of effort by personnel of those branches of the department and government concerned with physical fitness, recreation and continuing education;
2. to seek the establishment of programmes at the university level for the training of recreation, recreation facility, and parks personnel;
3. to encourage the implementation of sound physical education programmes and objectives in the elementary and secondary schools of the province;
4. to develop the facilities and programme of the Ontario athletic leadership camp at Longford Mills for the year-round training of leaders and instructors;
5. to encourage and support municipal and area conferences which will produce programmes especially for young people who have left school;

6. to provide bursaries and scholarships for students entering or enrolled in physical education and recreation courses;

7. to confer with universities in order to plan research projects related to fitness;

8. to encourage school boards to make school buildings and grounds available for suitable fitness programmes; and

9. to extend opportunities for the training of activity leaders at district and provincial training courses.

The fitness programme is intended to promote healthful and wholesome physical, mental and social living among the residents of this province, young and old, and in every walk of life.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, yesterday or the day before I was asked a question by the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) indicated that a statement would be made in reply. I would like to make it at this time.

I have read with interest the recent newspaper reports of the housing investigation carried out by the Reverend Glynn Firth and his colleagues. I am acutely aware of the need for more low-rental accommodation in Metro Toronto, and since I assumed my present portfolio I have done everything within my power to get a programme under way which would alleviate this need.

After the South Regent Park and Lawrence Heights projects were developed, there was a period of public housing inactivity in Metro while the whole question of housing policy at all government levels underwent a major review. Since an acceptable policy was formulated, however, we have concentrated our energies on catching up on the resulting backlog in demand. I am pleased to say that our endeavours are beginning to bear fruit with the following results:

Scarlett Wood, Etobicoke—150 units. All units are completed with the exception of 49 units of high-rise apartment buildings.

Warden Avenue in Scarborough—350 units. The first units are due for completion in January, 1963, and the remainder will be completed on an average of 25 units a month.

Thistletown, Etobicoke—1,200 units. The planning of this development is virtually completed and I hope to make an announcement regarding it within the next two weeks.

O'Connor Drive, North York—300 units.

Planning of this project is at a stage where development can commence early in 1963.

Jane-Steeles, North York—500 units. Planning is well under way and it is being related to the adjacent lands which are to be the site of York University.

Stableford Farm—100 units. Development could commence in 1963.

Earlier this year the 12-point plan for housing in Ontario was approved to give our housing programme greater flexibility. The rent certificate plan in operation in Metro at the present time was conceived as an immediate means of reducing the municipality's housing needs. We have made available to the Metro housing authority an amount of \$100,000 this year for subsidy purposes. The housing authority has been offered a total of 911 units since April 3, 1962, and has leased a total of 115. The disproportionately small number of units accepted is due to the fact that all kinds of accommodation is offered to the housing authority, much of which is either structurally or economically unsuitable.

This scheme is available to all of the 13 municipalities in Metropolitan Toronto. Its only limitation is the availability of units which are structurally and economically suitable and where there is an immediate demand for such accommodation.

I might say it was indicated at the time that this programme was inaugurated that this was a pilot plan for Metropolitan Toronto. Our hope was that it would be successful. It had never been tried any place else of which we were aware, and certainly not on these terms and conditions; and, if after giving it a fairly good shakedown we found that it was a good plan—it would work—we would then open negotiations with the federal government and the municipalities to see whether we could make this generally available around the province, and particularly in the more densely populated metropolitan areas.

I have with me today a letter sent on December 14 by the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority to the Reverend George Birtch. Copies were also sent to the Reverend Glynn Firth and the Reverend Phillip McCready. In the letter the housing authority outlines the principles of the rent certificate plan which makes it an ideal solution to the problem of emergency cases.

I might just point out that a welfare family in Scarborough lost their home on Saturday due to a fire and are moving into other accommodation today provided under the

rent certificate plan. The family consisted of a mother and four children.

I sincerely hope that the Reverend Birch and his colleagues will refer to the housing authority or to myself any hardship cases which come to their attention.

Under the provisions of our new programme we have recently approved an outright grant of \$903,000 to the city of Toronto in connection with the Moss Park low rental project. In making the grant we have stipulated that the money be used to reduce the rentals to those families in the lowest income category. There will be nearly 1,000 family units in this project alone.

A further plank in our programme is the rehabilitation of existing housing for public housing purposes. Provincial legislation permits the purchase and rehabilitation of suitable dwellings in any area in the municipality. The National Housing Act confines such activities to areas designated as redevelopment areas. This has had an inhibiting effect upon our application of this plank, and unless federal legislation is changed we will not be in a position to implement it in Metro until the Alexandra Park redevelopment area is officially designated.

Within the next week or so I propose meeting the federal officials in Ottawa for the express purpose of presenting to them our proposals to broaden the scope of our housing operation. I need hardly add that the purchase and rehabilitation of existing homes will form a significant part of the discussions.

To further accelerate the development of low rental housing in Metro, I propose to introduce a bill providing for the establishment of a central housing agency for Metro and then this bill can go to the private bills committee where it can be discussed by all of the municipalities in the Metropolitan area involved. This agency would be responsible for the planning, construction and administration of all low rental projects in Metro, and would be a focal point to which all families in need of accommodation could apply.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister comment on a question that arises in my mind? Is the government committed to the high-rise proposition in Moss Park?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Moss Park is an arrangement, as I am sure the hon. leader of the Opposition realizes, between—as we made a provision of money there—a number of millions of dollars for the purchase of the

land and the clearing of it. As far as the building of the buildings and their arrangement, this matter is strictly the concern of the city of Toronto. They are the ones who obtain the central mortgage and housing loan, as I recall. We have simply made a grant to them to keep down the rents in the lower income groups.

In short, we have no control. We have made no grant towards the building of the building; we have made a grant towards a reduction of rent fund, if you know what I mean, but we have not charge of the building or the styling of it. This is one of the reasons that I would like to propose, and I have left to the municipalities within this last year, freedom to try to get together themselves on a sort of voluntary central housing authority basis. Now, this has not yet come about. This, I hope, we might bring about by such an Act.

I do not frankly want to be put in a position, and I do not think this House would want to be either, of forcing any one of these municipalities to take a step which they consider contrary to their own self-interest. However, I think if we do present a bill to this House and then we put it before the private bills committee where everybody can come in and have a kick at the can, then we will have an opportunity of seeing whether this is the right way of going about it, because it is essential to do something to get along with this.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Yes, but is the hon. Minister not averse to using provincial money to direct provincial policy? If he determines that high rise apartments are not a desirable thing, I presume he would exercise his—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Yes sir, and I think I indicated last year when we introduced this 12-point programme, that one of the attractive features of a rent certificate plan is that it does provide family units in areas that are in existence. It saves them from deteriorating. It allows the families to be spread around the city and not put together, as in ghettos, and so and so. I hold out great faith and great hope for this programme which is pioneering.

It is a beginning, and nobody else has done it anywhere on the continent. I believe that if we are able to complete this programme and make it successful we will have done a very great thing.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day. There

was a question asked of me concerning the hospital situation in London. I have quite an exhaustive statement here from the Ontario Hospital Services Commission which I propose, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to summarize.

Active treatment bed needs: London is a regional hospital centre and as such provides ordinary care to the people of London and specialized hospital care to the population of a large portion of western Ontario. I have a table here which shows the active bed needs calculated on the widely recognized formula that the Ontario Hospital Services Commission uses. This is roughly five beds per 1,000 of population served, contrasted with the number of beds required on this basis with the number of beds available.

In 1962, given on this form, the bed needs are 1,317 and beds available are 1,278, which is a deficit of 39. By 1967 it is estimated that the bed needs will be 1,452, the beds available will be 1,463, and this will be a surplus of 11 beds.

Now these calculations do not include any beds The Department of Veterans Affairs hospital in London, which is known as Westminster Hospital, would supply. Some of the beds in this hospital are used for the care of non-pensionable veterans who normally would seek admission to the other hospitals. About 50 beds in Westminster Hospital are used for this purpose and have the effect of increasing the available active treatment beds in London. Thus there is, in reality, a small surplus of active treatment beds in London.

The apparent small shortage of beds of the active treatment type in London at the present time, when the DVA beds used by non-pensionable veterans are left out of the picture, will be converted to a surplus when the building expansion at St. Joseph's Hospital is completed early in 1964. This expansion will give a net increase of 185 beds.

Chronic care bed needs: based on the formula of determining the needs of beds of this type, requirement, one bed per 1,000 of population served. The table here shows the following situation: for the year 1962, bed needs were 222, available beds 472, which is a surplus of 250. In 1967, bed needs will be 242 and available beds will be 472, or a surplus of 230.

Thus, there is, based on the recognized formula for calculating these needs, a substantial surplus of beds of the chronic type in London. This situation has been the basis of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission's

refusal to approve the development of any more beds of this type in the city of London.

Convalescent care bed needs. Based on a formula of 0.25 beds per 1,000 of population, the estimated needs of beds of this type are for 1962, 164 beds; for 1967, 178 beds.

There are, of course, no hospital beds in London which are designated or recognized as being of this type. Discussions are presently going on with hospital officials in London with the intention of converting some surplus chronic care beds to convalescent type beds.

To summarize, the small apparent shortage of active treatment beds which exists at the present time is wiped out when the DVA beds used for the treatment of non-pensionable veterans are included. There will be a further surplus of 185 beds when the expansion at St. Joseph's Hospital is completed in 1964. This is an increase of 14 per cent and will greatly ease the pressure for hospital accommodation.

Second, there has been an increasing length of patient stay in London hospitals. In 1958, for instance, the average length of stay of a patient in Victoria Hospital was 11.7 days. In 1961 this had become 14 days. This, of course, puts further pressure on the number of beds available.

Third, the winter season always increases the demand for hospital beds and practically all hospitals have waiting lists of patients for admission during the winter months.

Victoria Hospital admits about 22,000 patients a year so that a waiting list of 1,000 represents the hospital intake for about 17 days, which is a figure not considered to be unduly high in hospital operations.

The Ontario Hospital Services Commission is satisfied that the great majority of patients on the waiting lists are "elective" cases and that no real emergency cases are being denied hospital admission in London.

According to the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, the major problem in hospital operation in London is the fact that the chronic hospitals are full because many of their patients are not truly chronically ill. The solution to this problem is the provision of more custodial type of accommodation in London and the proposed 100-bed expansion of the House of Providence there, will be of great value in dealing with this problem of hospital clearance.

It is agreed that a convalescent type of hospital is needed in London to offer modern physical rehabilitation facilities to disabled persons, many of whom have to be retained

in the general hospitals. The Ontario Hospital Services Commission is discussing this type of development with hospital and civic officials in London.

In conclusion, it can be said that members of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission staff have had many meetings in London with civic, medical and hospital officials dealing with hospital problems and have discussed these matters with the officials at these meetings.

Clerk of the House: Seventeenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MINES (continued)

On vote 1301:

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, before we go on with the presentation of the estimates of The Department of Mines, I wonder if I could take a few minutes to answer some of the criticism that came to me yesterday and with which I did not have time to deal.

A great favourite spot of mine is Elliot Lake. The uranium industry is very close to my heart and I was one, along with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) and other members of this government, who did everything possible to make Elliot Lake self-supporting and have it continue to thrive and provide a livelihood for its citizens during this period when uranium is not as greatly in demand as it was formerly.

I was very glad that the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) brought this to my attention yesterday because it shows an honest interest in a subject which is of major importance to a large segment of our mining industry and indeed to the whole economy of Ontario; and also because I had intended to speak on this same subject a little later during this session. However, I hope it is not necessary to assure this House that the situation in which the uranium mining industry finds itself, through no fault of its own, is a matter of grave concern indeed to this government and every hon. member of it.

I hope it is not necessary to point out in this House that the welfare of the people who had established homes and businesses in Elliot Lake and in the Bancroft area is a matter of very grave concern to all of us. Several steps that are within the power of this government have been taken to relieve the situation to whatever extent is possible.

However, it must be appreciated that really effective remedial measures are not easy in a community such as Elliot Lake which was built entirely around a single industry. When that industry quite unexpectedly finds that its markets are to be cut off, and the rug has effectively been pulled from under its feet, then we are faced with a very serious problem.

The economics of geography might, some say, indicate that it would be difficult to get new industry there but with that decision I do not agree. I believe that it is an ideal community, that it is ready and anxious to provide homes, commercial facilities, schools, churches and all the other amenities that can be offered by a fully modern town. Many hon. members of this House have been there and know that that is quite the fact.

However, I can assure this House that a concerted effort at this time has been made, is being made, and will continue to be made, by The Department of Economics and Development of this government and everybody, including the hon. Prime Minister on this side of the House. I hope, too, that the hon. members in the Opposition are fully imbued with the idea of making a future success of Elliot Lake and keeping it a fine place for its inhabitants in which to live and have a decent way of life.

I should point out that the establishment by The Department of Reform Institutions—when I was Minister before the now hon. Minister (Mr. Haskett)—established a minimum security establishment at one of the Elliot Lake mines and that in its way we helped to take up some of the slack during the period when the mines are not as prosperous as they were.

I am informed, too, by the former hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Spooner) and the present one (Mr. Roberts) that 96,000 acres of bushland north and west of Elliot Lake have been set aside by The Department of Lands and Forests as a park reserve. The area is being studied intensively in order that no conflict of interests will develop over the best possible use to be made of the land.

When all points are settled and it becomes part of Ontario's great park system, I have little doubt that it will rank high as a tourist attraction. The highway to Elliot Lake which ends at the Kirk Lake mine is now being extended seven miles northwesterly into the park reserve. Now that the bridge at Sault Ste. Marie is completed, Mr. Chairman, it is possible that this will be a

great future picnic and hunting area and something that will attract large numbers of tourists to Elliot Lake and contribute to its future prosperity.

This government has given a great deal of direct assistance to the residents of Elliot Lake. It is being provided through a stabilized mill rate made possible by an interest-free loan advanced by The Department of Municipal Affairs. During 1962, \$600,000 was made available on this basis and the previous year the loan amounted to \$480,000, and I expect everyone in this House agrees that those measures are needed and that this government is on the right track in providing them for this town which will come back to its own before too long. It is recognized, of course, that these expedients separately or together will not provide the whole cure and the only real solution for Elliot Lake's difficulties—and on a smaller scale those of the Cardiff townsite, and Bancroft in eastern Ontario—depends on a revival of the market for uranium.

In 1959 the United States government announced that that country's own uranium resources made it self-sufficient and that therefore options for purchases beyond the firm contracts with Canadian mines would not be exercised, although stretch-outs in the delivery dates would be permitted. Now, against this blow to the industry's hopes, Mr. Chairman, we may set another contract for 12,000 tons of U308 to be purchased by the British government.

This contract which was finally signed in July of this year will be sufficient to keep the participating mines in operation for several extra months at least. The original contracts were based primarily upon military requirement, as the hon. members of this House know, and at the time the agreements were executed the only use that was envisaged for uranium was as a fuel for nuclear power-generating plants. That is still the most important and most immediate peaceful application but it is not my intention at this time to dwell upon the great benefit that the nuclear generation of electricity will certainly bestow upon mankind some day.

I come now, Mr. Chairman, to the use of uranium for other than its nuclear properties. That is its application as an alloy to ferrous and non-ferrous metals. For the last two or three years in Ottawa, the mines branch of The Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, has been carrying out intensive research into the feasibility of using uranium with other metals to produce desirable characteristics.

The department has been aided in this programme by the Canadian steel industry and the uranium industry. I am sure that hon. members would appreciate that a scientific project of this kind is of necessity a long-range programme and that concrete results are not obtained overnight. I think no useful purpose would be served and I would be taking up the time of this House without justification if I were to give any detailed summary of what has been accomplished to date, and of the difficulties that have so far precluded complete success.

There have been promising results, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the use of uranium as an alloy in steel to produce extra strength and anti-corrosive properties but there have also been disappointments. I assure you the investigation and trials are going on to see what can be developed and one of these was the discovery that uranium has a tendency to segregate itself in the steel ingot with the result that more than normal cropping of the ingot is required. New approaches have been tried and, although consistently favourable results have not yet been obtained, encouraging progress is reported. The uranium mining industry itself is trying out drill rods made of a steel-uranium alloy and significant improvements in service performance have been indicated.

The hon. member for Sudbury mentioned uro-steel. Uro-steel is also being tried out in square pipe for structural use under corrosive conditions and a seamless pipe for sour crude oil and sour gas wells. Especially constructed uro-steel cord wire cable for use in aircraft is now undergoing fatigue tests. Uranium is being tried out, Mr. Chairman, in bearing steels with a view to increasing the cleanliness of the metal by reducing the oxygen content.

More recently, uranium has been tested with other non-ferrous metals including copper alloys. It has been found that uranium can deoxidize copper without reducing its electrical conductivity. It has also been found that uranium can combine with such harmful impurities in copper alloy, such as lead and bismuth, to render them innocuous. Thus, cartridge brass which, because of slight lead contamination, must now be fabricated by a cold-rolling operation, can with the addition of a small amount of uranium be successfully hot-rolled—a much cheaper process.

Research, Mr. Chairman, in these and other fields is continuing. It is still too early to permit unqualified optimism as to the results but there is hope for success. Just to point out what success in one field could mean to

Ontario's uranium mining industry let me say that it has been estimated that if a use for uranium could be found in only one per cent of the steel produced in North America, and that if as little as 0.1 per cent uranium were added to this fraction, a demand would be generated for more than two million pounds of uranium metal per year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt that our uranium industry faces difficult days at least until the end of the present decade. A good many mines will have to be closed down perhaps until new markets for the produce are developed; others, it is to be hoped, will manage to remain active through the stormy days ahead. Whatever happens in the short term, we know that the rock of the Elliot Lake and Bancroft areas is richly laden with the material that will be in great demand in the new nuclear age. That is one thing we can be happy about and we know that the uranium industry and the people engaged in it will yet resume their former place of importance in our national economy. That was a statement, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to make, to assure the hon. members of the Opposition and the other hon. members of this House that this government is not blind to any of these needs in Elliot Lake and the uranium field. We are constantly working on research projects and other things to see that that great natural resource of ours is used in the future.

There was another question—it was either the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) or perhaps the hon. member for Sudbury—that asked why we did not instruct our prospectors in a better way. We do conduct prospecting classes, and have for years, in schools, in the universities, and in the different areas where mining is carried on. We are doing that constantly.

It was mentioned that Saskatchewan aided prospecting parties with money grants. I think—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Nobody mentioned Saskatchewan at all.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Did not the hon. member for Sudbury?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I do not remember this.

Mr. MacDonald: I did not mention it by name, in case it exercised you unduly.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Saskatchewan is all right. That province is going to progress in mining too, when they get their potash fields working; it is doing all right. They did try

financing prospecting parties; and I am told by the hon. Minister of Mines—who, by the way, is a very close friend of mine, the hon. Mr. Brocklebank—that their results in this field have been very disappointing. It did not bring the results that they had hoped for.

Then there was another bit of criticism from the hon. member for Sudbury about the lack of mining and access roads in the Sudbury area.

Well, I am glad the hon. members applaud; but wait until I get through and you will probably applaud us.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The roads completed in the Sudbury area under the mining and access road programme from 1952 are: the John Smith Mine's road—six miles; the East Rim Nickel road—5.8 miles; the Fecunis Lake road—two miles; the Nickel Offsets road—14 miles; the West Tree Gowgama road—41.1 miles; the Sotham road—10.8 miles, between Sudbury and Timmins; and the Millinet-Selwood road—five miles. This is a total, Mr. Chairman, of 84.7 miles of mining and access road. I think you wish that you had them in your own area, and I do, too.

Another mention was made of our aeromagnetic surveys, and about our studies not finding rich ore bodies. They have to be found by prospectors. My old friends Roy Barker, Bill Dawidowich and Jack Forster, found Geco and Wilroy Mines. That is quite true, and all power to them. I will tell you how they found those two great mines—and Geco is going to be one of the great mines of the future in this country, if not in the world.

They were found through a map that was drawn by Dr. Ed. Thompson, of our own Department of Mines here in Toronto. He originally made the map and outlined the area; then Barker, Dawidowich and Forster were the fortunate ones who discovered the mine. That will be my answer to the hon. member who said that prospectors are the only ones who find ore.

There were a couple of questions on taxation. I think one was that the mines should be taxed on the ore in the ground and that they should pay more, and so on. But you cannot see the ore in the ground, as you know; therefore you do not know what its value it until it is brought to the surface. Somebody mentioned that.

Mr. MacDonald: Who said that? Nobody said that. You are just setting up a straw

man and beating it to death. Do you not get an equitable price on the ore taken out of it?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, now, they are taxed on the ore after taking it out of the ground. They are taxed 51 per cent of two-thirds of their profits; that goes to the federal and provincial governments. On top of that, they pay six to 12 per cent, of a mining royalty tax.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what we are talking about.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The total production in this province last year was \$950 million. Before a bit of that money went to the mining companies, \$755 million was spent on labour, and allied industries for surplus, etc., all in the cost of production. In other words, the cost of production was \$755 million before a cent was turned over; then the tax was 51 per cent of two-thirds of that profit; and on top of that there was the six to 12 per cent mining tax. I think, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Bryden (Woodbine): That is six to 12 per cent for their raw materials costs.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Pardon?

Mr. Bryden: This industry has the lowest raw material costs in any—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All right. But do not forget that it is made up of other facets. If you want to put the mining industry out of business, just start increasing those taxes.

Mr. Bryden: Nobody wants to put it out of business; but a company making \$100 million a year net is not going—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Just a minute. I am coming to that. The statement was made that International Nickel make \$52 million, is not that right, for the first half of the year? Do not forget that that \$52 million represented their operations all over the world. Not in Canada.

Mr. Bryden: Well, a large part of it was right here.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All over the world. So when you figure out—

Mr. MacDonald: According to the testimony of the hon. member for Sudbury, 75 per cent of it is up there in Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would not say that. But do not forget this is a world-wide opera-

tion, and a lot of that money goes into the development of other mines for INCO. They are a world-wide operation; the \$52 million is spread over all countries.

Mr. Bryden: The other countries get the profits and we put up the raw materials.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I could not say that. However, those are things that I wanted to answer before we carried on with the estimates, and I am one who welcomes questions and criticism. I think it is good for all of us, and I have no objection. I am always amazed at the knowledge of some of the hon. members of the Opposition and the questions they ask; I hope they keep it up.

Mr. MacDonald: You have no comment on the mines profits tax and rebates to the municipality?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I had a note on that, yes. The companies were criticized for not making public individual mining taxes. This is not peculiar to the mining industry, Mr. Chairman, either for corporation or income tax. In any industry these are not given to the public unless the company wishes to publish it in their annual report. It is not mandatory that they do it. I have no answer to give the hon. member who was criticizing them for not making public individual mining taxes. There are many reasons why they do not do that, but what they are I do not know. It is not mandatory; it is not done in all cases. Those are all the questions I can remember that were asked of me, I think. There are the answers, and I hope that they are full enough to satisfy the hon. gentlemen in the Opposition who asked them.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, it might be added, for the edification of my hon. friends to the left, that the hon. Minister did not make the record complete. He might have added, in relation to the operations of International Nickel, that obviously there are profits that my hon. friends here on the left are so quick to criticize; that they are also spending, in the next five years, some \$75 million in capital development in the Sudbury area. Some \$50 million of that, sir, is connected with the expansion of what was a pilot project—the production of iron ore pellets from waste materials, which I understand, they previously threw away.

Twenty-five million dollars relates to the opening of the Clarabelle Pit which, we are told, the moccasin telegraph has it, is going to pale the Froot Open Pit into insignificance when it starts operating. Of course, it

has the advantage of being close to the smelting and refining operations, whereas the Frood Open Pit was some miles distant.

If my hon. friends accuse me of being the public relations agent for International Nickel, it is a stigma which I shall bear with all the fortitude I can muster. But let it also be said that I had the honour, for quite a period of time, to advise the union that was in collective bargaining agreement with INCO. Somewhere along the way I had INCO in the courts, while I was acting for the union. We won the first round, lost the second round and the third is still to be determined in the Supreme Court of Canada. Of course a union has now taken over that is more friendly to my hon. friends on the left there. It has supported them; and I expect that so far as my services to the union are concerned, in opposition to INCO, I will be reading *The Unemployment Insurance Act*. I hope not.

I think it ought to be recorded because my good hon. friend to my right here from York Centre (Mr. Singer) informed me that the hon. Minister, in beginning his remarks, when unfortunately I was out of my seat, called into question some of my motives in raising this matter of uranium alloy steel. He addressed some remarks of a qualified nature, as to a possible interest I might have in it, in that I raised a—

Mr. MacDonald: Conceivably you had an honest interest in it.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, conceivably, I had an honest interest. But for my interest, whatever character or quality it was, I think it fair to say that the House would not have been informed of the researches in uranium steel if I had not raised it yesterday. No doubt the hon. Minister's assistants spent a goodly portion of last evening preparing the lengthy prolix about it which he delivered today, because I observed that he read from a prepared statement.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Surely, you would not impute any sarcasm.

Mr. Sopha: Never! Never! I would not need to be sarcastic. All I have to do is count the facts. They speak for themselves. But if the hon. Minister started that little innuendo, then I will be pleased to finish it. Thank you very much. I am only excelled in that capacity by yourself. So let us part in friendship. I think the hon. Minister—and the people from Elliot Lake will no doubt thank him when they read his remarks about the possibilities of this product by way of

bringing them a perpetual relief from the low estate to which they have fallen; though, as the hon. Minister said, this government is not blind to their needs.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I have a comment and a question I would like to ask the hon. Minister and perhaps you will permit me just a minor digression here.

I am constantly impressed with the vigour with which the Liberal Opposition can attack this government on technicalities, but, Mr. Chairman, when you get down to fundamentals it is amazing how quickly they join forces. We have here the hon. member for Sudbury joining forces with the hon. Minister to give us some rationalization on the position of International Nickel. The simple fact, Mr. Chairman—I say it and there I leave it—is that after they have paid their taxes they have been \$80–\$100 million in profits. In contrast to that, we, the people of Ontario, last year got something over \$13 million in mining royalties, not only from INCO but from the whole mining industry.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): How much did the shareholders get?

Mr. MacDonald: I am not interested. They certainly got a great deal, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. member: Most of them are going to New York.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. You berate the fact that money is going out of the country and then the next time you get up and support the company that is sending it out of the country. Mr. Chairman, one other point in his rationalization in support of the hon. Minister, in defence of INCO—the two musketeers, one on each side, defending INCO—the hon. member for Sudbury said that International Nickel was spending \$75 million up in this area. Sure they are spending \$75 million. International Nickel has in the sock at the moment \$321 million in depreciation and depletion allowances. And this is an accumulation into which they are going to dip. They are not going to any shareholders for this.

Mr. Whicher: Is the hon. member suggesting they have got that in cash?

Mr. MacDonald: Sure. Mr. Chairman, we listened for years, for example, about International Nickel as being the company that was going out in a sort of hairychested, red-blooded fashion to develop this nation. "They spent \$180 million," for example, "up

in northern Manitoba." At the time that they did that, they had over \$250 million accumulated in the sock, undistributed profits. In other words, the shareholders are getting plenty. We have got to a situation now where our taxation of these companies is so generous that they do not have to go out and get money on the market.

Mr. Whicher: You cannot get it from the market.

Mr. MacDonald: They can get it from the market. In other words, as was pointed out by the head of the Montreal Stock Exchange, we have got to a very unique position where capitalism does not mean capital any more out in the money market. The very heart and core of capitalism has been destroyed because our taxation is so generous that they have all the capital, at least for the big corporations, available in internally, generated reserves. They do not have to go and borrow it.

Because they are doing that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) has to come in to support backing up loans to be able to develop secondary industry, because a great deal of the money normally in circulation for economic development is tied up in reserves. So this free-enterprise government has to come along and bolster up free enterprise, which will not produce the money to make the economic development we need, and will not do it because it has it in the sock.

An hon. member: What has that to do with The Department of Mines?

Mr. MacDonald: It has a good deal to do with it. Now let me get back to The Department of Mines. I thought I was going to say this and leave it.

It is very interesting, Mr. Chairman, and here is classic proof once again, that this party is a so-called reform Liberal party. They champion the corporations at the drop of a hat.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: It has something to do with their campaign funds; it is the source of their campaign funds.

An hon. member: He was reading the *Telegram* the other day.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. You read the *Telegram* and you will see where it comes from.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might have a few words with the hon. Minister, he and I are pretty good friends. I was very interested in some of his comments with regard to maintaining Elliot Lake as an area in which people would like to live—I have forgotten the exact phraseology but it was very timely. I hope that some time between now and the time that the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs are introduced in this House that he will have a heart-to-heart talk with one of his hon. colleagues, because just today I was in receipt of a copy of correspondence which is now in exchange between somebody who owns property up at Elliot Lake and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner). The simple problem of this man is that he is now going to be faced with foreclosure because he has not paid his taxes, and he has not paid his taxes because he has absolutely no revenue. This is the problem at Elliot Lake. And he has made a very fair proposition that he will pay so much as soon as the—I have forgotten the details of his proposition, but just as soon as there was any rental revenue from these properties he would pay 50 per cent of that rental on back taxes, and said surely no purpose was going to be served in foreclosing and taking this property over by the municipality itself.

Now, I am interested in getting further copies of this correspondence with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, but it strikes me that since this government played a very important role in creating the situation in Elliot Lake, and therefore in creating the mess we now face in Elliot Lake, I would like to have, not from this hon. Minister but from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs at the appropriate time, the purpose he thinks is going to be served, in effect, by turning people out of property that they own because they cannot pay taxes and they cannot pay taxes because they have absolutely no revenue. We will leave that until the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1301 carried?

Mr. MacDonald: You are getting a little insistent, Mr. Chairman, but I am right on Elliot Lake and in the mines department. The question I want to ask the hon. Minister is this: I was very interested in his comments about research. I have said many

times in this House that the future of the uranium industry, I am convinced, is going to be a parallel to the record of the nickel industry.

The nickel industry came out of World War I as a white elephant. It was created to meet the needs of war. When the war ended it had a production capacity away beyond the needs of the civilian market. What happened then was that the nickel industry—if I may say some kind things about the nickel industry for the benefit of the hon. member for Sudbury—did a great deal of research with little if any assistance at all from the public Treasury, they went out and did the research work until they created, as we all know now, uses for nickel that are a thousandfold. You see it all around you. They created their market.

Now, a year or two or three ago when we were up around Elliot Lake I was interested in hearing people there say that the companies were not devoting any appreciable amount of money to research to create the market that they themselves need so desperately. I am rather interested to know whether the hon. Minister's statement—when he commented upon this research work all being done in the mines department at Ottawa—means that once again it is the public Treasury, it is the government departments, it is government geologists and metallurgists who are going to study to rescue this industry from the depression that it faces for the next ten years.

In other words, what are they themselves doing, what role are they playing in the research programme since most of these companies actually had all of their capital outlay returned in the first five years of their existence because of the favourable tax structure, depreciation allowances and prices? In other words, what role are they playing in the creation of the market which is going to be the salvation for their own industry?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has told us that he will get the answer later.

Vote 1301 agreed to.

On vote 1302:

Mr. Sopha: Could we hear from the hon. Minister in greater detail about this business he described yesterday, of geological parties going out from his head office; presumably as a recent development, or has that been going on for a number of years? How many such parties go out and when they do go out what do they do?

Now this question comes to mind very naturally. He talked about Manitouwadge being found as a result of a map prepared in his department. Is that what these parties do when they go out, prepare the maps?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: There are many facets to this programme. It has been going on ever since the department was formed. The man I mentioned to you, Dr. Ed. Thompson, is, and has been, with the department for years.

He was up in that area one year and he had an Indian with him—it is quite a story. He had an Indian with him and he was mapping that country simply because he had seen some of the geology and some of the rock that the prospectors had brought in. This old Indian kept saying: Manitouwadge, Manitouwadge; and pointing over in one direction. Now, Manitouwadge is an Indian word. I understand that there are some of the Indian community in the gallery this afternoon. They could probably tell you a lot better than I can. It is the god of wealth or gold or something of that kind. This Indian got him to go up into that country where Geco and Wilroy mines are now, and he mapped it.

This geological formation was favourable and it appeared on our maps in different recording offices and so on. Barker and Dodd and Forster saw these maps and they thought they would go in there and look it over. Prior to them going, another famous mining man, Murdock Mosher, had been in there and—

Mr. Sopha: Cobalter—from Cobalt?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: That is right. He staked there but he let it go. Barker, Dodd and Forster waited and sat on the property waiting for him to record it, but he didn't. They recorded it and they were the winners in the game of good fortune.

But we have these parties going out all the time. First of all, in conjunction with the federal government, we fly these areas by plane with a magnetometer which registers any favourable geology, with the exception of gold. Gold doesn't have any reaction on the magnetometer. All other metals have and when they get this reaction they pinpoint it. Then our geologists go out and they map it and in turn make up these maps which are sent out to the public. We try to get them in every recording office in the province at the same time, because there is much criticism if one part gets them ahead of the other and stakes that ground which might prove very valuable.

That is what we are debating here. We want to speed this mapping up. That is why we are putting on more geologists and more planes for this magnetometer survey over the whole province. It is a joint project with the federal government and I think that it is something that is going to tell us, all over our province, where the favourable areas are.

Now this afternoon I had a call from three very prominent mining men whom many of you would know if I mentioned their names. They spoke of this new Pickle Crow to the boundary of Manitoba road that I was speaking about; they called me as they had noticed in the press report that I was talking about this area. They told me of two finds they already had make up there which looked very valuable to them. They hoped that this road would be speeded up because it runs very close to where their finds are.

They also said that I should not take a pessimistic attitude toward Ontario mining, which I intimated and which the hon. member for Sudbury remarked about. We still have tremendous values in ore in this province which have not been touched. For instance, this area in the far north, on that Pickle Lake road alone—from what we can guess, we have made no detailed study of it—there are 70 or 80 miles of very favourable geology up in that area which we hope will prove very profitable. Does that answer the question of the hon. member for Sudbury?

Mr. Sopha: What can you tell us about prospecting for diamonds? Is there a group in northern Ontario? There is a rumour there is a group that has exclusive right over quite a large area of land to prospect for diamonds.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I was called Diamond Lil in the House last year and there was a lot of laughter about it, so I took the liberty of cutting a piece out of the *Financial Post*, under date of December 15. I believe you realize the *Financial Post* is a very worthwhile and knowledgeable paper. It is headed "Diamonds in Canada" and it is by Mr. John Black. He says:

For some months, up until a few days ago, ten men have been working near James Bay, picking up rocks. Little tagged bags of these samples have been moving by air to Johannesburg in South Africa.

Now listen to this, you kidded me so much about this last year, I would like to give you some information on this.

Lab technicians there have been examining them for evidence of something called kimberlite. All this because Harry J.

Oppenheimer, head of Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa, wants to find an answer to the question: are there diamonds in Canada? The actual search is being carried out on behalf of Anglo-American's affiliate, DeBeers Consolidated Mines, which for decades has ruled the world's production and distribution and price of natural diamonds.

Diamonds, the most elegant and elusive of all minerals, have been sought before in Canada. Some of the earliest attempts go back to before the turn of the century. Through the years some of the searches have been rife with mystery, confusion and in a few cases, out and out hokum. The James Bay hunt, strange as the word sounds, is the first consecutive programme of diamond exploration in Canada by the organization which is synonymous with diamonds in every language.

The Anglo-American programme began about six months ago. There was little fanfare. It started a couple of weeks after Harry Oppenheimer, told the *Financial Post*—issue of May 5th—that he proposed further "interest" in Canada.

At the time Anglo-American had just laid out \$20 million for 15 per cent ownership of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting. One result of this investment is an indicated \$1.2 million annual income in Canada for the South African complex.

This summer the search zoomed in on a 100 square mile rectangle about 75 miles southwest of Moosonee.

While manned by Canadians, the party was run from Johannesburg through a characteristic maze of Anglo-American subsidiaries. Leader was an Ottawa-based geologist, Mousseau Tremblay.

Tremblay is employed by a small Canadian company which does special drilling jobs from an office near Toronto. Officials of this company say they pay Tremblay, and supply him with what he asks for. Otherwise Tremblay takes his direction from Johannesburg.

Tremblay, one-time staffer of the geological survey of Canada, had worked for the enigmatic Canadian J. T. Williamson, before he died. Williamson became a millionaire through diamond finds in Tanganyika and, for a while, bucked the DeBeers global monopoly. About five years ago, after Williamson's death, DeBeers finally acquired control of Williamson Diamonds and its great Mwadui mine. Tremblay became an employee of Anglo-American.

On the James Bay job, Tremblay has been working over a characteristic blue clay section of the Ontario north, mapping geological features and gathering samples. In a way the work is "blind", since there are few visual clues to diamond evidence. That is why the James Bay rocks will spend weeks in Johannesburg laboratories subjected to complicated mineralogical analyses. How much if any real evidence of diamonds there is, has to be developed in lab analysis.

What led Anglo-American to this spot, no one will say. There is an abundance of opinion that diamonds do exist and eventually will be found in Canada. In part at least this stems from discovery of diamonds in Wisconsin, and other nearby states. Reports of these mines go back 80 years. One report suggests diamonds have been located as far north as Lake Erie.

A prominent theory is that these gems were brought down by glacial drift and because of rock features associated with the finds there is speculation that the source might be the great plateau which divides Hudson Bay from the prairie plains. There have been cases of lesser gems actually found in this part of the north as far back as 1825.

Arctic explorers were believed to have found rocks studded with garnets and other stones. This was far to the northeast on the Melville Peninsula.

Attempts have been made to follow back the drifted tipoff materials. But geologists differed on whether or not these tracer minerals actually originate in diamond host rock, kimberlite. Then about ten years ago Russia made spectacular diamond finds in the northern part of Siberia. The gems were in kimberlite pipes and associated with olivine, garnet, pyrope and ilmenite. All these odd-sounding minerals were known in the Hudson Bay region.

The effect of the Russian find was to renew belief that rich kimberlite types extended in the Canadian north. A number of prominent Canadian geologists stated so publicly. One company, Palco Exploration, undertook to test some of the theory. A crew was organized and more than \$10,000 spent in survey work on ground near Peterborough, Ontario.

A company, backed by Augustus Exploration—parent of Faraday Uranium Mines—got no worthwhile results. Around this time Toronto consulting geologist S. G. Wahl and an associate were doing diamond exploration of their own. These

men also had experience in the South African diamond field. Wahl's work covered several spots in Canada, including northern Ontario. "The approach", says Wahl, "is our own business."

Late in 1961 Wahl took out a three-year prospecting licence covering some 79,765 acres south of Moosonee. One corner of the acreage is cut by the Ontario Northland Railway. Wahl gives no details on his work subsequent to taking out the licence.

But on May 24 of this year Wahl's licence was transferred to Canadian Rock Ltd. Department of Mines records indicate a payment of \$4,100 in the transfers. Canadian Rock was formed in the 1950's to do specialty drilling work. Operations have been mainly on the east and west coasts. The small company is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Hard Metals (Canada) at Oakville, Ontario. Hard Metals (South Africa), parent, is controlled firmly by Anglo-American through a labyrinth of other companies, including Board and Hard Metals, Rand Selection Corporation, De-Beers Holdings—to name a few.

Now that is no small outfit, gentlemen, and it is no joke about there being diamonds in Canada, as you can see. So anybody who last year called me Diamond Lil, perhaps in a couple of years' time or sooner, will be saying, "Well, you really had something."

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Could we have the title of the book the hon. Minister just read?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I was going to come here first with a white beard and a red and white suit and be Santa Claus but the hon. members over there will not let me.

Mr. Sopha: If I heard the hon. Minister right, there is no question about there being diamonds in Canada. I did not hear all of that extract he read from that very fine newspaper, whether there was ever any evidence to indicate that there are in fact diamonds in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Go down to Ryrie's.

Mr. Sopha: He said the closest they had come was finding some in Wisconsin, and that might have been some girl who dropped her engagement ring. Presumably if we find diamonds, and I hope we do, they will have to hire Broderick Crawford to protect them against the nefarious activities of the NDP.

An hon. member: The King of Diamonds.

Mr. Sopha: The King of Diamonds. But I started in a serious vein. I did ask him and he did not reply to me, whether some group had actually taken out the exclusive right within Ontario to prospect for diamonds in a designed area, in a specific area.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: What is the size of the area?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Seventy-nine thousand acres, roughly.

Mr. Sopha: I take it they have not found any yet.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Not to our knowledge; they may have.

Mr. Whicher: They paid us something, did they not, for the privilege?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, yes, sure.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Is the hon. Minister going to answer that question?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I did not hear it. They pay, I think, \$2,000 rental a year and they must spend \$15,000 a year on work; that is the deal. The man is Wahl, whom I referred to here.

Mr. Bryden: Does the hon. Minister mean it is the big South African—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, it is a local man.

Mr. Whicher: Is it a private enterprise?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, it was Wahl who started it and it has since been transferred to the South African headquarters. The representative here is a Canadian. Wahl is a Canadian and his office is in Toronto, and he is their Canadian representative, and is running the operation.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I really have two questions on the hon. Minister's short résumé before he read the article. He had mentioned, I understand, that he felt there was no need for gloom as far as the picture of mining in Ontario went, and I appreciate that enthusiasm and I wondered, sir, whether the hon. Minister might account for the fact that in British Columbia the mining industry seems to be moving ahead, certainly this year, at a faster rate than in Ontario. That was my first question from the remarks that the hon. Minister had made.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, I am told that British Columbia will be a bit ahead of us

this year, and Quebec, but do not forget that 37 per cent of all the production in Canada is still in Ontario, 37 per cent. We are a great deal ahead of any other province. But I am a little disturbed at our effort being behind B.C. and Quebec at the present time. We are trying to do everything we can to get the lead position again.

Mr. Thompson: Does the hon. Minister feel he is doing as much as the government of British Columbia in connection with assistance to mining industry?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, we are trying to.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister with respect to his roads—this again was brought up in his answer to the hon. member for Sudbury. I would be interested in knowing the basis on which Ottawa helps the hon. Minister's department in connection with roads to resources, and whether he is satisfied with their help at this time.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: It is 50 per cent, but we are not satisfied. We wish the Dominion would put in more money and we would match it. In fact, their contribution was reduced from \$1.5 million to three-quarters of a million dollars this year and, as a result, we had to reduce our road budget. But one thing we do, if there is a property found that indicates it is worthwhile spending money on a road to it, we will do it on our own, in some other way, in order to help the property, but that is the limit of the federal government contribution: three-quarters of a million dollars this year, where it was \$1.5 million prior to this year.

Mr. Thompson: Does the hon. Minister think there is any relationship between that drop from the federal government and the fact that the mining prospects are not as bright this year? I should say this: I am no expert in any way on mining, but I have talked to several people connected with mines, and in one of these conversations I have learned that there was one mining company that was trying to get a road built through to a mining area. It found that there was considerable delay from the point of view, not perhaps as much on the part of your department, but in your joint decision with the federal government, and finally, in this case, they considered going around by another province in order to get the road built, because of the delay. Do you find, when you present to the federal government the negotiation for meeting costs half way,

are you satisfied with the prompt reaction from the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Is it the nickel mining and smelting road you are speaking of?

Mr. Thompson: No, nor would I be in a position, sir, to mention that.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The federal government approved that.

Mr. Thompson: Are you ever having any cases where there is delay, from the point of view of the federal government and the amount that they are giving? I think it is significant to me that here we are in, perhaps, not as booming a year as last year. You said that you might make the \$980 million or you might go a little below it, and yet in this particular year the federal government is decreasing the amount of money it is giving you. Have you made representation to get more from them?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, we are working on it. We lost a very dear friend of ours through death a short time ago. You probably knew Mark Boyer, Deputy Minister of Mines. A great loss to the federal government. He came in the time your government was in power and he was a great help. We have a new Minister now in the hon. Paul Martineau, who is a very fine young man and our relationship has been very, very friendly and we are hoping that it will continue so and that we will get greater grants.

But again, let me make this point. If we cannot get any more money from the Dominion and yet a mine, such as you speak of, shows that it is a mine that needs the road, we will do it some other way whether it is through The Department of Highways or some other branch of government. We will see that they do not suffer and that the road will go in.

An hon. member: There is going to be wasteland in the north this year, famine—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Do you think so? Well, I cannot answer that right now. I do not think so, though. Not in our area; but it may be, sir, that the reason there will be a famine this year is because you have got so many roads in your area there is no other place to put them.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): No, no.

Chairman: Order.

Vote 1302 agreed to.

On vote 1303:

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1303, I have a few questions. I would like to raise them on behalf of those men who have not been mentioned heretofore in the estimates in the last two days—the miners who go down into the bowels of the earth to produce the meat of the subject that we are dealing with at the present time. I would first ask the hon. Minister a question.

Last April in the previous session, the hon. Minister introduced into the House—and it was carried on through—Bill No. 75, that was a revision of The Mining Act in many instances. I would ask him: Does the hon. Minister intend to introduce into the House this session further amendments to The Mining Act?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: There will be new clauses introduced in The Mining Lands Act but nothing new on safety. I might say this, that we have had several interviews with the men concerned with mine safety on the union side, and I might tell my hon. friend that they are one of the most knowledgeable—what shall I say—the nicest group to deal with I have dealt with for a long time. You have got a lot of fine fellows in that group.

Mr. Bryden: You do not pay much attention to them.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Pardon?

Mr. Bryden: You do not pay much attention to them.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, yes, we do. Oh, yes we do. And we are giving very careful study to some of the things they requested. We are not too far apart on the whole thing, there are a couple of clauses in there that you boys know as much about as I do, and more that are a bit difficult. But we are getting places and we hope to meet them again before too long. We have met them twice this year already. But there are problems. I know what you are driving at and we are certainly giving these problems a lot of attention.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, Mr. Chairman, this answer certainly amazes me because I think that the hon. Minister has treated this organization with discourtesy at the least and, I think, with some contempt and in a callous manner. If we go back to the presentation of the bill, the problems presented by the steelworkers was pursued last year by the hon. leader of our party (Mr. MacDonald) and

the hon. member for Woodbine to some extent, and they promised that we would pursue them again this year and I think there is some justification even in regard to the promises or inferences made by the hon. Minister to the steelworkers committee who presented the brief.

If I am correct, sir, and it can be checked—last year the hon. Minister informed the House that in regard to Bill No. 57, the steelworkers delegation said it was fine to go ahead and pass the provisions and the amendments provided in Bill No. 57 on the understanding that they would present a further brief to the hon. Minister and his department this year and they would seek and expect consideration of their brief from the department. I understand that the hon. Minister gave them that assurance.

I have their brief here which was presented in October 1962, and I think they deserve this much attention anyway. I would like to put on record a few paragraphs of the introductory remarks that will lay the basis for my criticism of the department at this point. And I quote from their brief—from the first page:

United Steelworkers of America represent some 18,000 workers covered by the provisions of The Ontario Mining Act and the regulations made thereunder. These workers are engaged in the mining of iron ore, gold, asbestos, copper, stone-quarrying and the smelting and refining of nickel and other non-ferrous metals. In addition, certain sections of basic steel mills are also covered by The Mining Act.

And they have attached exhibits to give the locality of those mentioned.

As a result of their day-to-day experiences our members have considerable knowledge of the Act and the regulations. They are constantly making suggestions on how mine safety can be improved and for amendments to the Act and its regulations. It is our firm belief that The Mining Act is due for revision and we respectfully submit for your consideration the proposals set out in the brief, and we would welcome an opportunity to meet with the legislative committee on mining, since we believe the Legislature should consider several sections of the Act in light of the practical experience of our members in the operations of The Mining Act. There will also be a number of recommendations concerning the administrative practices of The Department of Mines. And we would stress at the outset that all these recommendations come from mining camps and from practical miners. They are not presented as carping

criticisms of either the Act or the department but as an honest endeavour to make the Act under which these people live—and some of them die—more effective and efficient in its operations.

In reviewing The Ontario Department of Mines report for the years 1955 to 1959 inclusive, the outstanding fact was the number of accidents. Over a five-year period there were 250 fatalities and 13,774 non-fatal accidents. It can be reasonably supposed that a large percentage of the latter have resulted in permanent disablement and loss of future employment in varying degrees. It is appalling to realize a modern industry should have such a record of accidents.

Now, the hon. Minister said very briefly in his opening remarks that the accident record compared favourably with other industries across the province. This is debatable, I would suppose, by those who have had a closer look at the statistics. But my main point is, Mr. Chairman, why disregard a request of such an important organization in this regard? Certainly there has been a demand for more labour union co-operation, and particularly in the fields of safety. This, you will remember, has been recommended by almost every committee that has been established since 1950. One of the main recommendations of the Roach committee has been the establishment of labour-management safety committees. The recommendation was that if they will not agree to recognize safety committees, then it should be mandatory through legislation, and it is a known fact that, in the mining industry, they do not give them the kind of recognition that they deserve, and in many industries it is the same case.

So I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that I have been pursuing some particular needs in the Act in the seven years I have been a member in the House. I know that the steelworkers, on behalf of the miners, have asked for a specific revision in the Act, before my time, and I think that it is complete discourtesy and callousness in saying that there are not going to be revisions in respect to what they have requested, in this session of the House. I am sure that, after speaking to Dwight Storey, who is the legislative director for the steelworkers, a couple of days ago, he will be somewhat disappointed that the mining committee is not going to meet and that they are not going to have an opportunity to present this brief in a little more detail and try to get the department to give recognition to some of the

things they feel should be in the Act, particularly pertaining to safety in the mine.

As the hon. Minister has said, this is a fine brief. Well done and specific, and I think it would make a great contribution to the Act itself. There is one specific area, and I hope that you will give it some attention: the section, 161, subsection 2, which has been a bugbear, even to the democratic process of industrial relations and I thought I had some recognition from the hon. Minister early in the last session on this point, that we might get some place.

It seems to me that the answer I received, in all deference to the ex-Minister of Mines—and he made it quite firm as far as he was concerned—was that management would determine who would be hired and who would be fired, who would be promoted and who would be demoted. I felt that maybe there would be some change in attitude from the new hon. Minister and I must say I am, at the least, disappointed that we are not going to make any headway in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to remark that I am quite concerned about the hon. member saying I was callous, and disregarded the union, and so on. I would like the hon. member for Wentworth to know, Mr. Chairman, I was a union card-carrier myself at one time. I have never in my life been callous or discourteous to union men. I appreciate the great work they have got to do and I admire them in every way; if you do not believe me, go up and ask the union men in my own area.

Mr. Gisborn: Based on your promises, your inferences—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Just a minute. I told you at the opening of my remarks of the respect I had for the group that came in and the knowledge that they brought to me. Do not forget that I spent a considerable time underground myself on this job; you do not think I would be going underground if I thought there was not every safety feature there that it was possible to have. And we are continually improving conditions. I pray to God we will not have accidents, but we unfortunately do. I do not know any way—nobody does—how they can be prevented. I do not think that the suggestions you make, which we have not finalized yet, are responsible for a great many accidents. But part 9 of the Act governing the operation of mines was revised last year, and there has been no disregard of the

union brief, I assure you. We commended them on it, as I said at the start of my remarks and it was excellently done; they offered to present us with written evidence to back up their argument on one item.

They wrote lately to advise that they have not yet got it ready; we cannot revise this section of the Act every year. I am not making any excuses, at all. We have not gotten together on this one item, I assure you. It is a very difficult problem, as you know, and you cannot put me in the position where I say “No” to the unions and “No” to industry. I am a referee between them, an arbitrator, and I am looking forward to seeing harmony in the industry between management and labour. We have it in a very large percentage of the cases, and I hope that I would not be the one to disturb that relationship. I assure you I have not at any time been callous or discourteous to any union man who appeared before me; I never will be.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I still do not think that what the hon. Minister has told us is satisfactory on this very vital issue. Unfortunately, one can say, without fear of contradiction, that the record of this government in regard to safety has been uniformly bad in almost every field where safety problems are concerned. They have been negligent and indifferent and usually have acted decisively, if at all, only after a calamity. We had examples of that in regard to natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas. We have seen it in regard to construction safety, and so on. These matters can be dealt with at the proper time and place but I—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Would you confine yourself to the estimates on mines.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I think I was confining myself to them, Mr. Chairman. Surely the question of mine safety does include the general question of safety.

Mr. Chairman: If you have a question, word it as a question. A general discussion took place at the beginning of the estimates.

Mr. Bryden: I am speaking specifically to vote 1303, Mr. Chairman, and I submit that I have a right to make comments on the question of mine safety and the operation of mines.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, but not on gaslines, construction and other matters not connected with mines.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, I made a reference to the general record of safety, which I think is relevant. It is proper to put a specific item into its larger context. I had indicated that I had no intention of discussing those matters in detail, but merely to mention them. They can be discussed on some other occasion; but we saw this attitude of negligence in those fields, and I submit to you, sir, that we see it in this field.

The hon. Minister, in his introductory remarks the other day, did not take quite the complacent attitude on mine safety that he took last year; he indicated quite properly that this is an area where eternal vigilance is essential. Certainly the statistics of the workmen's compensation board bear that out very clearly. One will find, from looking at those statistics—I have the latest report for 1961—that the accident rate in mining is about the highest for any industry in the province. I would concede that there are inherent hazards in mining which do not exist in other fields, so naturally it will inevitably have a higher accident rate; but the fact that it is just about the highest in the province is certainly a cause for concern.

Last year the hon. Minister brought in a bill which ultimately became chapter 81 of the statutes of 1961/62, regarding the operation of mines. It was a step forward to some degree, as I understand it from people who are familiar with the technical problems involved. There were some forward steps and some improvement over the old legislation, but I think that the people who represent the employees in the industry made it very clear to the hon. Minister that they regarded his bill as far from satisfactory. They accepted it as a step forward but they certainly hoped that he would entertain suggestions from them and would allow them to come before the mines committee this year, to put forward detailed recommendations for still further improvement in part 9 of the Act.

I have no doubt that the hon. Minister heard them very courteously, but it would appear that that is about as far as it goes. He certainly had before him a very good brief, a very constructive brief; but as far as one can make out he does not plan to do anything about it. He plans, I take it, to continue the 19th century, autocratic approach which is still apparent in this Act—the attitude that the employer knows everything and the employee knows nothing. The employee should be seen and not heard and should be grateful to the employer for letting him be there.

This essentially is still the kind of philosophy that comes through in part 9 of the Act. Unfortunately it is the kind of philosophy that is adhered to by too many of the tycoons in this industry—not all, but by too many of them—and it is particularly apparent in subsection 2 of section 161 which by statute eliminates important sections of collective agreements affecting the rights of employees.

The steelworkers, in their brief, in addition to proposing a great many very detailed technical amendments to the Act, made a proposal that I think the hon. Minister ought to be prepared to consider right now. It is not a technical matter but a very important matter of social policy and one intimately affecting the question of safety. That is that employees as well as employers should be involved in the whole programme of improving safety standards.

Right now the attitude towards them is that they are to be seen and not heard. But the hon. Minister himself has worked in a mine—I have not worked in a mine but he has—and I have talked to people who have worked in a mine, and I am quite sure that he would be prepared to concede on the basis of his own experience, and from talking to others, that the fellow on the job can often spot a hazardous condition that other people, with perhaps greater technical qualifications, will not necessarily spot. Why do we not encourage the pooling of knowledge of the people working right on the job, making that available and a factor in reducing accidents in an industry which, as I have said, as far as figures of the workmen's compensation board are concerned, is just about the most hazardous industry in the province?

It would seem to me that, since it is about the most hazardous in the province, all possible devices should be used to reduce accidents. Surely employee-employer co-operation, which is most highly successful in many other industries some of them considerably less hazardous, should be introduced in this industry. The antediluvian attitude of some of these employers in the industry, who regard themselves as answerable to nobody, should be discouraged. Positive steps should be taken to ensure labour-management co-operation in the enforcement of safety standards. Subsection 2 of section 161 should be modified so that it will not nullify important provisions in collective agreements as it does now. Employers who enter into collective agreements respecting the rights of recognized unions of employees can do so with their tongues in their cheek in this industry because they know when the chips are down

they can always rely on subsection 2 of section 161 to nullify the effect of the agreement.

This much at least the hon. Minister could surely do this session. I would suggest he could go further and start to create conditions for genuine labour-management co-operation in safety matters in this industry such as exist in a good many other industries.

Vote 1303 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Might I—is that vote passed?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: We will be glad to hear from you.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Go ahead, Mr. Chairman, go ahead!

Mr. Bryden: Even safety the hon. Minister does not care about.

Vote 1304 agreed to.

Vote 1305 agreed to.

On vote 1306:

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I have a friend, quite interested in development of mining properties, who informs me that the regulations of The Mining Act which cover the recording of claims and also the transfer of claims are quite archaic and are much different than the conditions that prevail in the province of Quebec.

If you want to record a number of claims, as I understand it, you have to make out a separate application for each one. If you want to transfer a number of claims which are contiguous, you have to make out a separate application for each one. He says he believes it would be much more advantageous and much better for the industry and those involved if you could list all the claims on one application and the same way with the transfer, do the same thing. I will expect an answer next week.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, the gravel deposits of Brant county are extensive and very valuable and I understand that the material from them is shipped all over Ontario. But as the deposits are worked out, the pits that are left are not only unsightly and dangerous but a great waste, as they are left semi-flooded and scattered with boulders.

Now some of the municipalities in the area have passed by-laws requiring the companies to leave the worked-over pits in reasonable shape. I do not know the wording, but they expect them to grade them, replace top soil, and I believe there is some indication that there might be reforestation in co-operation with the government, whereas other municipalities have not seen fit to legislate in this way.

I feel that legislation should be uniform in this regard. I wonder if the hon. Minister's department has looked into this and what recommendation might be made. Would the hon. Minister care to comment on this?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: I might say to the hon. member I am glad he brought that question up because our select committee on municipal affairs is looking into that whole problem with the hope that they will come up with some final solution to it. I agree with the hon. member. In my own area this happens a lot. It is unsightly and very dangerous when these holes are left filled with water. We have had kiddies up in our area drowned, and things of that kind.

It has been a matter of concern to The Department of Mines. They have no avenue through which it can be settled and it was turned over to the select committee on municipal affairs. They are looking into it now with the hope of finding some solution that will be satisfactory.

Vote 1306 agreed to.

Vote 1307 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: That concludes the estimates of The Department of Mines.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply do now rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

House in committee of the whole; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

GUARANTEE OF LOANS

House in committee on Bill No. 2, An Act to authorize the guarantees of the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario.

Section 1 agreed to.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I made some observations during the second reading about the second clause of this, and if I may briefly review it, I said at the time that the guarantee that is sought to be set up in this section, in my opinion—and I do not, Mr. Chairman, in any way, seek to give the impression, I assure you, that I am at all entranced by my opinion; that it is an opinion honestly held, and I want to bring it to the attention of the House. That guarantee that is sought to be set up, and the language employed, cannot be enforced in the courts.

Now, if we may look at the clause—and it is rather likely as a matter of fact, as you will observe, Mr. Chairman, I always have an almost inherent distrust of clauses that measure more than an inch in width. Now this one is a full three inches, if my eye is accurate. Its arithmetical size or, I should say, geometrical size. It says:

On the recommendation of the Minister, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council may guarantee the payment of any loan, and the form and manner of the guarantee shall be such as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council approves, and the guarantee shall be signed by the Treasurer, or such other officer or officers as are designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council, and upon being so signed, the province of Ontario is liable.

So far, so good, and it is in the employment of that word, that phrase “the province of Ontario” that I make my first complaint. I contend, in the first place, Mr. Chairman, there is no entity, known to the law, as the province of Ontario. So far as my awareness is concerned, the province of Ontario is a geographical institution, if one may call it that, but it is certainly not a legal entity. Be that as it may, if it was sought to enforce this guarantee in the court then certainly any action must be dropped against Her Majesty the Queen.

I said, on an earlier occasion, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat, that I am more of a royalist, or monarchist, than the people who sit in the Treasury benches, because if I were awarding this I would say, unhesitatingly, the Queen, being the central figure of our

parliamentary institutions—I would rephrase that: Her Majesty the Queen in the right of Ontario, as represented by the Minister of Economics and Development. Later on I shall point to a specific statute where exactly that phrase is employed.

Now, it is an old adage of constitutional law, as I understand it, that the Queen cannot be sued in her own courts, and that, of course, finds its origin a long time ago in the constitutional development of the United Kingdom and the constitutional and monarchical institutions as they were transplanted from the old land into Ontario. That is the situation of common law. The Queen cannot be sued in her own courts. The reason for that was that of course the Queen owned the courts, and the Queen ruled in the courts. You can transpose the word “King”, where I use the word “Queen”. I use the word “Queen”, because our present sovereign is a lady, of course. A monarch cannot be sued in his own courts, runs the old adage of the law, except by specific statutory enactment provided, and that principle, Mr. Chairman, of course, is recognized in our statutes. If one resorts to The Interpretation Act, one will see a very short statement in section 11, which reads thus:

No Act affects the rights of Her Majesty, her heirs or successors, unless it is expressly stated therein that Her Majesty is bound thereby.

Let's just have that again, Mr. Chairman, in case somebody didn't quite hear it.

No Act affects the rights of Her Majesty, her heirs or successors, unless it is expressly stated therein that Her Majesty is bound thereby.

Now, nowhere, in this statute, upon a perusal, does it appear that Her Majesty becomes bound by the guarantee that is sought to be set up by section 2. I would say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that a guarantee is a very complex part of the law, and it is called the law of suretyship. Generally speaking, when a guarantee is given, that is to say, if you, Mr. Chairman, guaranteed my promissory note at the bank—which is a doubtful possibility, but just supposing you did, for a moderate amount, knowing your great affluence—supposing you made a guarantee for my note for \$100 at the bank. Then, Mr. Chairman, if the bank, which is the institution guaranteed, did anything at all to prejudice you, let us say, for example, the bank extended me more time. I had to pay this note in three months and I went around to the bank and said, “I cannot pay

it in three months, give me an additional couple of months", and the bank said, "That's fine", and they didn't inform you, then, Mr. Chairman, you're off the guarantee, because you have been prejudiced. Or supposing I owed the bank money on two or three accounts, and I went in and said "I want to put this on the note that Mr. Whitney has guaranteed", and they put it against another account, instead of applying it to that one, and then they come to you and they say: "Sopha hasn't paid his note", and you hear of this misapplication of funds, you might protest to them, and say, "I am no longer on the guarantee." You would be successful, probably.

Now, in this guarantee that is set up in section 2, one can conceive of almost innumerable sets of circumstances in which there might arise some conflict. That is why I take the trouble to raise this. There might arise some conflict as to whether the province has been prejudiced by the institution guaranteed. The province might not feel, the Provincial Treasurer might not feel, because of the course of events, that have occurred between the person guaranteed, and the institution guaranteed, that it is morally bound to cover its guarantee.

One could conceive of all sorts of things happening. The province could say to the bank, the trust company, the insurance company, the lending institution, "We are off the hook; you prejudiced us." Now, that institution, if it is acting upon this statute and has in good faith loaned the money for the capital expansion or the work or the establishment of the factory, as the case may be, then that institution would want to resort to the courts in order to determine whether the province is liable on its guarantee or not.

My proposition is that they cannot have recourse to the court, unless the statutes specifically provide that Her Majesty the Queen is liable in the courts because, in order to sue the province they have to sue Her Majesty, who is the figure in whom all things provincial inhere. She is still the central figure, the legal figure of the province, and they cannot sue her—I am making my submission—they cannot sue her unless there are specific words in the statute that give the right to bring the action in the courts. Now, that is one possibility. Let us look at it from another point of view.

We know the habits of this government. We have seen it demonstrated, of insuring itself against its liabilities. And I had occasion at another time to draw objection to the

insurance feature of its liability that is set up under The Highway Improvement Act and in respect of their liability to keep highways in repair and the liability for negligence in failing to keep them in repair. The Highway Improvement Act imposes upon The Department of Highways a legal duty, and provides the machinery, the mechanism, whereby that legal duty is enforced. But the province, this great Department of Highways which takes in something like \$155 million annually, does not want to assume the role of self-insurer. It insures itself against its liability with private insurance companies and any actions brought against the province are defended by that insurance company.

Now, who knows but in respect to the liability sought to be set up in section 2, that the province might not also insure itself with a private insurance agency? I do not know; they might well do that. There is such a thing as a fidelity bond that they can purchase. But the important thing is this, that if they do insure themselves with a private institution against their liability, as has been the experience in The Department of Highways, those private insurers will not hesitate, mark you—they will not hesitate, Mr. Chairman—to surround themselves with all the prerogatives of the Crown.

I related the unfortunate case of Mr. Perappilits at some other time—where he named The Department of Highways—but I will not go into the details of that save to say that the private insurance companies do not hesitate to use every defence that is open to them in order to defend against a liability sought to be imposed upon them. That is my point; and if it is a prerogative of the Crown that may be pleaded they will not hesitate to plead it.

If we may just glance at The Highway Improvement Act, Mr. Chairman, and see how that statute deals with the liability of the Crown. I have said, and if I may just briefly re-state that, that The Highway Improvement Act is probably the only statute in the province that imposes a liability on the Crown in court. I know of no other that imposes such liability; but in imposing the liability The Highway Improvement Act also sets out the mechanism under which that liability may be enforced. That is my point.

I am making the plea that if it is intended in this statute to convey to the business community, the lending institutions, that the province intends to be legally liable, that it intends to be liable in the courts for the guarantee that is sought, then let the statutes

say so. Add a section, and let it say that Her Majesty the Queen shall be liable in the courts.

Let me go back to what The Highway Improvement Act says, and I will read it into the record in that regard:

In an action against the Crown under this section the defendant shall be described as Her Majesty the Queen in the right of the province of Ontario, represented by the Minister of Highways for the province of Ontario. And it is not necessary to proceed by petition of right or to procure the fiat of the Lieutenant-Governor or the consent of the Attorney-General before commencing the action; but every such action may be instituted and carried on, and judgment may be given thereon in the same manner as in an action brought by a subject of Her Majesty against another subject.

That is the end of the section.

So you can see, Mr. Chairman, very readily, that the draftsmen of The Highway Improvement Act recognized this very problem. I would hope that the hon. gentleman who pilots this bill through the House is reasonable enough to see the problem that is encompassed here. The remarkable thing about it, you know, Mr. Chairman, the thing that never ceases to amaze me, is when I see, on the one hand, the way statutes go through the standing committees of this House and the way they are amended, and then the way they are passed through the House—and sometimes those procedures are each of them very peremptory—and then on the other hand, when I visit the law courts downtown and see one of the statutes of this province being considered, being argued in the courts, and see some of the highest priced lawyers of the province, perhaps three or four of them on each side, arguing for three or four days about the meaning of the statute. I would say that, for the efficacy of their arguments in relation to it and the obfuscation that they can create in the minds of the judges in interpreting it, the quantum of their reward is in some way correlated to those factors.

I hope I have made that sufficiently obscure so that no lawyer is able to accuse me of saying anything against the profession; but they had better not look at it too closely.

My point is really a plea for simplicity. Mark you, some hon. members might be surprised at that but it is a plea for simplicity. I am merely saying, and I am making a lawyer's objection, that if it is intended to

give the lending institution legal right to collect from the province then do not we risk—once the guarantee of the province has been accepted—that something might occur by way of the pleading of the prerogatives of the Crown and this constitutional law so as to throw discredit upon the province and its name in the money markets?

In other words, if it is intended to let them sue on the guarantee then put it in the statute in the way that The Highway Improvement Act has it. Do I need more convincing proof of the justice of my cause than to point to The Highway Improvement Act and say that when they sought to set up a legal liability on the Crown they put it in the statute?

There is another statute that is very informative; that is the statute passed by this Legislature in 1952. It is chapter 8 of the statutes, pardon me, chapter 78 of the statutes of Ontario, and it is called, An Act respecting proceedings against the Crown. That statute follows the lead of Great Britain, which is always about a generation ahead of us in such matters. They are always about 25 years ahead of us in Great Britain in most of their social advances.

The British recognized, of course, that in the increasingly complex nature of government, when government was doing many more things that affected the citizen, it was only right and just that the citizen should have recourse to the courts to sue the government, to sue the Crown, for the liability which it created against itself by its negligence, its misfeasance, its nonfeasance and its sins of commission and omission. So the British, a long time ago, passed such a statute as The Proceedings against the Crown Act.

This government passed it—I assume there was no opposition to it—in 1952 and it became printed in the statutes as Chapter 78; but, for a reason that is perhaps known only to Providence itself, it has never been proclaimed. The Lieutenant-Governor has never been invited to give his assent to it. I assume he would if he were asked to do so.

This statute, in its several 30 sections, sets out the manner in which the Crown may be sued in court. That is for its wrongs. It prescribes that action shall be conducted according to the rules of court; it gives the style of cause that may be used and, in fact, everything else that is necessary to be done, Mr. Chairman, to take the Queen successfully into court.

We always get back to that proposition—to get the Queen in her own courts and

successfully sue her in them—because she has a very special right that inheres in the majesty of her office not to be sued in the courts which she owns and which she runs, where all the proceedings in those courts are carried on in her name and all the magistrates and all the judges simply are as servants and agents of the Queen to administer the justice according to the common law and according to our historic concept of it. But to watch some of the magistrates sometimes you would think they owned the courts and were given to them by almost divine right, the way they carry on. However, I will save that for another day.

But I merely point out the special character of an action against the Crown. You see, Mr. Chairman, in section 2 it never does say in respect of the liability sought to be set up, if you look at it or if any hon. members will look at it with me, it never does say that this guarantee furnished by the province is enforceable. After it says that the province of Ontario is liable for payment it never says anything more about how the guarantee is enforced.

And I will predict—I hope I am wrong, I honestly do hope I am wrong—but I will predict that the first time the Minister of Economics and Development goes to a financial institution with this statute in his hand and waves it in front of them and says: "Loan this company \$25 million and we will guarantee it", that that company which probably hires a lawyer who is paid something in five figures, to advise them, is going to say to the Minister of Economics and Development: "We would like to accept your guarantee but we have looked at your statute, our solicitors have looked at your statute, and we would like you to tell us, Mr. Minister, how that guarantee is going to be enforced in the courts, in case you go back on it."

For that matter, Mr. Chairman, it is in the interest of the province that in seeking to set up this legal liability—as no doubt it intends in respect of this guarantee—it is in the provincial interest to set up the method of its enforcement. It is as simple as that; set up the method of enforcement as they do in The Highway Improvement Act.

Now that is all I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman. I hope I have got to the ear of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay).

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): He was not listening to the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: No? Well, I would be surprised to hear that because he is a very courteous

man and I only make that plea to him. Perhaps I will be accused—I hope not, I hope I am not accused, I do not like to be accused—but I perhaps will be accused of seeking in some way to display my knowledge of such things to the House when in reality I am only displaying my ignorance of them. But if that accusation be made, then I will say to the accuser, as I said to my hon. friends on the left today that I shall have to bear it with all the fortitude I can muster at this Yuletide season.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): I would say to the hon. gentleman that he was quite correct, that I was listening to what he said, every word of it, and whilst I was unable through limited facilities that I was given by the Lord himself to follow all of what the hon. gentleman mentioned, I nevertheless believe that he sincerely feels there is an important point involved in this.

He mentioned The Highway Improvement Act. I do not recall the section number. Does the hon. member have the section number of The Highway Improvement Act?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it is 33, subsection 7.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That section, as I understand it, is the only section of its kind, I think, in any of our legislation, and I would say to the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, that in the preparation of this bill which was prepared initially in the department, it then proceeds to the Legislative Counsel's office for improvement and to be put into proper legal form. I have discussed this with the Legislative Counsel and also the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), because the hon. gentleman gave us the benefit of his observations several days ago during, I think, second reading of the bill.

The opinion expressed by both the Treasury people and the Legislative Counsel is that this section follows a similar kind of section in many other Acts. I am advised there are Acts dealing with co-operative loans, school debentures, municipal debentures, housing loans, junior farmers' loans, municipal improvement loans, Sandwich and Windsor and Amherst Railway Act, the Ontario Hydro Act, and so forth; it is a provision very much like this which has enabled the province to guarantee I think some \$1,750 million for the debentures of Ontario Hydro, and this doubt has never been raised before.

I do not mean, therefore, to say that there is no merit in the position taken by the hon.

member, I only say that there are persons who are in the Legislative Counsel office who are the servants of this House—who advise the government on matters of the legality of our legislation—and they maintained to me that the position as set forth in the Act is adequate; that it has covered a number of hundreds of millions of dollars of guarantees which the province has issued, without this matter ever having been raised before.

I will, however, say to the hon. member that I think that the point that he makes raises a general proposition. It may well be said that if this Act were to be changed in the light of the great many other Acts which have a similar provision, such as the one in this Act, it may throw some suggestion upon the other Acts that they are not valid Acts and I think this would concern the Treasury at the moment.

However, I would assure the hon. member that I do think this is perhaps worth looking at in terms of a general enabling piece of legislation and I think that is all I can usefully say on it.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister something. In the fifth line "and the interest thereon made for development purposes by the lender". I am sure that the hon. Minister has in the back of his mind that this will be used for industries which employ labour or substantial labour. But on the other hand under this word "development", we might be developing a motel or a restaurant or some industry classified as one of the services. Now, I personally would hate to see this bill used for purposes that do not employ substantial labour and I would like him to say something about those words "development purposes".

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I do not know that I can usefully add anything to that which I have already said on second reading and on first reading. It is the intention and the basic purpose of this Act that we establish an agency to encourage development.

With respect, I think it might at this stage be an error to try to hedge in the meaning of development. What I think we have in mind is anything which will increase the productivity of this province, anything which will lift the gross provincial product to a higher level, things which will add to the labour force and decrease any number of the unemployed.

These are things which I think we gener-

ally consider to be a matter of development for this province, and with great respect to my hon. friend I would hope that we could leave this word "development" at the moment. Semantically it may not be the very best, but it seems in one word to sum up the tenor and the feeling that gave rise to this Act initially.

Mr. Whicher: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: As a matter of fact, I would say to the hon. gentleman that whilst we at this stage do not intend, I do not think, to get into tourist accommodation in northern Ontario, this is perhaps an area where assistance should be given, and perhaps on further recollection the hon. gentleman might agree. I have been approached I know. I am sure other hon. members have when they have travelled in the north by those engaged in the tourist industry, expressing an opinion on how difficult it is to obtain financing in the tourist industry in some areas of the far north. Such a guarantee might make that financing a possibility and I think it might thereby be an effective instrument in assisting the tourist industry in the north.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, there is another point I want to raise. Does the hon. Minister consider that he may come under any criticism in the financing of industries that are in direct competition with the same industries financed by an individual or by a corporation?

I have heard some thought about this. Perhaps some people might think that it was not fair, when they put up all the money themselves to get into some particular industry; and then some other group, which has not got the financial resources simply goes to the province of Ontario because they are not considered a good risk to the extent where they can get any money from the financial houses of this province, and the province says: well, all right, you have got a good chance of success, here is the money; as a matter of fact, maybe at a reduced rate of interest from that paid by private enterprise. Would the hon. Minister say something about this?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I think frankly the hon. gentleman has raised a valid observation. I think it is very difficult, however, to enter into any of these modern techniques of encouraging development if we do not consider that there are two sides to these things. I am sure that the hon. member weighed that in his mind when he was pro-

posing last year a development fund in the amendment to the budget speech, and I am sure that he realizes that this is a risk.

On the whole I think most of our people and most of our industries will feel that if this is going to give employment and it is going to help increase the gross product of this province and thereby revenues and so forth, that this is perhaps a worthwhile thing. I mean, I cannot say that somebody is not going to object to it.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Chairman, may I ask this question? I have in mind a construction company that has been in business for a number of years and which through some misfortune in a contract that they had in the past has had to curtail its operations. However, they still have a large amount of equipment and are trying to continue by taking just small contracts, but they cannot get backing from bonding companies in order to obtain large contracts. I would like to know if companies such as this, that have been in business for a number of years and went to this development fund, whether they could be recognized?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I would say to the hon. gentleman that this Act envisages really two aspects. One is the guarantee of loans and the other, although it is not spelled out here I have told the House that it is to be done, we are establishing in the department a small businesses branch where we will have people available to give help with reference to managerial and technical problems.

Now it may very well be that a company of this nature, of which the hon. member speaks, their problem may be administrative. It may be financial, I am not sure, but I know that the department will be more than willing and very anxious to receive from these people a stipulation of the nature of their problem and to discuss it with them and see if we can help them. I would say to the hon. member that if the problem is in terms of bonding, we would not be issuing bonds. On the other hand, it may very well be the guarantee would be available in some way to assist them; but I certainly tell him that we would be very anxious to do what we can.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, it was pointed out in the House, and I think quite

rightly so, that section 3 could be strengthened by changing a few words in it. It does now read that the Minister may establish an advisory committee. I am grateful for the observations that have been made and I would move now that this language be changed and the section read:

The Lieutenant-Governor shall establish an advisory committee.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I always like to see an hon. Minister accept suggestions from the opposite side of the House. I would suggest, however, that the amendment really does not meet the basic problem at all.

The section as it stood read that the Minister may establish an advisory committee to assist him in considering applications. Now it will provide that he shall establish such a committee, but there is nothing in the statute, and there is no way, I suppose, of providing in the statute, that he will pay any attention to what the advisory committee recommends to him. The old saying that one can lead a horse to water but one cannot make him drink is quite applicable here.

I think the essential problem is that the administration of this statute is in the hands of the Minister, sir. I do not think that this type of legislation should be subject to ministerial discretion. The hon. Minister in previous discussions of this bill referred frequently to an agency. I think the basic criticism is that there is no provision for an agency. The Minister is the agency, he determines whether or not people will get a guarantee as authorized by the Act.

He now must set up an advisory committee. We do not know who the advisory committee will be, we do not know whether he will pay any attention to their advice, we do not even know if the advice will be any good in any case. I think that the real answer to this problem is to put the administration of the statute in the hands of an agency that is independent of the Ministry, that is set up by statute and then administers the legislation and grants guarantees according to some published set of rules, and in a manner that is not impartial but is seen to be impartial.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Could I just make one comment? It has been suggested by many people in the House that one of the problems they feel is that we guarantee, the Legislature guarantees, bonds of Ontario Hydro and Ontario Hydro is independent

and removed from the Legislature and there is much suggestion that this is not the desirable thing.

Now this is precisely what the hon. gentleman would be proposing as I understand it, that this Legislature would have to guarantee loans. Have to guarantee! Its credit would be used irrespective of its point of view, and could be used by some independent group over which it had no authority, before whom it could not call anyone to account, and so forth.

My own view is that I was torn, frankly, when we were preparing this bill, as to whether it should be in this department. Now if I put it in a commission I think I would have been subjected to the argument that we have already got too many commissions—perhaps not by you, my hon. friend, but by somebody else. We have already got too many commissions.

A hundred million dollars of guarantee and no committee you could bring them before; no full responsibility in the House. These are among the other arguments that have been so often used.

On the other hand, if I put it in the department, the attitude is I ought to have a commission. So I mean I just could not win on this thing, one way or another. I just had to take the chance on who was going to hit me hardest.

Now then, in this aspect particularly, I want to draw to your attention that I assure this House that there will be an advisory council or committee. I assure them that there will be representation on it of industry and of labour and of finance and these people will, I hope, be nominated by their various associations upon whom we will call. I would think that you would realize that you cannot get people of quality to sit on these groups, if their opinions are not going to be given consideration. I respect this. On the other hand, I do not think the government wants to be bound, simply because some outsiders happen to say that something, in their opinion, should be done.

Now the last point I want to make is this: that I do not have anything to do with approving the loans. The loans are approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council.

An hon. member: Well, it is on your recommendation.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Sure! Well, on whose recommendation should it be? On mother's? You have to have it on somebody's!

Mr. Bryden: That, Mr. Chairman, is a complete evasion. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-council, as we know, is the Cabinet, which is a political body and I am sure that they will act on the advice of the Minister, or the Minister will not stay there very long.

It has been said that uneasy lies the head that wears the crown, and the hon. Minister's crown seems to be bearing down on him very heavily at the moment. He thinks that he is in the situation of being damned if he does and damned if he does not. But I think this is the sort of problem that one ought to consider in terms of the logic of the situation.

If there is anyone, and I do not say there is, but if there is anyone who objects to the establishment of independent agencies, *per se*, such a person is stupid. In this day and age there is an important role for the independent agency, the quasi-judicial agency. I am suggesting that this is an area where such an agency has a role to perform. It is not true, as the hon. Minister has suggested, that once such an agency has been set up it cannot be called to account by anyone. That is a matter, Mr. Chairman, for us to determine.

There have been some suggestions in this House, and I think with some validity, that Hydro in the past has not been sufficiently accountable to this Legislature or any of its committees. But that is not inherent in the nature of the thing. That merely results from the inadequate procedures we have had in the past. I would point out to the hon. Minister that the federal government has made provision not merely for guaranteeing loans but actually for advancing money to worthy creditors in the Industrial Development Bank. For a great many years that bank hardly did anything, but in the past two or three years it has been quite active and has advanced quite substantial sums of money. It is an independent agency and it is not merely handing out the guarantee of the government of Canada, it is handing out the money of the government of Canada. I think its operation is satisfactory and I think a similar arrangement is appropriate in this situation—actually it is not an identical situation; we would not have a bank because it is not envisaged that money will be advanced—but a similar sort of agency with a similar degree of independence, subject always of course to being called to account by the Legislature, is an appropriate way.

However I can see, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister is not going to be persuaded on this point so I presume there is no point in pursuing it any further.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister made reference to getting good people to act on advisory committees, yet the evidence is abundantly clear, and admits of no contradiction, that the hon. Minister thinks the only people qualified to advise on the economic affairs of this province are Conservatives. I know of no Liberal who has been appointed to any of the councils where you have the authority to appoint them. You come into my constituency and you appoint the man whom you hope is going to run against me. He is on the television, being a television announcer, night after night announcing that the hon. Minister has appointed him to the economic council. You would think that His Holiness, Pope John, had appointed him to the ecumenical council.

I know of no Liberal that you have ever appointed.

The second thing you speak of is \$100 million. Where in this statute is the figure \$100 million? Where did you dream that one up? The sum of \$1 million is referred to in the Speech from the Throne. If you mean to guarantee \$100 million, put it in the statute. In other words, put your money where your mouth is, as they say in the vernacular! Show you mean that, instead of promulgating that, all of it!

Third, where in the statute is there provision where you report to this Legislature from time to time on the amount of the guarantee that you have rendered yourself liable for? It is silent. We never know. Six months from now; a year from now? You will be gone after that. I will not go beyond that point.

How much have you rendered the province liable for? Why not a statement in the legislation saying that the Minister shall report to the House, at least annually, at least once a year?

Every other statute has it, requiring a report. He shall file a report about how much of the guarantee has been used.

Now those are just a few friendly observations and I hope early in the New Year we will hear about some prominent Liberal that you have appointed to something.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, I am not going to get sucked into that invitation to make comment upon prominent Liberals! But I would point out one gentleman, for instance, who is on the economic council and that is Mr. David Archer. He can hardly be described as a prominent Conservative. Your point was that I only appoint Conservatives, this is the first point you made—

Mr. Sopha: He is NDP. Now you are toadying up to the socialists.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I am not toadying up to anybody! Now then, the next point—I only say that in a friendly aside to the very friendly comment that was made.

It is not necessary to have anything in this Act about making a report to the Legislature because this Act will be administered by my department and the department is responsible to the Legislature and during my estimates can be called to task by everybody in this House. That is the proper way to do it.

As far as the \$100 million is concerned, one could easily put up to \$100 million; but what do you do then if in the middle of the year you have gone to, say, \$100 million and two or three very excellent opportunities come along? You just say: I am sorry, we will have to wait until the Legislature comes back again. This is all you could do and I think it leaves greater flexibility to put it this way.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, in connection with section 5, I was interested, sir, that the hon. Minister spent a considerable time in drafting this particular bill.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I did not say in drafting, I said it has taken a great deal of time to develop the concept and the principle of this and to discuss it with the people in the community around this province who will be involved in it.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I am suggesting, sir, it would appear as though you had not taken much time in drafting it.

Mr. Macaulay: Well, as I said once before, you are not offending me. It is the legislative council which drafts these Acts.

Mr. Thompson: Well, whoever it was, it appears that there has not been much time taken and I would like to refer to section 5 describing "the conditions that shall prevail before application where guarantees will be considered." I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell me exactly what that section means. From my own point there is confusion about this, it could mean the broad economic conditions that prevail in the country, or it could mean the narrow conditions that are required by each applicant.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That is what I had in mind, that regulations will be drawn which

will prescribe the conditions that should prevail before an applicant can make an application for a guarantee.

Mr. Thompson: I am not a lawyer; I am just a simple fellow from Dovercourt. I say that there is ambiguity in conditions, without qualifications, the way it is worded now. It would have been easier for me to understand if you had suggested something like prescribing the conditions required at that point before guarantees will be considered. That is my first point.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I appreciate the hon. gentleman's observations.

Mr. Thompson: If I could then turn to another aspect in connection with the conditions of these applicants; I am wondering, with respect to the lending institutions, if they are going to have to give some sort of a share in guarantee with respect to the loans. Are they going to give—I mentioned, when we were discussing this in second reading, that I understood there was a practice with lending institutions that, apart from someone guaranteeing the loan, the lending institution itself has also to put up some of this directly. They have a direct responsibility in connection with the loan.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: An institution would put up all the loan. I do not understand what the hon. member said. The lending institution will be putting up the loan.

Mr. Whicher: Will the government guarantee it 100 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Oh no, not necessarily. We are anxious to bring about development; and if it looks as if we have to guarantee a portion of it we will attempt to guarantee as little of it as possible and still bring about the development. I think that is the basic point. There is no point in going for 100 per cent coverage if 50 per cent will do the job. Our purpose will be to limit our guarantees if we can, but what we want is development.

Mr. Thompson: As far as the hon. Minister is concerned, he is leaving this fairly flexible. There is no rule on this. Might the hon. Minister guarantee 100 per cent?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister in a position as yet to indicate when regulations are likely to be issued under this section?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: As soon as the bill passes the House, assuming it does, and has Royal Assent. We are now drafting regulations in the hope that the bill will pass the House.

Mr. Thompson: One point, and I would still like to emphasize this, is that I had felt—though I appreciate the hon. Minister emphasizing that the bill is for the purpose of development—concern about this section A, that there could be conditions which are not conducive to industry to develop. The hon. Minister may say: "Well, look! Economically, the situation looks bad across the province, therefore we are not going to guarantee loans; because guaranteeing loans is not enough. We will have to wait until it looks as though the economy is beginning to boom again."

I say quite sincerely, that I think if you are going to give leadership you will not wait. But I still feel that that section A could be interpreted two ways; and I would like to feel some assurance that, in connection with the loans, you will not rely solely on this measure. But if you are moving, other than just in providing loans—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: As a matter of fact, if we had had this bill through the House sooner—and I do not mean to be unfriendly, but the sooner we get this bill through the House, the sooner we will be able to get into business. So far as lagging is concerned, in some respect it is in the hon. members' hands.

Mr. Thompson: In answer to that I would certainly hope that the hon. Minister is not inferring that the duty of a parliament is not, first of all, to give complete scrutiny to the public funds that are going to be given to the people.

Sections 5 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 2 reported.

It being 6 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

(Monday, December 17, 1962)

Front Cover: The words "Evening Session" appeared as a printer's error and should be deleted.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, December 18, 1962
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Tuesday, December 18, 1962

Notice of motion	409
Indian Welfare Services Act, bill to amend, reported	409
Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowances Act, bill to amend, reported	409
General Welfare Assistance Act, bill to amend, reported	409
Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-1963, bill intituled, reported	409
Interpretation of an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario with respect to the collection of income taxes, bill respecting, reported	409
Co-operative Loans Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	410
City of Oshawa, bill respecting, Mr. Thomas, second reading	410
Village of Bath, bill respecting, Mr. Whitney, second reading	410
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	410
Presbyterian Church in Canada, bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, second reading	410
City of Belleville, bill respecting, Mr. Sandercock, second reading	410
City of Belleville, bill respecting, Mr. Sandercock, second reading	410
Chatham Community Young Men's Christian Association, bill respecting, Mr. J. F. Edwards, second reading	410
University of Windsor, bill to incorporate, Mr. Belanger, second reading	410
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Lavergne, Mr. Troy, Mr. Reilly, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Root	410
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Trotter, agreed to	439
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	439

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1962

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Government notice of motion No. 6,

Resolved:

That, (a) there shall be paid monthly, out of the consolidated revenue fund,

(i) to the chief judge, an allowance at the rate of \$7,000 per annum,

(ii) to the judge of the county court of the county of York, an allowance at the rate of \$4,500 per annum,

(iii) to the judge of every other county and district court, to every junior judge of a county or district court, and to every judge for the county and district courts of the counties and districts of Ontario, an allowance at the rate of \$3,500 per annum;

(b) every allowance payable under subsection 2 or 3 of section 9 of The County Judges Act in respect of the year 1962 shall, notwithstanding any other provision in that behalf, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund at the rate of \$2,000 per annum,

as provided by Bill No. 28, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Resolution concurred in.

THE INDIAN WELFARE SERVICES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Indian Welfare Services Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 11 reported.

THE MOTHERS' AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowances Act.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 12 reported.

THE GENERAL WELFARE ASSISTANCE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 13 reported.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-63

House in committee on Bill No. 15, The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63.

Sections 1 to 15, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 15 reported.

COLLECTION OF TAXES

House in committee on Bill No. 27, An Act respecting the interpretation of an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario with respect to the collection of income taxes.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 27 reported.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions, reported certain bills without amendment, one bill with amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions, reported certain bills without amendment, one bill with amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE CO-OPERATIVE LOANS ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 31, An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF OSHAWA

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr1, An Act respecting the city of Oshawa.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

VILLAGE OF BATH

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr4, An Act respecting the village of Bath.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BAPTIST CONVENTION

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park), in the absence of hon. J. Root, moves second reading of Bill No. Pr6, An Act respecting the Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr7, An Act respecting the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE

Mr. E. Sandercock (Hastings West) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr8, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE

Mr. Sandercock moves second reading of Bill No. Pr9, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CHATHAM COMMUNITY YMCA

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth), in absence of Mr. G. W. Parry, moves second reading of Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting the Chatham Community Young Men's Christian Association.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr36, An Act to incorporate the university of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. G. Lavergne (Russell): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I do so, sir, as I always do, with mixed feelings. There is the feeling of pride and privilege, sir; pride in having the opportunity of standing in this honourable House and that privilege of serving the people of that great riding of Russell. Then there is the other feeling of humility and responsibility.

Sir, may I say this to you, that at all times in this honourable House I feel ever so humble because I know that back home there are some hundreds of people who could fill this seat much better than I, hundreds of people who could express themselves more eloquently than myself, and perhaps serve their public more, but for some unexplainable reason they did not offer their service and I was the chosen one.

Then there is the feeling of responsibility. I am sure that all the hon. members of this House feel this, that the responsibility weighs heavy upon our shoulders, and I, sir, pray each and every day that I may be given that opportunity, or at least that assistance, to carry out and discharge those duties of responsibility so that my actions would be worthy of the people whom I represent.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to offer to you those traditional words of appreciation, words that are sincere in my heart, sir. I offer these to you for every

little act of kindness, those words of advice that came both from you and from your office and I am sure it is the same words of advice that have been offered to every hon. member of this House.

I would also like to take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. members who have been elevated to Cabinet posts and they who have been appointed to commissions. I would say this—not like some of the hon. members of the Opposition who got up and berated the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) for choosing this man and pointing to others—but I would say this, that while we know that in this House there are many who could fill these seats, I feel that the hon. Prime Minister has chosen well and has chosen wisely and he has surrounded himself with a group of young, energetic people who will definitely bring good administration, the continued good administration to this province.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add my words of congratulation to the mover and to the seconder of the speech from the Throne. They did a magnificent job and I offer my sincere congratulations to them. The speech from the Throne is resplendent with all good things for this province and for the people, and I am not like some of the hon. members of the Opposition who may say it is an election-year speech from the Throne. I say this to you, sir, that it is typical of the speech that emanates from this side of the House and from this government.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. member does not like elections, does he?

Mr. Lavergne: If the hon. member would repeat that, I did not hear him.

Mr. Sopha: I said the hon. member does not particularly like elections, does he?

Mr. Lavergne: Well, I am going to tell the hon. member—Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best way to answer my hon. friend over there who has that soft voice and is very seldom heard in this honourable House, that my hon. friend and his ilk over there are always crying about elections. Well, now, I would say this, that whenever the election is called and the smoke clears, they will find that the hon. Prime Minister has pinned their hides to the wall.

Mr. Sopha: I will give the hon. member three to one he does not get elected.

Mr. Lavergne: I have got that in my hip pocket, for the hon. member's information.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Lavergne: Mr. Speaker, I do seriously want to pay tribute to that great band of men and women who make up the civil service of the province of Ontario. Now, sir, I had the opportunity of entering many of the offices, and their kind deeds and their actions and their courtesies are very good indeed. And I would like to say this, that—unlike my hon. friend who is rising to his feet all the time, who is always belabouring, berating the civil servants who have no opportunity of defending themselves—in my humble opinion, I feel that the civil servants in the province of Ontario are the greatest goodwill ambassadors in this province.

I heard my hon. friend speaking here and he always gets up and says, "I want to be fair".

Mr. Speaker, I would say this, that my hon. friend from Sudbury has taken the word "fair" out of his vocabulary and thrown it away; he doesn't know how to be fair, never knew and will never know.

When he is speaking about elections—now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, and I want to say to my hon. friend, as long as he keeps—if he puts his ears where his mouth is, and kept them as open as his mouth, perhaps he could listen and hear something. There is my hon. friend from York South (Mr. MacDonald), a professional gravedigger, who has all the attributes of a gravedigger, and has that which goes with it, the tongue and the teeth to do it with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue what I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted, I would like to go into this. I have listened to some of my hon. friends; I intended to get on my feet, and perhaps to extol my own virtues, and there aren't too many that I have. If my hon. friend will only get to his feet if he wants to say something, and give me an opportunity to answer. They are like a chorus over there, Mr. Speaker, they are like a chorus, you know; they are not only room mates, not only desk mates, they are room mates on top of that, for political expedience, they fall into bed together, and they do this, do you know why Mr. Speaker? They do this because they say, "We have to face a common enemy," and they point over this way, and say, "We have to face the common enemy." Well, Mr. Speaker, I have something I would like to inform them, that they would do well to wise up and to realize it is not the government that is the common enemy, because it is the people of Ontario who will never entrust, in the hands of either of these two parties, the

ruling of this great province. They are their common enemy. You can rob a little, and I would say—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lavergne: Now you just listen, my friend. You just get up and don't mumble. Keep your hand out of your mouth and speak up. If you have anything to say, say it. Just say it.

Here is a man who lets his own rhetorical abilities run away with him. He is so impressed with his own speech he stood in this honourable House—and I was a witness to it, and if it hasn't been struck out of *Hansard* it will be there for all time—and said that he had defended safe-crackers that are most honest, yes more honest, than presidents of Kinsmens or Kiwanis clubs, or presidents of other great corporations, Mr. Speaker. I would say to my hon. friend that that in itself is an insult to the intelligence of the people of Ontario. My ears are as open as your mouth, my hon. friend, and that is very wide.

Mr. Speaker, now I am just—I had intended coming up here—but my cheering fans over there—I better put my speech away. There was not much to it, and I would have let them off easy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: I also stood in this House, or sat in this House, and listened with great patience to some of the flood of words pouring from the lips of the Opposition. Here an hon. member stood up every five minutes—up and down in his seat—questioning, criticizing, condemning, castigating this government or the department heads. And if a very simple question is asked of him, and this is a very simple question, Mr. Speaker—"What would you do?"—his earth-shattering response, the answer to do away with all answers, in a very hearty manner, is "I sit here to criticize, not to offer an alternative." Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I think the hon. leader of Her Majesty's Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) when he hears his members say that, must feel that he has a mink stole around his neck. When an hon. member stands up and says he was sent here by intelligent people of the province of Ontario to criticize and criticize, then I think that is an insult to their intelligence. My hon. friend, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sopha: I am not your friend; I am mad at you.

Mr. Lavergne: Mr. Speaker, parliamentary procedure will not permit me to call my hon. friend what I would like to call him, but

perhaps if we meet outside this House I could tell him what I think about him. I am not permitted to say it here—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, I imagine you know all those words, too.

Mr. Lavergne: I am not permitted to say it here, but Mr. Speaker—would that silent voice from York South say what he—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): If you have anything to say, why don't you say it?

Mr. Lavergne: My hon. friend, why don't you just shut that what you are trying to talk with! Just keep that closed! Keep your ears open and perhaps you will learn something, too. You, my hon. friend, have nothing to offer to the people of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend over here, as I stated at the outset, is nothing but a professional gravedigger. He digs more with his tongue and his teeth than a professional gravedigger digs with his shovel. He is the type of man who likes to bury people. He tried to do a good job down around my place. He came down and tried to do that, but—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): People did a job down there.

Mr. Sopha: Does he know if he has a speech?

Mr. Lavergne: I think they did a remarkable job, my friend. I think you have something to learn about that. You have something to learn about that, and—

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend across there had his opportunity to address this House. If he does not like what he is hearing, the exits are not closed; they are not locked; he can leave any time.

Mr. Sopha: Why not just read us a carol—The Night Before Christmas—

Mr. Lavergne: Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, and I might as well get down to the point—

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lavergne: —where this Opposition—

When we speak of points, my hon. friends would not know a point if it hit them in the face. But when we get down to facts in this matter and we hear the berating of the Opposition who speak of this government—when they go back and say we should not go back into history, we should look to the future and the present. I am going to

say this, Mr. Speaker: If this government had not picked up these shattered remnants which the former administration left in the province of Ontario, Ontario would be in a sorry shape today. It would be in a desperate shape, as my friends said it would be. They picked up what was left—

Mr. Sopha: It would be worse.

Mr. Lavergne: It would be worse if it was with you, my hon. friend. But it picked that up and forged forward; and today, Mr. Speaker, Ontario is looked up to. All the eyes of the rest of this great country of ours are focused on Ontario, because from this government comes forth some of the most forward legislation in the Dominion of Canada. I want to touch on some of the departments, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, I would like to touch on The Department of Highways.

An hon. member: That is a good department.

Mr. Lavergne: That is a good department since this government has taken it over, but it was in a terrible shape in days gone by when the hon. members opposite had it. Today, Mr. Speaker, you can go the width and breadth of this great province of ours, travelling over ribbons of concrete. In former times, I know down in my own riding, the people from the interior had to either come out with horse and buggy or sleighs in the winter. There were no roads, there were only paths there. There were only cow paths. When this government took over there was a difference though; they put themselves to the task and today you can go throughout my riding and drive along these cushions of cement and asphalt—

Mr. Sopha: Do not mention the name of Lavergne as you go through.

An hon. member: What is the hon. member's point?

Mr. Lavergne: My point is just about as pointed as the head of the hon. member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lavergne: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to them over there speaking about education. Mr. Speaker, you know the shape that education was in before this government took it over. Today the province of Ontario leads in the matter of education. It has the best and greatest legislation on the North American continent and that is recognized.

Some of my hon. friends sitting up there

should perhaps remember policies enunciated by the former leader of that party who said that there was too much money spent on education. He said there was too much money spent on education and that if he was elected we would go back to the little school house. This was one of the policies of that Liberal Party.

Perhaps these young men who say they were not associated with the party in those days should read back into the history of their party. This is what he said.

Mr. Speaker, this government has gone forward in the matter of legislation with giant steps. I repeat that today the province of Ontario leads all other jurisdictions on the North American continent in the matter of education.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I hear my hon. friend speaking about Eastview. There is an old saying that down in Eastview anything can happen and does happen. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: they have just written a new song down there and the title of this song goes like this: "Eastview must be heaven, 'cause they have no Sophas there." That is spelled s-o-f-a-s though, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in their right mind in Eastview who would crawl into bed with my hon. friend who is from Sudbury, the way he is talking all the time.

But, as I said before, I have listened to the torrent of words that emanate from the other side in matters such as have been brought forward. There is no doubt that they are trying to impress everyone with their importance, they are trying to impress everyone with the matter of education, and on top of that I would say this, and perhaps this is a friendly warning to the hon. leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): He is a fine man.

Mr. Lavergne: Oh, he is a fine man, I do not disagree with that. But perhaps a friendly warning to him that some of these boys sitting in the back are in such a haste to get down there into the front seats and perhaps take over the leadership, that he would be well advised not to turn his back on them. If the hon. member wants a copy of *Hansard*, I will send it over to him.

Mr. Speaker, in the province of Ontario we enjoy the greatest type of government in any jurisdiction. This is not only my belief, but this is the belief of the great majority of citizens who make up this province of ours.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members would just speak one at a time, perhaps I could hear what they say, but it is a mumble and jumble of voices and no one can make out what they are saying.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lavergne: Mr. Speaker, down in my riding—I want to say this—that down in Russell, this starts at the westerly extreme end of Ottawa and it goes down and borders on the border of the riding of Prescott; and starts from the Ottawa River and goes from the Ottawa River right down to the Cambridge line. Included is a great portion of the city of Ottawa. We have the two airports, Rockcliffe Airport and we have Uplands Airport in that particular riding. Down there, Mr. Speaker, there are a great people, the English and the French, with many new Canadians who have come into our riding and have brought in their own culture and way of life and have contributed much to our way of life. But they have one thing in common, Mr. Speaker, they have one thing in common, and that is that they stand shoulder to shoulder, and they stand hand in hand and support a good government, the type of government that this Progressive-Conservative government is giving to the people of Ontario today. And they will continue to support them!

Mr. Sopha: Is the hon. member going to run again?

Mr. Lavergne: That is an established fact. And I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker: my hon. friend asks: "Am I going to run again?" Perhaps my hon. friend would like to come down to Russell and run there. I will run on this ticket and let him run on his ticket and see how far he gets. If the hon. member feels he is so big and so important, all he has to do is to come down to Russell and the people of Russell will send him back to where he came from with his head between his legs.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lavergne: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is in for a surprise! Now if he would only put his pocketbook where his mouth is, then perhaps we can find out just what is what. Mr. Speaker, if you'd ask that excitable young man, the human jumping jack, if he would just sit down a little; he had his day in court, let me have mine. Whether he likes it or not, let me have mine. I appreciate his interjections though, Mr. Speaker, he can continue to do so, if he wishes.

My hon. friend says: "Make your speech more sensible." Well, Mr. Speaker, if any person has to make a speech more sensible! We are sent here, not as these free to criticize, but sent here to pay attention to our work. I am sure that my hon. friend, when he stands on his feet with some of these speeches and some of these bold words that he calls sensible, Mr. Speaker, has another guess coming. If ever a lot of utter rot and nonsense emanated from the lips of any man!

I have sat here, day in and day out, I have sat here for the last few years and listened to this erupt from the lips of this particular hon. member, who is so puffed up with his self-importance that he cannot see two feet ahead of him.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to bore this House the way some of my hon. friends over there have bored this House continuously since the opening of this particular Legislature, but I would like to say this: that I am reminded of the particular clergyman who stood up in the pulpit, this particular Sunday, and he said this. He said: "Brethren, tomorrow, at least next week, as you know, and if you do not know, I will inform you, that there is a provincial election in the province of Ontario."

And he said: "Further than that, that is the right, it is the right that your forefathers and your fathers fought for. It is the right for you to cast your ballot and to choose your representative." He said: "It has gone beyond that. I say to you that it is not only a right, but it is now a duty that you preserve that which your forefathers won for you." And he said this: "I am not, of course, permitted to tell you how to vote. Standing in the pulpit, I cannot tell you that. But perhaps in going to vote on election day, you may keep this in mind, that Heaven is blue and hell is red."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of this great province of ours are looking to this government to continue in office, to continue the good legislation that they have provided. They are looking to this government and will continue to look towards it for many years to come, because just as long as this government continues to provide the legislation and the human betterment that they have been doing, and just as long as my hon. friends in the Opposition continue in the same manner they are, like feathers in the wind storm, not knowing where they are going.

Even today, yes, even today you pick up one speech one day. One hon. member is

talking about one thing, the other is talking about another. It is all confusion and chaos. They do not know where they are going. They are spinning around like feathers in the wind hoping to alight someplace.

What they are doing, Mr. Speaker, right at the present time, they are trying to collect some of these platforms, some of these planks in the platforms, some of these great planks that they had in this platform of years gone by, some that they had in yesteryear and just a few years ago. Today, and I say this to you, Mr. Speaker, that these planks that they are trying to collect are nothing but political driftwood which is drifting on the seas of uncertainty.

They are trying to collect it, to lash it together; and what they are trying to lash it together with is nothing but utter nonsense, and the voicing or the shouting of—I am looking for the word, I will get it, you give me the word—they are trying to tie it together with lies, first of all, and broken promises.

Mr. Speaker, and I say this to the people of Ontario, that if they ever, at any time, try to get on that platform, the platform of broken promises and wishful thinking, it will not be a sturdy platform, it will collapse under them.

Now I say this to my hon. friends, and I repeat it—they who are roaring and crying for an election—I repeat this that when the battle cry has sounded and when the smoke rises from the political scene, and I repeat this for the information of their hon. leader, that he will find, and the Opposition will find out, that their political hide has been nailed to the wall.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not my last speech. I just want to say this, that I did want to stand in this honourable House and say a few words. These I have said, and I want to say this also to my hon. friend across who said that I will not be perhaps a candidate down there. I will repeat this that if he wants to put his money where his mouth is, and we can find this out, perhaps he can come down and if he wants to come down and run against me then we will find out what the good people of the province of Ontario in Russell will do to a man of his ilk. Thank you.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I must confess at the outset I have been thrown a bit off-stride after listening to the remarks of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Lavergne). I thought in his earlier remarks that I was hearing again a chapter from

David Copperfield, and those who have read the book will know the character to whom I refer. If they do not, they will be told about it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and your staff for the courtesies that have been extended to me in the past. I do not know, at times I may have caused you concern in my eagerness to get information from some of the hon. Ministers. I do want to add my welcome to the fine young hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). I am quite certain, as has been said by other hon. members in this House, that he will enjoy, I am sure, as I do, serving the people of his riding. I know that he will make the same contributions as that very fine member, the late Mr. Hanna.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, at least the former Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Spooner), the sponsor of that trip north—I want to thank him very much, and particularly his staff, for the wonderful job they did. No stone was left unturned to make our journey and the journey of the hon. members most enjoyable. I know, in fact I am sure, it was an eye-opener to many of those who had known nothing of the north, and they got some idea of its potential.

As someone has said before, the changes have been rung and there are new faces in the front benches. Partly, the image of the former Ministry has been changed for sort of an image of youth. I want to warn the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Robarts) that youth alone will not lead him to victory.

This afternoon we heard the carol singers with their lovely carols. I am sure that the civil service commission and those in the civil service are to be congratulated for their very fine performance.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Troy: I listened to them and some of their beautiful carols. I intended to be much more trenchant in my criticism tonight, but after hearing those beautiful sentiments I decided to tear up my notes altogether and make a new speech.

We had a visit in my riding—a social visit—by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) to the Progressive-Conservative association there and fortunately the association gave the hon. Minister an opportunity to see all the fine elementary schools and the fine secondary schools we have in the area; and also that young university of ours which is a branch of Laurentian.

I am sure that he was quite convinced that North Bay is an educational centre. I presume that he also saw the teachers' college and I hope that he will very soon persuade the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) to build a new one.

I notice in this physical fitness announcement he mentions physical fitness and as he knows very well there is no opportunity for any kind of fitness in those old teachers' colleges.

I may say, too, that the visit was terminated by one of these partial impartial banquets at which the hon. Minister spoke and he made—one of my friends tells me—a very fine impression, as a personable young man and one who was willing to learn. However, I must say that he has fallen into a trap right away, the same trap the former hon. Minister of Education fell into when he evolved what is known and will be known for ever as the "Robarts Plan". He put that into effect during the campaign for leadership so suddenly without any consultation or very little consultation, anyway, with business, industry or the teaching profession.

Recently the hon. Minister announced that there was to be a change for the dates of grade 13 examinations; again, as I say, I do not think there was too much consultation with the people mostly involved—those in the teaching profession. But I am sure he will learn from his mistakes and I hope so because, you see, I wish him well in that department because I believe it is the most important part in government.

The Speech from the Throne, when I listened to it—and as the Clerk of the Legislature read the Speech and the Pandora's box of gifts was opened and all the goodies unfolded—I almost thought I could hear Christmas coming early and the belly laughs of "Ho, ho, ho"—from Santa Claus over there on the front benches. But I am sure, as somebody has said, it is an election platform and we will leave it at that.

The Speech from the Throne, however, did forecast a long list of very important measures to be placed before the Legislature. For example, medical health insurance, portable pensions, minimum wages, meat inspection, education and so on. But the electors of three ridings in this province—the hon. member for Russell has been talking about the hon. members of this side of the House but he does not seem to realize, does not keep up very much with the times because we have had by-elections in this province and the majority of their seats are occupied by members of my party. The electors of three Ontario ridings are being deprived of repre-

sentation during this current session as these important measures come before us and none of these has a voice in this Assembly; two of them have been unrepresented for more than three months. To me it is patently and definitely unfair for this government; nay, it is rank discrimination, it does not fit in with the brave words that we have heard about human rights in this House and outside the House, to deprive these people for protracted periods—the electors—of this right, which is fundamental in a democratic society.

I ask the hon. Prime Minister—he is not here now, I presume? I do not say it was possibly because the hon. member for Russell was speaking that he decided to leave; I do not know. But in any event, I ask him to exhibit some of that dynamism that his supporters are always prating about as they extol the virtues of his party. Act now to give these forgotten people the representation that basic justice demands.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Troy: Then, after taking that initial step, let him initiate action which will result in the revision of our somewhat archaic Legislative Assembly Act. And also root out the legal verbiage that surrounds it and now permits of dilatory tactics. I think it is characteristic, too, that not one, as far as I know, not one of the supporters of the hon. Prime Minister and the leader of this province has had the courage in the House to deplore this injustice.

Last Thursday in this House the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) made a statement which was prompted by my questions regarding the administration of a certain branch in his department in District 13. I certainly was not happy with the statement and I was cut off by you, Mr. Speaker, as I sought to elicit further information. I do not say for a moment that the hon. Minister was deliberately concealing information but I believe that he did not tell the full story. Therefore I am demanding that this matter that involves misuse of public funds, public stores, public equipment—the amount involved we do not know, but I understand it certainly was not a matter of petty pilfering only—that this should be brought before the committee on public accounts. Then and then only will the matters of record be laid before the committee and the full story will be told.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Troy: I ask, too, that the dirty mess at New Liskeard, that the linen of that dirty

mess be washed before the committee. It is somewhat coincidental, I think, that recently in the *Toronto Telegram*, I believe it was, I saw an advertisement which called for applications for a chief auditor in one of the departments of the province of Ontario. I think, as I recall, it said that the department had a certain number of branches, probably 18. Would that be the chief auditor for The Department of Highways? Would it be that the hon. Minister and the Cabinet are not too happy with the auditing procedures? Well, I leave that particular question for another day and another forum.

I call your attention to the message of the former Minister now hon. Minister without Portfolio, the member for Northumberland (Mr. Goodfellow). In that message he pays tribute, as he should, and appreciates the loyalty and co-operation of the staff of The Department of Highways. In his message, the hon. Minister also said that he had received reports of the solid progress towards providing Ontario with the finest highway system. It was unfortunate that the former hon. Minister—who seemed to me when he was head of that department to be quite reasonable and quite approachable—did not have an opportunity for a short tour to travel the original Trans-Canada Highway, the Ottawa valley route, not that sort of trans-Cabinet route, that runs and skirts near the laird of Lindsay, as someone has said, Carleton Place where the former hon. Minister was and goes down to southern Ontario and then strikes north again. But I refer to the Ottawa Valley, the original Trans-Canada Highway; the neglect that this government has shown in that highway in district 13 is nothing else but scandalous.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): It is a good road.

Mr. Troy: If the hon. Minister had to travel that road day after day like many of those that work in either Mattawa or North Bay, he would not say that, sir.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I have travelled it.

Mr. Troy: I know the hon. Minister has, but that was some months ago and it has deteriorated since then, sir, and there is a great amount of traffic, the heavy truck traffic, and in the summertime heavy tourist traffic. The hon. Minister should go down and stand at the corner near the Trans-Canada Hotel there, or if he wants to go inside and sip Adam's ale and watch the traffic going by and count the number of trucks he

would be amazed at the number that travel that road. He would be amazed at the number of tourists and he would be amazed also if he stopped and asked them how were the roads, what the answer would be.

If the present hon. Minister remains as the head of this department during the life of this government I suggest that he take a trip up to Ottawa and travel westward through to Deep River. Once he passes Deep River and he reaches Bonfield he will find that the words that I speak are quite true. Certainly he should wear his seat belt because he will have a fairly rough ride.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the planning department of The Department of Highways informed me today that at long last the section between Bonfield and five miles east will be on the tender calls next year. I was very much disturbed for a while when I heard that northern Ontario was going to have the scourge of famine this year as far as highways are concerned. The cost of building highways in southern Ontario is so expensive, at least \$1 million a mile in some places, that it might be off the list, but I am informed that a tender call will be made. But I was informed by the construction engineer that Highway 64, which runs from Noelville to Verner and then on up through Sturgeon Falls and Field and joins No. 11 north of Marten River—I say again, at long last the construction of that highway was begun and my understanding was that it was to be paved next summer. I find now that funds are not available and that it will not be paved.

You will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, when I stand and look at somebody like that very famous French-Canadian leader, the Hon. Louis Lafontaine, whose picture adorns the walls outside, one of the architects of democracy in this country. It is not a pose, sir; it just happens that I do not want to take a chance. I have been in a bilingual riding for a long, long time, and there is also my Celtic background; I use my hands, so I want to take no chances, I do not want to throw this shoulder out again. It is not a pose, sir.

I know it is not just Nipissing that is suffering, it is also the Nickel Belt, because we understand that the paving of Highway 64 in that section, in the vicinity of Alban, and Ouellette, will be stopped. I understand that funds will not be available next year. I hope that I am wrong.

I hope, too, that there is still a surplus of some of the funds from the capital cost, so that they may transfer some to winter works programmes, because in our area \$30,000 will

do a lot of work. Down here, with the system in Metro Toronto with the parkways—

Hon. Mr. Cass: It costs more in northern Ontario.

Mr. Troy: I know it does, but I am just saying that \$30,000 will do a lot of work in certain sections of Highway 531. But when you have to spend \$1 million a mile down here—

An hon. member: Well, you get \$1.5 million in tax revenue where you do not get anything up north.

Mr. Troy: Taxes are scarce, that is all.

This is directed to the hon. Attorney-General. Some time ago, in the month of November, there were two cases of highgrading. One was heard in the city of North Bay, the other was heard in Haileybury before his honour Judge Robinson.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I think the hon. member will find the hon. Attorney-General will be silent on this one.

Mr. Troy: In North Bay, before magistrate Gould. They were similar charges of highgrading.

In the Haileybury court, the defending lawyer was a very prominent Liberal; in the North Bay court the defending lawyer was a Conservative; in fact he is president of the association in the North Bay area. In both cases they were thrown out of court.

I read into the record an editorial from the North Bay *Nugget* headed:

ANTI-HIGHGRADE SQUAD'S METHODS QUESTIONABLE

The uniformed officers of the Ontario provincial police enjoy the esteem and the affection of the citizens of this province.

And this is particularly true in northern Ontario where the police are in much closer contact with the general public than in the more populous areas south of here.

It is unfortunate [the editorial goes on] that in recent months the activities of certain specialized plain-clothed squads have earned the force as a whole some undesirable publicity. Reading the reports of their activities the public might be excused for wondering if the force has a double standard of conduct, one for the uniformed branch and another for the special squads. In the Cobalt silver mining area the anti-highgrade squad has during recent years managed to obtain

a number of convictions. It is unfortunate that none of these convicted appear to have been habitual criminals engaged in the handling of silver ore but for the most part have been adults or teenagers not particularly noted for their intelligence.

Now, highgrading is a serious crime which is hurting the economy of the mining area. It will only be stamped out in two ways. The first would seem to be by eliminating the buyers and distributors of stolen ore. Without these highly organized criminals there would be no inducement for anyone to steal ore. The second is by enlisting public confidence in support of the police in their efforts at the silver-producing level to eliminate dishonest miners and silver traffickers.

The type of publicity which the anti-highgrade squad has earned of late is not likely to endear it to the general public or to inspire public confidence. It would seem reasonable to suggest that if a special squad is needed it should be recruited from the ranks of the uniformed men who know the north and have the trust of the people. It might also be reasonable to suggest that the control of highgrading at the mining area level might be best handled by the uniformed branch.

Certainly it is a matter of record in the Cobalt area that the only arrest and conviction for highgrading of a known criminal was achieved several years ago by a uniformed officer. It is also common knowledge that he subsequently quit the force because he was firmly instructed to leave highgrading investigations to the high-grade squad.

It concludes with:

Queen's Park would be well advised to take a hard look at the record and public image of the highgrade squad in the silver area.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Troy: Certainly, sir. I do not say I will answer it.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I would just like to inquire, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. member has taken the ordinary precaution before recording that editorial in the record of the House, of looking over the proceedings of the court which heard the two cases mentioned by him, and whether he has also taken the benefit of discussing these matters with the people most affected, the mine

managers and operators, so that he could be fully informed as to the difficulties and to what is actually being done?

Mr. Troy: I presume—I read the editorial, I read the proceedings as published in the paper, I was not given a copy of the proceedings from the court. I read in the northern papers—

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am delighted to furnish for the hon. member's personal and private information and perusal—

Mr. Sopha: Furnish the comments of the judges, of those officers, the condemnation, the prosecution.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Troy: I will also pass the information on because when a reputable newspaper is led to write such an editorial as this, criticizing the actions of one of the branches of the hon. Minister's provincial police, then certainly the hon. Attorney-General should write to the editor.

Mr. Sopha: Did the hon. Minister reply to it? Did he write a letter about that editorial?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member, I am not quite sure which one, but I would like to inform him that there are certain appeals being entered in connection with some of these cases. I am not sure whether it is the one to which he refers, and it might be well not to discuss it further on the floor of the House, but I will provide for the hon. member the information which is made available to me, for his personal and private information.

Mr. Troy: I think the hon. Minister should also write to the editor of the *North Bay Nugget* to tell him that if this is wrong he should correct it. If the force is unjustly accused, then the hon. Minister in charge of that force should rise to their defence.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Has he not been trying to do that and convince the hon. member not to read something about which he does not know anything?

Mr. Troy: Well, just a minute; just a minute. I will have to take a glass of water on that one. Out of the mouths of babes—I will not make the retort—this is Christmas time; I will refrain.

Earlier in this Legislature the hon. member for Simcoe East—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): I am right here.

Mr. Troy: I know.

He brought up a matter to the attention of the House. It seemed unfortunate that it was not treated, although he meant well I am sure, in the vein that I consider it should have been—rather serious. It refers to the regulations of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario as far as they pertain to veterans' clubs, labour clubs and the Canadian Legion. I do not want anyone on the other side of the House to say I am not the only veteran here—I know that there are many who have had more distinguished service than I—but there is no one in this House with the length of service that I have had in the militia.

I am concerned with these regulations as far as they apply specifically to Legion branches, and to the best of my knowledge the government policy now in effect is in the following categories: first of all, club licence is restricted to the sale and consumption of beer and wine for men and women. This applies to branches, of course, in areas which are so-called wet areas. We appreciate very much the extension of the privilege that was given so that women may now come into our clubrooms, that is if the branch by-law so allows; we appreciate that privilege. Of course we have to see to it that the regulations regarding facilities and rooms are complied with.

The dining lounge licence—in order to comply with this regulation, or the regulations covering this particular licence, it is my understanding that the Legion branch, as well as any other veteran club or labour club, must have been serving full-course meals for at least three years and have a full-time dining staff and appropriate facilities.

This regulation, as far as the Legion branches are concerned, is not worth the paper it is written on. There is hardly one branch—possibly that great large branch with commodious quarters at Sudbury, that is the only one in Ontario—which could possibly comply with this regulation. As a result, it is an absolute waste of money for a branch to come down here to Toronto to interview the Liquor Licence Board in the hope of attaining a dining room licence. Moreover, as I interpret the regulations, we could never convince the Ontario government to give us a lounge licence anyway.

It seems to me most hypocritical to give us something, a privilege like this, knowing full well that practically no branch in Ontario could comply with it.

There is another type of licence: club licence restricted in local option areas. Again hypocrisy is evident here. For a branch to

receive a licence in a local option area, it must have been serving full-course meals at least three years, have a dining-room staff, submit a menu, properly set up a dining room, etc. How in the name of heaven can a little branch, say, of 50-odd members, struggling to raise funds in order to better their quarters, comply with this regulation?

I was over with my good friend, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes), to a little branch in this area. It is in a dry area, it has a little basement hall, and in order to comply it must have been serving full-course meals for three years in order to get just a licence to serve beer in its club rooms. If the government would say: "Let us have sandwiches and coffee, that should satisfy," then they might be able to qualify; but this way they will never get it, under present regulations.

As I said, the hon. member for Simcoe East brought this matter to the attention of the government. I am unable to emulate his colourful language but I certainly agree with the argument that he presented. It is strange too, that the hon. leader of this government, himself a veteran of very distinguished service, could possibly sanction such a policy, giving it to us with one hand and taking away with the other.

For the information of this House, I am going to read into the record extracts from an editorial from the *Niagara Falls Review*, which was written following the address of the president of the Canadian Legion speaking to District "B" convention. In his address, the president of the Canadian Legion, Ontario, certainly put the issue on the line. The editorial writer points out:

At present the government is using the requirement that meals be served as a barrier to a licence, knowing that the Legion branches cannot afford to maintain a restaurant when 90 per cent of their members eat at home.

It goes on to say:

This is a sorry situation. All thinking people have long recognized that the present liquor laws need wholesale revision. Premier John Robarts said so himself when he took office and proceeded to make a number of changes to it at once. But his government has continued to dismiss the largest veterans' organization in the country with friendly words and no action until the Legion has suddenly decided—

Apparently the Legion is going to make it a major election issue in the next election.

It would appear time for the government to clarify its policy in this regard.

Not only does it refer to the Canadian Legion, it refers to every other veterans' club and labour club in this same category. I think I understand, too, that all the hon. members of this Legislature were furnished with copies of the Legion brief.

I turn, finally, to the ONR Commission. I notice that there are certain things that pertain to northern Ontario in the Speech from the Throne and there is nothing mentioned, as the hon. member for Sudbury has pointed out, of Moosonee. During the winter session this year, I presented several questions to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) regarding reorganization of the commission. He said at that time that a three-pronged survey was being made into the organization, administration and operation of the railway. He promised that a statement would be made regarding reorganization of the commission.

Since that time, before the death of the late chairman, the personnel at one time numbered eight. With the death of the late chairman last fall, the vice-chairman, who is the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. A. Johnston), was named as acting chairman. The appointment was well received in the north, certainly in the North Bay area, particularly among the labour force of the railway, because they know the hon. member to be one with very human qualities. Some months have gone by since this second appointment, and I am sure all who are concerned with the operation of this railway would welcome an announcement that the hon. member for Parry Sound has been named chairman and given that appointment.

It seems to me at this time that it is pretty rough for him to be acting as a member of a riding and at the same time be so busy with operation of that railway. One thing or the other—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Since the hon. government members have lost interest in the debate altogether, I suggest we move adjournment of the House and pack up for the evening. There are not enough in the House; I move we adjourn the debate, since there are not enough hon. government members.

Mr. Speaker: I point out that there is a quorum present in the House, and I cannot accept the motion.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): A motion to adjourn is always in order and not debatable.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, a motion to adjourn is always in order. This is not playing the role impartially, I suggest to you, sir.

A motion to adjourn is always in order and not debatable. That has been established, and a vote should be called.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): There were only six hon. members opposite until half an hour ago.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. MacDonald moves that this House do now adjourn. All those in favour of the motion say "aye".

Those opposed say "nay".

I declare the nays have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise.

All those opposed please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the ayes are 22, the nays are 37.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. MacDonald: May I have clarification on one point? Just for the future, if there is only a standing vote, are the bells rung to call in members?

Mr. Speaker: On motions to adjourn the number only is recorded.

Mr. Troy: Now that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) is here, I will change my tactics and talk about the dairy industry in northern Ontario. I thank the hon. member for York South for this delightful interlude. Although I did not need the rest, I appreciate very much having such a crowded forum now, all lined there with the hon. members in the front benches. I see the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and others.

Nevertheless, on November 28, the milk producers of northern Ontario—northeastern Ontario—the distributors in that area met first with representatives of all parties in northeastern Ontario and later with the hon. Minister of Agriculture—pointed out to the hon. members and to the hon. Minister that the incursion of the concentrated milk producers of southern Ontario, that is concentrated liquid milk, is creating somewhat of a havoc in our dairy industry and among the milk producers in my area. Now as I

understand it, and a strange thing too, apparently the one who led the way north is the president of a well-known Toronto dairy, who also happens to be, I am informed, the president of the Conservative association in the riding of the hon. Minister from Riverdale (Mr. Macaulay), a sort of a cuckoo in the economic nest of the hon. Minister.

Now if I understand it properly, if this is expanded it is going to mean the eventual death of the dairy industry in our area. As the hon. Minister very well knows, the price of milk, of fluid milk, per hundred weight to the farmers is \$5.50 in the Nipissing-Sudbury area and \$5.80 in Sault Ste. Marie. It is impossible for the dairy farmers in that area to produce milk at less, as I understand it, than \$4.80 a hundred weight. Now milk is sold in our stores so that the consumer—and we have got to think of the consumer because there are far more consumers than there are dairy men—if the consumer can get milk at 19 cents a quart, compared to 26 cents a quart for the fluid milk, he certainly, when he has to buy four or five quarts of milk a day, he is going to buy the cheaper type if it is comparable. So actually what is going to happen, I understand, is that there is going to be an expansion of this type of milk.

At first it was supposed to be shipped up north because we were in areas remote from the dairying industry. But it has gone into Sudbury, it is in North Bay, Sault Ste. Marie and the Parry Sound region; in Timmins and Kirkland Lake. It is just going to mean the farmers cannot sell milk.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture very well knows, with the regulations of the milk board in recent years, what it is costing our farmers. They have to have milk houses. Unfortunately, in this season too, in certain areas, in the Powassan area, and in the Chisholm area of Nipissing, there has been a serious lack of precipitation. Farmers have to have new wells dug, and the result is in the last two or three years, it has cost them three or four thousand dollars for new equipment just to stay in business. They had to comply with these regulations.

Now, the dairy distributor can, if he wants to compete with these concentrated liquid milk people, he can make some sort of prepared milk himself and sell it probably at 20 or 21 cents. He can survive, but if the milk producer, or those who have the dairy herds, if they cannot sell their milk it is just going to mean the death of the industry. As the hon. Minister also knows, in our section of Ontario, we cannot grow cash crops

as they can down here. We cannot grow corn, we cannot grow soya beans, tomatoes; we have good dairy land, good for forage and for beef cattle, but if we expand the growth of beef cattle then it takes some years before it becomes a cash crop. What is the farmer going to do in the meantime? That is going to be a problem and a serious one, I think. I hope that the hon. Minister, as I said before, will discuss it with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development because a lot of money is involved. I am quite concerned about them.

To touch on other facts, too, in our northern Ontario region, the pasture season is short, the cost of feed grain—and I am glad to see that there is to be a survey of the Ontario drainage Acts, because that is quite a problem in northern Ontario, as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) knows. So, I will pass it on to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and I know that he is concerned, too, with the plight of these farmers, but it is going to be serious as time goes on. I understand that other dairies are going into concentrated liquid milk. I do not know the difference between concentrated liquid and fluid milk, but it has been so classed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will return to the Ontario Northland Railway Commission, and as I said before, during the last session, the spring session, I asked certain questions of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, who now reports for the railway. He said a three-pronged survey was to be made in the administration organization operation of the road. Certain changes have been made and during the intervening months since then, we have had at least eight members at one time on the commission. The former chairman, Colonel Reynolds, died last fall, and now the hon. member for the riding of Parry Sound, who was the vice-chairman, is acting chairman. It seems to me that enough time has passed by in these four months to decide—as he is very popular, properly accepted in this northeastern area, is one who is known for his human qualities, and is very acceptable to the labour force—so I think it is time that some decision should be made to have the appointment made permanent. Then he can do one duty as chairman of the ONR commission, or as the hon. member for Parry Sound.

I think, also, that the commission itself should be reorganized. We have had two members, with all due respect to Mr. R. S. Potter of Matheson, Mr. Aubert of Englehart. These have served a long time and their contribution is good but I think it is time that

they should be replaced and also, with all due respect to the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Fullerton) it seems to me that the interests of the railroad would be best served if it had someone from along the line of the railway.

The hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle) is a member of the commission; so is Mr. Roy Thompson of Kirkland Lake, the president of the Northeastern Development Association, and member of the economic council, set up by the hon. Minister of Economics. He is a member of the commission. And Mr. John Kennedy of North Bay, a very prominent businessman there, is a member of the commission and, of course, the hon. member for Parry Sound, who is acting chairman. It seems to me that the great town that is the heart of the Porcupine gold country, the town of Timmins, should also be represented on that commission, preferably with, maybe, somebody who has some contact with labour, and can speak, to some extent, for labour on the railway.

As the hon. member for Sudbury has pointed out earlier, there was no mention of Moosonee in the Speech from the Throne and probably that pipe dream has, for the time being, dissipated. The Great Whale area and the vast section of northwestern Quebec contains minerals of untold wealth and we in the Liberal Party will have a plan that will eventually greatly enhance the business of the Ontario Northland Railway, as we tap those resources, but I think that at the present time, it would be best served if the hon. Prime Minister would start—maybe he has already—to extend the ONR from North Bay to Georgian Bay to the port of Parry Sound and we will have that connection with Georgian Bay and the products.

For example, we are soon going to be exporting ore down the ONR line. As soon as it gets to North Bay, it is transferred to the CNR there, and it will be very little freight revenue from that short distance, but the bulk will go to some other lines of railway. But if we had a port at Georgian Bay and the ONR continued down there it would be much better in every way for business both coming in and out. Certainly there would be this problem with the farmer, with feed grains and other things that are brought in to our dairy industry.

I think, too, that, granted this mine, the Adams mine, is going to be a good thing for the Kirkland Lake area. Fine. It is going to create work and it has brought back already a number of men who were laid off,

but the actual revenue from the transport of the iron ore is not going to be too much. I certainly urge the hon. Prime Minister to think of the possibility of extending the line from North Bay to Georgian Bay.

I shall defer any further comments on this until the estimates of The Department of Economics are presented to us, except to say that in my opinion, and in the opinion of my fellow members on this side of the House, and I am sure in the opinion of those who are most interested in the development of northeastern Ontario, that the railway falls far short of doing the job which it was created to do, that is, developing northeastern Ontario.

Even those who are supporters of the Conservative Party who travel a lot in north-western Quebec tell me that the development policy of the Quebec government—both in the former government under Maurice Duplessis and now under Hon. John Lesage—their policy is much ahead of ours.

So I close with this in mind, that whoever is on the commission always has before him that it is a development road and anything that enhances the development of northeastern Ontario, of course, naturally is good for all Ontario.

Mr. L. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to tell the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy) that I have a different interpretation to the Speech from the Throne than he has. I do not consider the Throne Speech to be a box of goodies, as he suggested. On the contrary, I consider it to be full of sensible and practical legislation, worthy of support by all responsible citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as is the custom in this assembly, I should like next to convey my congratulations to you, sir, on your superb administration as Speaker of this Legislature. You never fail to impress me with your quiet, authoritative and impartial manner, combined with a sense of humour and abundance of dignity.

At this time I should also like to join with other hon. members of this House in extending congratulations to those who have been appropriately recognized by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and who have been appointed to Cabinet positions. And may I remind the hon. member for Nipissing that it was not on the basis of youth alone, but on the basis of proven ability.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, would I want this opportunity to go by without saying a special warm word of welcome to Mr. Murray Gaunt,

the new hon. member for Huron-Bruce. I can heartily endorse the statement that was mentioned here by one of his hon. colleagues recently about his being a good-looking, young and fine representative. May he retain, sir, his good looks and his youth for a long time.

Having entered this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, in the same by-election as the hon. member for Toronto-Beaches (Mr. Harris) who sits on my right, we have many things in common. It was with genuine satisfaction that I listened to his appropriate response to the Speech from the Throne, and also listened to the seconding done by our hard-working and well-liked representative from Welland (Mr. Morningstar).

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I also listened to the speech made by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Lewis) regarding coloured margarine. It was of particular interest to me. Obviously his constituents share similar views to the people of Eglinton. In fact, similar views to the people across this province. A number of constituents from Eglinton met with me during the latter part of the summer and they protested vehemently against this discriminatory legislation which forbids the colouring of margarine.

Following their presentation I wrote to our able and efficient hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), asking for an explanation, and asking for some action. During our north-land tour I met up with the hon. Minister of Agriculture; he told me he would like to discuss this matter with me. Upon his return, I wrote to him once again and reminded him about this nuisance ban. Later I wrote to the hon. Prime Minister, a man for whom I have a great admiration, asking that consideration should be given to this outdated legislation. Once again, in this very building last month, I met with other members of the margarine committee. I sat in one of the private offices and spoke with them during an interview for 20 minutes. They brought several sacks of margarine, and I sat there squeezing and bending and pushing and rolling and kneading a bag of margarine. The women cautioned me and said that only the night previously a bag had split and spilled its greasy contents over their clothes.

Mr. Speaker, it may be a source of much humour for some of the hon. members here but I tell you the housewives do not think it is so funny?

Finally I threw the soggy bag down on the desk and one of the ladies said to me: "How would you like to eat that margarine now?"

Mr. Speaker, I tell you with all sincerity that the patience of Ontario women has been severely tested. Their freedom of choice to purchase coloured margarine as been denied. Why, in this democracy such as we have, cannot coloured margarine be purchased when the people of Ontario want to purchase coloured margarine? In my opinion this ban is both unjust and undemocratic. Housewives throughout this province are irate and they have every reason to be. Why should they tolerate such a ridiculous, time-consuming chore of mixing colour into white margarine when it can be satisfactorily processed for them at the factory?

As my hon colleague from York-Humber pointed out: "Ladies, you may have coloured margarine. My government says that you may have coloured margarine, but we will not make it easy for you. We will make it as difficult for you as we can. We will make it as inconvenient and as messy for you as we can. We will give you an alternative, however. If you insist upon using coloured margarine you may scrape it out of a package, stir it and mix it into a bowl, then clean out the bowl and place it in a suitable container for future use. But if you do not like to do it that way we will give you an alternative."

Yes, you may do what I did a few weeks ago, sit in this office twisting and turning and fuming and fussing, and waiting for a bag of margarine to turn to a uniform colour. Why, in this push-button age, Mr. Speaker, in which we live do we have to have such an asinine law?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: We can purchase cars today with power steering, power brakes, power seats, power windows, yes, even power windows on no-drafts. Yes, everything for the convenience of the driver. We can live in homes that are equipped with automatic heat when all that is necessary to do is touch a dial for added comfort. We can even wear automatic watches that do not require winding. The specialists in design and convenience have produced push-button washers and dryers, automatic refrigerators. Particular concentration and emphasis has been placed on the kitchen where colour, and design and ease of operation are given priority.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: As one hon. member said, Mixmasters and juice blenders and even electric can openers with magnetic attachments to take off the lid. And yet, Mr.

Speaker, even when we do everything to make it easy for the housewives, what does my government do? It permits restrictive legislation, which belongs to the Gay Nineties, to remain on its books. Yes, it was back in 1886 when Canada legally banned the sale of margarine. Now, the provincial government is making it compulsory, as all know, for the housewives to colour their own margarine, a messy, time-wasting, unnecessary, outmoded law.

An hon. member: Terrible.

Mr. Reilly: Why does this oleomargarine Act forbid the colouring of margarine? Some people may argue it is done to protect the dairy industry, and this may sound like a plausible reason. That is, if the dairy industry should have protection, and secondly, if the ban on coloured margarine actually affords any protection. I do not think that either case is true. The time has come—in fact, Mr. Speaker, it is overdue—when the dairy industry must learn to get down to business and compete for the sale of its products. They must face up to the fact that margarine is a healthful commodity, that it is in great demand by the consumers. I am not discounting the serious condition of the dairy industry but it must learn to be more aggressive and not to depend upon subsidies and monopolies. It must learn that the demand for its product has been decreasing and it should only make enough butter to meet the requirements.

Now, perpetuation of this obsolescent and restraining legislation is not the answer to the dairy industry's difficulties. All this does is to antagonize people. There is no reason why one segment of this population should be seemingly protected at the cost and the inconvenience of the majority of people. Mr. Speaker, if the dairy industry in Ontario needed help our consumers would be among the first, to lend the loyalty and assistance that they needed, but the fact is that Ontario has never been able to produce adequate butter for its own needs. Here on page 5, of an issue of the *Rural Co-operator*, which I received recently, an issue of Tuesday, November 27, it reads in bold type: "No Butter Surplus in Ontario."

And then it goes on to say "that up to a year ago Ontario had to import butter from other provinces to meet consumer demand"—apparently quoted by the chairman—Mr. James Baker, the Ontario dairy commissioner.

Surely, under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it is fallacious to say that we are

trying to protect the dairy industry in Ontario against a competitive spread when we have had no surplus of butter in Ontario? Granted that Canada as a nation produces more butter than it can consume. No doubt Quebec and the prairie provinces have contributed largely towards this surplus condition, possibly because of the federal government's willingness to purchase all the butter that is manufactured, at 64 cents a pound.

I will admit that the dairy industry is an important part of our Canadian economy and that its problems are not easily solved but one thing is sure, the banning of coloured margarine is not the answer. Practically every country, except Canada, permits coloured margarine. It obviously has not had any ill effects upon the economy of 48 states in the United States of America. Denmark, a great dairy country, with four million head of cattle, and a large producer of butter, still permits coloured margarine.

Now, it has been suggested to me that some of our farmers may be opposed to factory-coloured margarine. Strangely enough some of the biggest purchasers of margarine are reported to be farmers. Perhaps this is not strange when we stop to think about it, because they are interested in economy too. People all across this province are interested, Mr. Speaker. Over 30 municipalities, east, west, north, south and central—including Windsor, Fort William, Sudbury, Cornwall, as well as Toronto and its contiguous municipalities—have sent in resolutions requesting coloured margarine. Yes, over 30 municipalities throughout our province.

In the current issue of the *Ontario Chamber of Commerce Journal*, which we received not so long ago, there is also a recommendation. It is prefaced by the statement: "The colour restriction on margarine is discriminatory and conflicts with principles of free enterprise," and concludes by saying: "It is recommended that the government lift the colour ban on margarine." Now, it is not necessary for me to remind the hon. members of this House that this organization, the Ontario Chamber of Commerce, comprises almost 250 boards of trade and chambers of commerce with a membership of over 40,000 professional and business men.

I have been trying to look at this subject objectively and have asked specifically, Mr. Speaker, what are the objections to having factory coloured margarine? One objection that I have frequently heard, and I heard it here earlier this evening, is the possibility of deception between coloured margarine and butter. Surely regulations and controls

governing the packaging and labelling of our products will prevent this.

Another objection mentioned here tonight was that 80 per cent of the ingredients used in the manufacture of margarine are imported. It is hard to arrive at a precise estimate, because refined oils of animals, fish, marine animals or vegetables or a combination of them may be—I have "used according to the Act"—all of them could be used, so it is hard to arrive at a definite amount. If the complaint is on the basis of importation of edible seeds my only answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: It is obviously more profitable for the Canadian grower to export the soya bean or the soya oil than it is to sell it here in Canada. What is there to prevent expansion in the production of edible oil seeds in Ontario? Not only to grow them but to crush them, extract the oil and refine it? Very simply, Mr. Speaker, my answer is that we do not grow enough edible seeds here. Of those seeds that are imported, 100 per cent are crushed, extracted and refined here. Many farmers, I know, are reluctant to make changes and to put in new crops. But I merely remind the hon. members of this House that the potential is there for them.

So far, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to deal with the discriminatory aspect of this legislation. Now, I would like to deal with the economic, and the human aspects, Mr. Speaker. I have said very little about those phases. It has been pointed out to me that many low-income families, old age pensioners and invalids, are drastically affected. In some cases they are even too weak to squeeze the colour into margarine. Yes, actually too weak to do it and have to arrange for someone else to do it for them. In many other instances, margarine has been recommended by doctors, particularly in the case of heart disease and special diet.

On the basis of economic necessity alone there are many low wage earners, some with large families, who are entitled to consideration at this time. We may as well face it, we must be prepared to admit that margarine is not a new product. Margarine is here to stay. Margarine is recognized as a modern, economical, wholesome and nutritious food. It is our democratic right to purchase coloured margarine.

Now, it is strange, Mr. Speaker, all the barriers that have been put up to prevent the consumption of margarine have failed. Yes, the federal government has levied 11 per cent on each pound of margarine. I understand it has been removed from all other basic foods except margarine. The provincial

government's refusal to allow coloured margarine, making it less palatable and less acceptable, hasn't acted as a deterrent. The fact that margarine is the only food that is manufactured, in which the colour is regulated, has not stopped its consumption. So the time is rapidly approaching; in fact, it is here now, Mr. Speaker, where we must be prepared to do something about it. We should face up to it now. In fact I urge my government to face up to this problem realistically, just as we have had to face up to other problems.

First step, I suggest to my government, Mr. Speaker, is this: that they notify the producers of butter fat that the restrictions on the colouring of margarine will be lifted as of a specific date in the future. Second, I would recommend that the Ontario government and the federal government co-ordinate their efforts to market various dairy products and find new uses for butter fat. Finally, I would refer to the hon. Minister of Agriculture to the statement that he made in this House on Thursday, December 6, recorded in *Hansard*, in which he said: "According to the experts we need an additional 500,000 head of cattle every year for the next 10 years."

Now if this is the case he should encourage the dairy industry to convert some of its effort into the raising of beef cattle. My concluding thought, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members of this House, and especially to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. members of his Cabinet is that coloured margarine is inevitable, why not now?

I have given the subject very serious thought and I have tried not to be unilateral in my thinking, I have tried to look at it from both sides to decide which is best from the standpoint of everybody. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully, and somewhat reluctantly, have come to the conclusion that I shall give official notice at this time that it is my intention to introduce a private member's bill asking that the ban on coloured margarine be lifted.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, as this is my first speech in this House I think it is only fitting that I should acknowledge the many kind words of welcome that have been directed to me by hon. members of all parties in this House. I include my hon. friend from Eglinton (Mr. Reilly). I can assure you they were greatly appreciated.

It is indeed a great honour for me to take part in these deliberations of this House and I do hope the opportunity will afford itself for a good many years to come.

However, I would also like to point out that I am happy and proud to be a member of the Liberal Party, the party that is going to form the government after the next provincial election.

As many other speakers have done, I would like to convey my congratulations to the newly-appointed Cabinet Ministers and to the Speaker of this honourable House. I know in both cases they will carry out their duties to the best of their ability.

Mr. Speaker, when this House has before it consideration of matters affecting agriculture, and agriculture is very dear to my heart, it is inclined to dwell on prices and markets and distributive practices and taxation. Likewise when this House has before it matters affecting industry it is inclined to follow much the same procedure. It is altogether proper that such procedure should be observed because these are the questions of immediate concern and contention.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as our less populous areas are concerned, there is a matter which, while not as newsworthy as the more visible problems, is none the less of vital concern to all who live in this province and one which has long merited more attention than it has received.

Now, while this subject touches on both agriculture and on industry in the area I have the honour to represent it touches—it presses—on the lives of those who dwell there and, to the extent that the strength of all Ontario depends on the strength of all the parts, this subject, Mr. Speaker, is the concern of all Ontario and should be the immediate concern of this House.

This subject is the erosion of opportunity for youth in our rural areas.

When the area that is Huron-Bruce was settled between 100 and 150 years ago—settlement in pretty much the present pattern took about 50 years to establish—it was already behind that area to the south known as the Huron tract, Mr. Speaker, and behind the lake area to the north.

Wingham, now the centre of the riding, the largest town in the riding with a population of less than 3,000, was not settled until a man on a raft, coming down the river from Brussels, stuck on a sand bar and settled there. That was in 1859.

Wingham's first industry was a grist mill to serve the settler-farmers in the immediate vicinity. And as the land settled and the area grew in population, other industries grew up to serve it. They grew, not only in Wingham, but in Lucknow, in Brussels,

in Blyth, in Mildmay, in Teeswater, in Ripley and in the smaller communities that grew to serve the farm community during the last century.

And then, beginning with the last generation and accelerating into today, began what I refer to as the population erosion, Mr. Speaker. First the young men and then the young women began to leave the farms and to seek employment—in the Ford factory in Detroit, employment in London, in Kitchener, in Toronto and further afield.

Co-incidental with their exodus from the farm came the great developments in farm mechanization. The area of Huron-Bruce was at one time noted for its horses. Tomorrow, if the trend continues, horses will be explained to children by means of pictures.

Today the farms are larger, the people fewer, the opportunities less. We on the farms, desperately seeking some holding back of the clock, are inclined to point fingers at vertical integration in agriculture, at the inadequacy of agricultural products price floors, at the inequalities of taxation, particularly in the field of advanced education.

I am not pressing on these points tonight, not because I am in any sense withdrawing from these issues, but because tonight I am reaching further and digging deeper in an attempt to alleviate a worsening situation.

This starvation of opportunity which expels our young people from the farms is more than a social phenomenon to note in passing. It is much more than that. It is a shrinking of the small farm family circle and all that that circle means in religious good, in social good and in economic good. It is a negation of the aspirations which brought our forebears to clear and to plough and to settle with the thought that there would be plenty for those who followed after.

But this shrinkage of population does not affect only the farm home and the family circle. In one way or another it affects everyone who works or lives in Ontario.

Every young man or young woman who leaves the farm to go to the city takes with him a customer of the merchants in the nearby town. The customer shrinkage, when projected to hundreds or thousands, means fewer and less prosperous merchants, fewer shop workers, eventually smaller town population. And as the towns shrink so does their attraction for new industry.

It is a vicious circle of abandonment with the economic barometer steadily plummeting. The farms get larger and emptier; the towns

get quieter and less prosperous. The area withers.

This, Mr. Speaker, benefits nobody. And yet practically nothing is being done to remedy the situation. Nor have any steps been taken that warrant hope for the future.

Take my own area. Take Huron-Bruce as an example. No one of my generation has seen the slightest effort to plan for the future, to promote employment, to look ahead, to plan.

There has been no planning for the future. There has been no inquiry as to where the future might lead. There has been no governmental interest in whether this area dwindled or prospered.

The hard fact of the matter is that the rural areas of Ontario have not evolved with evolution. Great sums are being spent and much publicity has been given to job re-training. This is to the interest of industry and to the other monied classes the government serves.

But what has been done in like measure for the Ontario farmer and for the resident-worker or small business man of the small towns? Nothing—positively nothing!

What should be done? What steps should be taken by local residents, by local merchants? What steps should be taken by the government of Ontario? The answers to these questions are controversial but somewhere, somehow, action must be undertaken because the passing of the buck has left us woefully little time in which to reverse our downward trend.

It must be obvious to all who study this important problem, Mr. Speaker, that the first requirement in amending a condition that is rapidly becoming intolerant is adequate information—regional information.

A survey is needed to measure the fall-off in opportunity and the same survey could readily be employed to reveal avenues of new opportunity. The making of such a survey is surely a government obligation and one that should be undertaken immediately. This has been done before and done successfully. Right now the government of Mexico is paying out many millions of dollars to have a professional assessment made of the potential of its various areas. And yet Mexico is considered, compared to us, a backward country.

So let us have a survey which will tell us in what direction we should look. Then let us revise The Municipal Act to enable communities to effect the remedial measures indicated by the survey.

Today, section 422 of The Municipal Act provides that the council of a municipality having a population of not less than 5,000 may pass by-laws for the establishment and maintenance of a department of industries and for appointing a commissioner of industries to bring to the notice of manufacturers and others the advantages of the municipality as an industrial business, educational, residential or vacation centre. It also states that the council of a local municipality may expend in any one year a sum not exceeding the amount of one mill on the dollar on the total of its taxable assessment and as an additional one tenth of one mill on the dollar on that part of its total taxable assessment in excess of \$10 million for the purpose of paying any expenses of its department and commissioner of industries, if any, and for the purpose of distributing information respecting the advantages of the municipality as an industrial, business, educational, residential or vacation centre, but no local municipality shall expend in any one year an amount exceeding \$60,000 for such purpose.

All this high-sounding phraseology is totally meaningless in the areas to which I refer.

In Huron-Bruce, for instance, the largest town is Wingham with a population of 2,800. The Act does not permit Wingham, as a town, to act to save itself. If Ontario is to grow in opportunity, if the deep rural areas are to benefit from such growth, if these areas are to continue to be an asset to, rather than a burden on, the body, then this Act must be revised to help smaller towns to help themselves.

I know that there will be resistance to these two suggestions. I know that there are those who will say that places like Huron-Bruce want to be supported by government, that these places want protection and crutches to lean on and someone—government perhaps—to support them.

Mr. Speaker, the person who makes such a statement slanders all the good people who live in these areas. To borrow from history and to adapt a great quotation to the present discussion I state here and now that the people of Huron-Bruce will fire the last shot in the defence of freedom of enterprise. All they ask, all they seek, is equality of opportunity.

First, then, a survey. This survey should tell us in specific terms what we have in this area, in these towns and villages, that will attract what kinds of employer. This survey should measure our water supply, our labour pool, our hydro load, our soil capacity for

various types of crops, our transportation facilities, our domestic market potential, our housing availabilities and all the other factors including freight, refrigeration, storage and insurance that industry needs to know before it establishes.

When this survey is completed, its findings should be analyzed and there should be established from those findings realistic targets in terms of industrial attraction.

When the survey and the survey analysis have been completed, there should be set up a meeting of the wardens, the clerks and the Reeves and mayors of the region and these facts should be made known to them in an exhaustive presentation of perhaps one or two days.

Out of this presentation there should come the formation of regional committees which will meet from time to time and which will make requests to specific government departments for specific further information as the need arises.

The end function of these regional committees would be to act to attract industry through the dissemination of information essential to industry and through such local attraction to industry as seemed advisable to the regional body as a whole.

Hon. members may say that this is no different from the establishment of an industrial commission. I agree that, in many ways, it is similar indeed to such a body. And hon. members are aware that such bodies have done a lot for industry to create prosperity in their areas.

But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that if The Municipal Act of Ontario, I am referring to section 422, disbars from all but the large town the privilege of maintaining an industrial commission, there would seem to be no other choice than the establishment of some such body.

Let us suppose for a moment that such a body exists. Let us suppose it has been in operation regionally for a year or so. Could we not visualize a stop in the emigration of young people, an increase in the gross product of the region, a reduction in the individual tax burden because of industry sharing that burden?

I think we could. I know we could. For this has been the effect of new industry establishment elsewhere, and we could have it too in these poor little rich regions that have been abandoned to an expediency which gears its effort to serve the concentrated areas.

Mr. Speaker, for us to let our rural areas run down in their productive capacity is

exactly the same as neglecting the maintenance of a house. The property deteriorates.

This situation can—this situation must—be rectified. A simple survey and implementation of its findings can turn Ontario's wasting rural areas into pockets of progress that will attract investment and provide jobs to keep our youth at home and assure them of a career.

We owe this, Mr. Speaker, to the diligence of our ancestors. We owe it to those who follow after us.

Anything less than development for progress is selling Ontario short. Let us get on with the job.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, my first words are words of congratulation to you, sir, and to your deputy for the way you have presided over this House, you have been impartial in your decisions and you are a credit to the Speaker's chair. I want to thank you, sir, and your competent staff for the many kindnesses and courtesies you have shown to me and to the people I have the honour to represent.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention in this address to spend most of my time discussing matters that are peculiar to my own riding of Wellington-Dufferin. I prefer to devote most of my remarks in this address to matters of general interest all over the province of Ontario. I may use my own riding in some cases to illustrate the points that I am trying to make. I have decided to speak on provincial affairs in general since it is some time since I have delivered an address in this House. I want to congratulate hon. members who have been charged with greater responsibilities in recent months and I wish them well.

I would also like to offer words of congratulations to hon. members who have laid down heavy responsibilities. Many of these men carried the load through a period of development and expansion in Ontario that has never been equalled in any similar space of time, they have made a tremendous contribution and they have earned the right to take things just a little easier.

During this session, Mr. Speaker, and indeed during the last session I listened with great interest to the various speakers who have taken part in the debate. Tonight I want to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion to adopt the address from the Throne. I was particularly impressed with their broad grasp of public affairs, and I want to predict a great future for the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris).

I know he is going to make a great contribution to the province of Ontario.

We know the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) has always been one of our most active members. He has rendered a great service to the people of his riding and to the province. And his re-election to this House in every election indicates that the people of Welland appreciate the service that he has rendered. His address was typical of a good member of the Legislature who appreciates sound constructive proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have listened with great interest to addresses delivered by hon. members who are members of the Opposition and of the NDP party. Some of the addresses had constructive points, but many of the addresses have puzzled me. They seem to indicate that the hon. members are not trying to be constructive. It is either that or they have failed to grasp what has taken place in the province of Ontario under Progressive-Conservative policy. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that there are young hon. members in this House who may be swayed by some of the statements that have been made, statements which in many cases were not a good picture of provincial affairs.

With that in mind I thought perhaps I would devote some of my time in this address to reviewing the tremendous development and expansion that has taken place in Ontario under the sound policies of the party that has been in power since the last Liberal government was turned out of office.

To gain first-hand information I have travelled extensively in many parts of Ontario. And to compare Ontario with other provinces in Canada I spent some weeks on a trip to the west coast, through provinces that have not been privileged to live under Conservative policy for the length of time that we have here in Ontario, and indeed some of these provinces which have been living under different forms of government during the same period that we in Ontario have lived under the policies that have been carried out by the party that has been in power for some years.

Mr. Speaker, from the observations I have made and from the statistics that I have studied, it seems to me that if some of the hon. members opposite would just get out of the bush so that they could have a look at the trees, they would not make the speeches that have been made in this House. Perhaps they have refrained from taking the advantage of the opportunities that have been presented to travel in this province.

It may be that they feel they can make a speech that will suit their purposes better by drawing on a fertile imagination rather than basing their speech on the facts that are plain to be seen if one will take the time to go and see.

I want to thank The Department of Lands and Forests for organizing the fact-finding trip that we took into northeastern Ontario last fall. It was my privilege to go over a similar route approximately ten years ago. And this fall everywhere we could see the evidence of development and expansion.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): What development has taken place at Moosonee?

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York Centre was not on the trip ten years ago so he could not make the comparison. We could see development in new highways, we could see it in new mines, we could see it in new mills, and processes for processing our forest wealth. We could see it in new schools, we could see it in the bright faces of the students who met us in many of the towns we visited. We could see the evidence of progress in the tourist facilities that have been developed over the past ten years.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was surprised to see how few hon. members of the official Opposition took the trip, since the hon. member for York Centre has so much to say tonight. It may be that they were tied up with other matters, but from speeches that I have listened to in this House and statements that I have seen attributed to these hon. members, I would have thought that they might have shown some interest in the northeastern part of the province. Perhaps, I should say, more interest than they did show.

I believe that the hon. leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Wintermeyer) is the only leader who did not go on that trip. And in fact the great majority of the hon. members of that party were noted more by their absence than by their presence. I noted that some of the hon. northern members from the official Opposition were not there, in fact I think 50 per cent of them were not there.

An hon. member: How many times has the hon. member been up there?

Mr. Root: I have been up there three times on fact-finding tours, two in northeastern Ontario and one in the northwest.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, when I say I was there three times I was there three times on fact-finding trips, I have been there many times on personal trips and on other trips. But I want to say this, since the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) has interjected, that the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) was there and 40 per cent of his members were there all the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. members of the official Opposition do not start making percentage comparisons, because they will not look very good. I remember during this debate, hearing the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Chapple) trying to take the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) to task about the position of the mining industry, yet I find in checking into this matter, that in 1943, at the time the last Liberal government was turned out of office in Ontario, there were only 321 producing mines in the province. In 1961, the last year for which figures are available, there were some 961 mines producing—almost a 300 per cent increase—and that has taken place under the policies of the present government.

This development in northern Ontario is typical of what we see all over the province. I grow a bit weary when I listen to hon. members opposite suggesting that it is time we had a change, that it is time this government is turned out of office, and I grow weary, and I am sure the people of Ontario are getting a bit fed up listening to this kind of talk, when the hon. members opposite know that Ontario has never had the development and expansion in any similar space of time that could come even close to paralleling what has taken place since the party in power succeeded to office. We know what caused the change. The people got fed up with the period of stagnation and lack of progress under the former regime.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that a change came over Ontario with the change of government. New policies were put into effect and one policy that had far-reaching effects was the reversal of the former government's power programme. Some of us who are a little older remember the dark days when the government that preceded the present government cancelled the power contract, and actually left Ontario short of power at a critical period during the years of the last war. That government did not seem to have an appreciation of what power could do in rural Ontario, and I would point this out to the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) who has just completed his

speech. This is one of the things that has done more to change the rural way of life than perhaps any other thing; and that power development meant as much in the way of industrial development.

The change of government brought about a change and instead of cancelling contracts, the government set out on a programme of power development and rural electrification. Rural electrification was made attractive to the farm people by an equalizing of the rates and by the generous assistance that the government gave to the construction of rural lines.

I note that in my own riding of Wellington-Dufferin there was a tremendous swing to electrical power in the farming areas. In Dufferin county, for instance, in 1941 there were only 19.6 per cent of the farmers with power. Twenty years later, under this government, in 1961, 98.8 per cent of the farm people had power. In the county of Wellington, in 1941, 25.8 per cent of the farm people had power and under this government in 1961, 91.6 per cent of the farmers had power.

Rural electrification was made possible by the availability of power and by the equalizing of rates and by the fact that the government of Ontario contributed over \$96 million since 1943 to assist in the construction of rural lines. Prior to 1943, the total contribution to assist in the construction of lines, and this is for the whole history of Hydro, was a little over \$19 million.

In 1943 we had available for Ontario some 2.85 million horse power of energy. Under the power development programme that has been pursued by Ontario Hydro with the backing of this government, power reserves today for Ontario amount to 7.05 million horse power, about a 350 per cent increase.

While I am speaking about power and while I was doing some research, I discovered some interesting statistics. I find that because of the rate structure, the consumption per consumer has gone up in many areas that are served by Hydro. For instance, the farm customer in 1942 used about 150 kilowatts per month per customer, at a cost of \$2.35, that is the average cost. By 1961 the monthly consumption per customer had gone up to 542 kilowatts, with the average rate actually reduced to \$1.91. I suppose that Hydro is the only form of energy that is available to the farm people today at a reduced cost.

This is the way to help rural Ontario. The same can be said for the residential people

who live in hamlets in rural Ontario. The monthly consumption per customer in 1942 was 86 kilowatts at a cost of \$2.98. In 1961 the consumption had jumped from 86 to 427 and the average cost had dropped to \$1.87.

In the commercial field, including summer commercial, the monthly consumption per customer in 1944, and these are the latest figures I have available, was 155 kilowatt hours at an average cost of \$2.28. By 1961, the consumption had gone up to 700 and the cost was reduced to \$1.98.

In the industrial field in 1942 the kilowatt hour consumption per month per customer was 7,568, at a cost of \$1.38. By 1961 the consumption per customer had gone up to 11,835, at a cost of \$1.53.

I will give you one example, Mr. Speaker, of what equalizing of rates has meant to the rural consumers in my riding. In 1942 the average cost per kilowatt hour to the farm in the Shelburne area was 4.93 cents. In 1961, that cost was reduced, through the equalizing of rates to two cents per kilowatt hour.

I think hon. members can understand why the rural people support this government when they have the facts placed before them. I am sure that if the hon. members opposite would only give the people the facts, their chances of ever taking power in this province would be drastically reduced. I think I have some idea why some of the speeches we have had to listen to from those opposite are made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you might want to ask me what effect did power development have on the other phases of Ontario's economy. I would like to give a few illustrations. For instance, in the whole history of the province up to 1943 there were some 10,587 manufacturing establishments in the province. In 1960, in this last year for which I have figures available, the number had increased to 13,387.

I have already told hon. members that the number of producing mines has increased from the 1943 figure of 321 to a 1961 figure of 961. Manufacturing and mining are industries that take great quantities of power and the power development programme which has been carried out by the party that is in power in Ontario today has made possible this tremendous industrial development.

I might point out that it is estimated that in 1943 there were 1,619,000 people employed in Ontario. In 1962 this had increased to 2,313,000.

In 1943 the payroll in wages, salaries and supplementary labour income in Ontario was \$2.02 billion. In 1961 this had risen to \$7.911 billion, a tremendous increase in the purchasing power in the hands of the people who earn wages in the province of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the figures I have quoted are for the people who are in business. There has been about a 50 per cent increase in manufacturing, and the payroll has increased almost 400 per cent under the policy of this government.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Has the hon. member got the figures for New York State there?

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. leader of the Opposition were more interested in Ontario than in New York State it would be in the best interests of this province.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the figures for employment in Canada, and I will take the figures from 1946 to 1962, you will find that in 1946 there were some 4,896,000 people employed in Canada. By 1962 this had risen to 6,254,000, or in other words a gain of 1,358,000. Canada is a nation of ten provinces and two territories and yet you find that one province, and that is the province of Ontario, had a gain in its labour force of 645,000, almost half of the increase for the whole nation. In other words, Ontario provided 181,000 more jobs than all the other provinces put together, along with the two territories, leaving Quebec out. And Ontario provided 220,000 more jobs than the province of Quebec, which is similar in size and should be similar in economy.

One could put it another way and say that if the other nine provinces and two territories, that have two-thirds of Canada's population, had equalled Ontario's gain in employment, there would be some 577,000 more jobs in Canada than there are today.

I noticed in the *Toronto Telegram* of December 12, 1962, that the jobless total in November was 342,000, which is 7,000 less than in November of 1961. These figures indicate that if the provinces that are living under socialism, Social Credit, liberalism, and other policies had done the job that the province of Ontario has done, we would need people to fill the jobs that would be available. If the rest of Canada had expanded their job opportunities as Ontario has expanded hers, there would be 235,000 more jobs than there are people available to fill the jobs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, the babble of voices from opposite is quite similar to the efforts that are being made day after day to cover up the facts. The only hope that the hon. members opposite have of gaining power is to cloud the issues and keep the people from knowing what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I think the increase in the job opportunities in Ontario is a great tribute to the policies that have been pursued by the government that has managed the affairs of Ontario for the last 19 years.

I would like to put some more statistics into the record re the amount of capital that has been invested in manufacturing in Canada and in some of the provinces since 1945. In Canada there has been an investment of some \$15,410.7 million invested in the manufacturing industries in 1945 to 1962. Of this amount \$7,467,500 has been invested right here in the province of Ontario.

We hear a lot about the Socialist province of Saskatchewan. I could tell the House that in that province in the same period the capital investment in manufacturing amounted to only \$248.3 million.

Now, lest the official Opposition take too much satisfaction out of this figure, I would remind them that the sister province of Quebec, which is quite similar to Ontario, had a capital investment of only \$4,161.7 million, just a little over half of the amount of investment that came to the province of Ontario.

I mention these figures to give some indication of where the job opportunities have come from that have provided such tremendous expansion of the labour force in our province. Power development, industrial expansion and job opportunities have made Ontario the most attractive place in all Canada in which to establish a home, a business or an industry, and I say this without fear of honest contradiction.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I say this without fear of honest contradiction. I am not saying I will not be contradicted but I said honest contradiction.

To back up this statement, I could tell you that since 1943 some 2,119,943 people have emigrated to Canada. Of this number, 1,103,977 chose Ontario. In a nation of ten provinces and two territories, in other words, 88,848 more people chose Ontario than the other nine provinces and the two territories combined. I would say to the hon. members opposite that when people are choosing a home they are not under any particular obligation to settle in any province in this coun-

try, but they chose Ontario because they knew that this was a province that offered the greatest opportunity—1,103,977 people cannot be wrong, and the hon. members who sit opposite right.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the hundreds of thousands of new Canadians who have come to Ontario, many thousands have come to Ontario from other provinces, and we welcome them. They have come from provinces where they were living under different forms of government. To back up this statement, I could point out that since 1943 Canada's population has grown by 6,775,000. In the same period of time, Ontario's population grew by 2,327,000, or, in other words, 300,000 more than all of the other provinces and the territories, leaving out Quebec, and 418,000 more than the province of Quebec.

To the hon. members of the New Democratic Party I could point out that while the population in Ontario was growing by 2,327,000, the province that they keep telling us about, Saskatchewan, was growing by 92,000.

Again, I say, 2,327,000 people cannot be wrong.

I think that the hon. members of the NDP and of the official Opposition are in for a big surprise when they go to the people of Ontario and try to tell them that they have not had good government over the past years under the party that is in power.

Mr. Speaker, I could give you another example of the development that is taking place in Ontario today and over the past 14 years. We hear a lot of remarks from hon. members opposite about the number of housing starts. I could point out that since 1948 there have been 1,568,334 housing starts in Canada. Of this amount, 598,295 were right here in Ontario.

In other words, while Ontario was building 598,295 houses, the other nine provinces and two territories were only building 970,079. In other words, the average housing starts per province and territory in the period 1946 to 1961 was 88,165, or 6,156 per year. This is the average over the nine provinces and two territories. In the same period, while the average was 6,156 per year, Ontario was starting 42,735 per year.

Mr. Speaker, the \$2,218,315,000 that has been spent in power development since 1946 has paid rich dividends. Now power development is only one of the policies that has made a tremendous difference in Ontario's economy. Another policy that has had a terrific impact on all parts of our province has been the programme of developing roads and highways

in all parts of Ontario. A great change has taken place since 1942-43. Today you can drive into almost any part of Ontario and see roads that are the equal of anything in North America. In 1942-1943 the highway budget and provincial assistance to roads amounted to \$19,780,000. 1961-1962 saw an expenditure of \$243,238,000.

Roads and highways are the lifelines of every community, and much of the development and expansion that has taken place in the province would not have been possible if it had not been for the progressive road-building policy that has been pursued. We think of the great expressways, the controlled access highways that make it possible for people and goods to move rapidly from point to point. We think of the tremendous increase in the assistance to our municipal roads, of the development road programme, of the assistance in the urban centres.

Many of the forms of assistance did not exist when the present party took office. The former government had apparently not thought of development roads. They apparently had not thought of assisting with the streets in the villages and the towns and the cities. Their grants to bridges was on a dollar for dollar basis. Under this government it is a grant of four to one. This type of assistance has made possible the expansion and development in areas that could not have expanded and developed without adequate roads. And I could remind the House that most of the traffic in rural Ontario moves by motor transport.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss at this point if I did not publicly thank the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) for the recent roads that he announced would be assumed into the highway system on April 1st—

Interjection by an hon member.

Mr. Root: I told the hon. member several days ago—he must be hard of hearing—Mr. Speaker, that I did not announce anything the day before. My press release went out after the hon. Minister spoke.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been more appropriate if the hon. leader of the Opposition and other hon. members that spoke in the House had commended the hon. Minister of Highways, instead of bringing to the notice of the Legislature that a newspaper jumped the press release.

If they want to criticize the newspaper, let them go to Guelph and tell them they do not approve of the way they are doing it. I

commend the newspaper, I can quite understand why the newspaper in that area would feel it was sufficiently important that they could hardly contain themselves. I can quite understand why they would jump the gun.

I was going to say—it would be remiss of me if I did not publicly thank the hon. Minister of Highways for the recent roads which he said would be assumed into the highway system on April 1st, 1963.

In one of the first speeches I made in this Legislature, I gave attention to the fact that for some reason the former government brought a number of highways to the border of Wellington and Dufferin and there they ended, spilling provincial traffic on to the county road system.

No one has ever given me a good reason why the Liberal Party did that to the good people of Wellington-Dufferin. And for years we carried traffic on our county road system that in other parts of the province was carried on provincial highways. We have received generous assistance from this government in the form of development roads. We appreciate it. We are more than pleased to see justice coming to our area by the assumption of these connecting links; connecting links that the former government forgot to put in the highway system. These links will not only benefit the area of Wellington-Dufferin, they will benefit all parts of Ontario, from Toronto north and southwest. The roads from Palmerston to Harriston, Mount Forest, and Shelburne will make it possible for tourists entering at Windsor and Sarnia, and our own people from Western Ontario who are travelling to northern Ontario to take an alternate route and see the beautiful part of Ontario via Highway 23 and the new Highway No. 89. They will not be involved in congestion north of Toronto, until they are up in the Barrie area.

I think that Toronto people, who are frustrated by the congestion on the weekend, will appreciate the fact that some of this traffic, which has no intention of going into Toronto is able to travel by other routes, relieving some of the pressure in their area. The same can be said for the extension of Highway 25, from Acton to Ospringe, or No. 24. From 24, the same route to northern Ontario is available, up through Erin and Orangeville up to Primrose adjoining the new Highway 89. This route provides an alternate route to the north for tourists entering at Fort Erie, Niagara Falls and for our own people travelling on Highways 401, No. 5, No. 2, and No. 7. I know that this addition to the highway system will benefit all parts of southwestern

Ontario. The tourist traffic following this route will benefit all of the municipalities en route. In Halton county, I think of Milton and Acton. Under the former set-up, if you look at the map, to get to Acton you had to turn around and go back down to Brampton. Now they can go through to the north. In the southern part of my own riding, I think of the benefits to Ospringe, Hillsburgh, Erin, Orton, Belwood, Grand Valley, and over in Dufferin, we think of Orangeville and Shelburne, and in the north end of the county, in Peel, I think of Alton and Caledon.

All these towns in the area will benefit from the tourist traffic that will follow this alternate route, and if this traffic goes on out through Simcoe county I can think of the benefit in Alliston and Cooksville, and all the towns en route. The route that connects with Highway 23 in Palmerston will bring tourist traffic out through the town in Middlesex and Perth. I think of Listowel and Clinton and in Wellington, Palmerston, Harriston, Mount Forest, Conn, and Shelburne. Many people will want to use this new highway from Shelburne across to Harriston and Palmerston to get into the Bruce Peninsula, benefiting the county of Bruce. This new highway will benefit the county of Huron, because at Harriston this highway will connect with Highway 87 that leads to Wingham. I note the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) is wondering what this government is doing to help his riding, and this is one thing it has done.

Mr. Singer: That's why they elected him.

Mr. Root: Oh, I think 5,000 turkey dinners elected him. Mr. Speaker, all in all I think it was a wonderful thing for The Department of Highways to put in these connecting links, links that were left out by the former government. No one has ever explained to me why they were not put in, when the highway system was overhauled by the former administration. Today the people of Wellington-Dufferin and, indeed, of all southwestern Ontario feel they have received a measure of justice that was denied by the former administration. I want to thank the hon. Minister of Highways, and I would be remiss if I did not say a thank you for the people of Wellington-Dufferin; and I want to thank his predecessors, the hon. Mr. Goodfellow, the hon. Mr. Cass, and hon. Mr. Allan, and the hon. George Doucette. All of these men played their part in developing the highway system of Ontario to the position it is in today. One of the finest systems you can find in the North American continent.

The tourist industry, agriculture and industry prosper and expand with good roads. Mr. Speaker, in the field of human betterment, there is a record that makes everyone in Ontario feel proud, we think of the hospitalization plan that is covering 97 per cent of our people. Ontario was the first province to sign the agreement with the federal government. We think of the tremendous increase in provincial assistance in a financial way for health facilities. In 1942-43 the provincial budget for health was some \$10,752,000. In 1961-62 that budget was up to \$130,316,000. In 1943, we had some 34,066 in our hospitals and in 1961 this figure had increased to 59,821 for an increase of 25,755. We think of the health units that are scattered over the province, playing a major part in an overall health programme. The health unit programme was not established until after 1945, when it was established by this government.

In my own riding, or at least in the county I represent, in the fiscal year of 1961-62, for the county of Wellington unit the figure was 88,835, and 28,534 for the Dufferin county unit. These figures include the national health grants. In the field of human betterment—the tremendous contribution that is made by The Department of Public Welfare—we think of the disability pension introduced by this government. We think of the increased pension for blind, for the aged, for mothers, for the disabled, for the assistance to children's aid societies and many other organizations. In 1942-43 the total provincial assistance for welfare was only \$9,158,000. By 1961-62 this had risen to \$54,447,000.

I could go into greater detail but I want to deal with another subject that is very close to my heart, and this is the subject of agriculture. My first words speaking about agriculture, Mr. Speaker, are words of congratulations to the young lads in my own riding—Ron Storey; 18 years old, of Eramosa township. Ron Storey won the Queen's Guineas this year at the Royal Winter Fair. Ron is a member of the Eramosa township 4-H Calf Club in Wellington county. He had entered the Queen's Guineas competition for the last five years. His animals placed in the top ten of the Angus class, both last year and three years ago, and he has never been lower than the second group. Ron, by his continued efforts, has brought great honour to himself, to the Eramosa Calf Club and the county of Wellington; indeed everyone in the county was pleased to see this coveted award won by a lad who had given years of effort. Everyone was pleased to see him sell this calf to Loblaw's for \$9 a pound for a total of \$7,038. His achieve-

ment will no doubt encourage others to compete for the Queen's Guineas in years to come. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House that Ron Storey won top honours with his calf at the Erin Fall Fair on Thanksgiving Day. I think I have told the House before but in case some new hon. members are not aware, we are very proud of the Erin Fall Fair which has properly earned the title "the preview of the Royal."

When I am speaking of the Queen's Guineas I could remind the House that this is the sixth time that the Queen's Guineas has been won by a Wellington county junior farmer; other winners were Ken McKinnon of Erin township who gained the award in 1947 and 1948, and that is history. I think Ken McKinnon is the only person who has won the award two years in succession; other winners were Angus McIntosh of Guelph, Bill Dunbar of Guelph, Ross Graham of Palmerston.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 15, the *Arthur Enterprise News* carried a report of a speech by Mr. William Tilden of Harriston, president of the Ontario federation of agriculture. I must say that I was struck by the heading and by some statements that Mr. Tilden made. Under the heading "New Hope Exists in Rural Ontario," Mr. Tilden said:

Farmers have come through one of the most difficult periods in Ontario's history, but there seems to be a newborn feeling of hope in rural Ontario, stated William Tilden of Harriston.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member for Huron-Bruce has left but this statement is coming from the head of the largest farm group in the province. Mr. Tilden was addressing the 26th annual meeting of the federation. Continuing his note of optimism, Mr. Tilden said:

Whatever the reason, we are now enjoying prices for many of our commodities much more in line with the cost of production than has been the case for some time.

As I said, Mr. Tilden was addressing delegates on the first day of the three-day convention in Toronto's Royal York Hotel.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Tilden's words are significant. He is the head of the largest farm organization in the province and I think that hon. members opposite who have a lot to say should remember that Mr. Tilden said that we are now enjoying prices for

many of our commodities much more in line with the cost of production that has been the case for some time.

Mr. Speaker, when I read these words I thought I would do a little research into what actually is happening as far as prices in marketing are concerned in the province of Ontario. We all know that Ontario has the most advanced marketing legislation in Canada. Under our marketing legislation there are some 13 plans that market some 26 crops. In 1943 there were only eight plans marketing 11 crops. This is some indication of the growth in marketing of farm products, Mr. Speaker.

It occurred to me that it might be of interest to hon. members who may not be acquainted with the farming operations, to have brought to their attention some of the prices that farmers are receiving now, and what they were receiving for the same commodities just a few years ago.

Since potatoes are produced in large quantities in Dufferin and Simcoe counties, I could tell you that in 1957, Highland potatoes sold in 75 pound bags at an average of 75 cents per bag. In 1962, they were selling at an average of \$1.30 per bag. The top price at the Toronto wholesale market for Ontario No. 1 potatoes—this price includes commission, handling, trucking and container costs—was \$1.40 per 75 pound bag in 1956, and \$1.85 in 1962. Mr. Speaker, you might be interested in the price of some other commodities.

For instance, in 1956, chickens, five pounds to six and a half pounds were selling at 21 cents a pound. In 1962 this grade was selling 25 cents a pound. In 1956, broilers were selling at 18 cents a pound; in 1962, they were selling at 20 cents a pound. In 1956, butter was selling at 59 cents a pound, and in 1962 it was selling at 63 to 64 cents per pound. This is No. 1 grade at the farm for butter fat.

In 1957, grade A eggs, large, were selling at 49 cents a dozen—this is the Toronto price to farmers—in 1962 they were selling at 51 cents per dozen. In 1957, hogs were selling for grade A dressed weight at the Ontario stockyards at Toronto for \$28.25 per hundred-weight; in 1962, they were selling for \$32.55 per hundred-weight. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, these prices are all for the week of October 1, and were the top prices quoted for that week.

In 1957, choice steers live weight, up to 1,000 pounds were selling at the Ontario stockyards, Toronto, for \$18.50 a hundred;

in 1962, the same grade of cattle were selling in the same week for \$30 a hundred. In other words, a gain of eleven and a half cents a pound. To appreciate what this means to the farmers of Canada, I could tell you that the cattle population of Canada in 1962 was 12,075,000. I know that cattle would not all be the same weight, there would be some calves—in fact there were 3.4 million calves—there were 253,000 bulls, 2,955,500 cows, for milk, and 2,419,300 for beef.

Yearling heifers raised for dairy purposes were 724,800, and 854,400 for beef. Then there were 1,460,800 steers.

To give you some idea of what this raise in price values of beef means to the farmer, I could tell you that if all the cattle were marketed at 1,000 pounds weight—that is about the average weight—a 1 cent per pound increase in value would amount to over \$120 million. The 11.5 cent gain in price between 1957 and 1962 figured on the same basis, would amount to \$1,387.5 million of either cash in the farmer's pocket, or credit in the bank.

When we look at these figures or think of these figures, I think we can understand why Mr. Tilden said:

There seems to be a newborn feeling of hope in rural Ontario—

and goes on to say:

—whatever the reason, we are now enjoying prices for many of our commodities much more in line with the cost of production than has been the case for some time.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that hon. members opposite will keep in mind these price increases occurred at a time when there was not only a Conservative government in Ontario, but there was also one in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, you might want to ask me what has the government got to do with creating markets and the rising price for produce. I would like to point out, sir, that government can help a great deal by creating a favourable climate for the expansion of business. This has been done by the government in power in Ontario today.

I have shown in the remarks that I have made that Ontario has become the most attractive place in all Canada in which to establish an industry, a business, or a home. I have mentioned the effect of power development on our economy both rural and urban and industrial. I have mentioned the tremendous increase in grants for education and for health—grants which relieve a great share of

the burden of taxation on property and business, making Ontario a more attractive place in which to operate and to live.

In addition to what I have already said, I would point out that this government has been very generous to the municipalities in many ways. In 1942-43, the municipal grant of a one mill subsidy in my own riding of Wellington-Dufferin, amounted to \$25,109. In 1961-62, the grants received by my riding had been expanded as far as the municipalities were concerned in many ways. We had grants in lieu of taxes. We have per capita grants that were introduced by the present government. We have winter works programmes worked out in co-operation with the federal government, police and fire grants, and the grand total adds up to \$112,627.65 in the year 1961-62.

This year, 1962-63, it is estimated that these grants will reach \$131,196, as against the \$25,109 they were receiving before the present party took office. I point this out as another way in which the government creates a climate that attracts people and business. These new grants that mean so much to Wellington-Dufferin, the taxpayer of Wellington-Dufferin, are grants that apply to every municipality in Ontario. In 1942-43, the total assistance to municipalities in Ontario was \$18.3 million; in 1960-61, this had risen to \$330,941,227.

Earlier in my remarks I mentioned the tremendous increase in population in Ontario, since the present administration took over. Over half of the new Canadians have come to Ontario. Our population has grown by 2,327,000. By next year, if that rate of growth is maintained, it will have grown by approximately 2.5 million people. The overall policies of the government that have attracted 2.5 million people has created a tremendous consuming market that did not exist in Ontario when this government took office.

I have made inquiries regarding the per capita consumption or the per capita domestic disappearance of food in Canada for the year 1960, and I find that Canadian people use 69.2 lbs. of beef per year; 55.2 of pork; 15.1 of chicken; other poultry including turkey 5.5; 36.7 lbs. of eggs—and I do not know why they weigh the eggs; 391.8 lbs. of whole milk, including cream; 16.9 lbs. of butter; 6 lbs. of cheddar cheese; 171.4 lbs. of potatoes; tomatoes, fresh, canned and otherwise, 59.4 lbs; vegetables, fresh, canned, frozen and otherwise, 113 lbs.; apples, fresh, canned and juice, 27.8 lbs; peaches, fresh and canned, 9.1 lbs.; cherries, fresh, canned and frozen, 1.6 lbs.; honey, 1.3 lbs.; flour, 136.7

lbs.; beans, 2.9 lbs.; oatmeal and rolled oats, 4.9 lbs.

I have quoted these figures to give people an idea of the tremendous consuming market that has been created by a population expansion in Ontario, that has never been equalled in any other part of Canada. For instance, since we consume approximately 70 lbs. of beef per capita, the increased population alone will consume approximately 175 million lbs. of beef per year. Since we consume approximately 55.2 lbs. of pork, there is a new market for 137 million lbs. of pork per year. And since we consume approximately 391.8 lbs. of milk this consumption has created a market for 978 million lbs. of fluid milk that was not here when this government took office. The increased butter consumption adds up to over 40 million lbs. per year; 428 million lbs. of potatoes.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, anyone can take the chart of per capita consumption and multiply it by 2.5 million and he will have some idea of the tremendous consuming market that has been created by the overall policies of this government attracting so many people to Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, another stabilizing factor in the economy of the province, is the tremendous increase in assistance from The Department of Public Welfare. Last year the budget provided for \$54,447,000. This money goes to people who are in need of help and provides valuable purchasing power that has great effect on markets for all types of commodities and services and at the same time makes it possible for people who, through no fault of their own, are unable to provide the necessities of life—in other words to have a good life here in the good province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, in another area, governments are strengthening the economy of the province and of the nation and these policies provide increased markets for the producers of Canada and of Ontario. I am talking about a balanced trade with the world, and in particular with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have brought this matter to the attention of the House on previous occasions. But in 1946, at that time I think the hon. members opposite know there was a Liberal government in power in Ottawa, Canada had a favourable trade balance in the overall picture of \$430,738,000. But under the policy the government of that day pursued, that favourable balance kept dropping and by 1950 it had disappeared. By 1956, the last full year that that government was in office, instead of a favourable

trade balance we had an unfavourable balance of \$786,509,000. That same year the unfavourable balance with the United States was \$1,228,309,000.

Since the change of government in Ottawa, and by the policy they are pursuing, we notice that the unfavourable trade balance is disappearing. In 1961, and this is the last year for which I had figures, it had dropped to \$15,520,000, a tremendous change from the unfavourable balance of \$786,509,000, under the former government.

The same trend is evident in trade with the United States. Instead of a deficit of \$1,228,309,000, that was under the former government, it has now dropped to \$754,859,000 in 1961, the last year for which I have figures. It was my understanding that for a great part of this year our trade balance is in favour of Canada in many of the areas I have mentioned.

With regard to this policy, I think that the hon. members in this House, and I am sure the people of Ontario, will want to commend the Ontario government for the great effort they are making to promote the development of industry here in Ontario and the policy of buying more Ontario goods and less from other countries. It will not only help the national economy; it will provide even more jobs. I am sure that the hon. members opposite will want to join in supporting the government in this policy.

Mr. Speaker, what is good for agriculture in regards to markets is true for all kinds of business, and this government has done a great job in expanding markets.

Mr. Speaker, I have brought these figures to the attention of the House to try to get through to hon. members opposite that they are serving no useful purpose when they go around this province suggesting that it is time for a change of government. I would like to put into the record some figures that appeared in a press article in the *Toronto Daily Star* on Thursday, October 18. I know the hon. members opposite will agree that I am in no way prejudiced when I read from the *Star*. This article is under the heading:

ONTARIO PAYS COOL BILLION IN PERSONAL INCOME TAX

The Ontario residents paid the federal government more than \$1 billion in personal income tax in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1962. This was more than twice that paid by residents of any other province. This information was contained in answer to a question posed in the House of Commons yesterday by

Andrew Lang, Liberal, Vancouver South. The tables showed the income tax paid by Ontario residents had risen steadily from \$285,968,440 in 1950, to \$1,015,724,845 in 1962. The next highest province has always been Quebec. In 1962 Quebec residents paid \$469,827,176.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is this: when hon. members opposite suggest that it is time for a change in government I would remind them that income tax is collected on the same basis right across Canada. You do not collect income tax from people unless they are working and unless they are making money, earning good salaries. Income tax is not even collected on small returns or small salaries, and these figures alone should indicate that Ontario is the most prosperous province in the whole Dominion of Canada.

The article goes on to say: "Ontario firms also paid more corporation taxes than those in any other province. In 1962, Ontario firms paid \$610,147,909 in corporation taxes and the Quebec firms paid only \$405,362,708."

Mr. Speaker, again we know that corporation tax comes from companies—I want the hon. members opposite to hear this—again we know that corporation tax comes from companies and businesses that are showing a profit. We only tax on profit above a certain figure. I give these figures to try to enlighten hon. members in this House who try to say that Ontario is not prospering under a Conservative government.

Ontario is the greatest contributor to the federal Treasury in corporation tax, income tax and in succession duties, because Ontario is the most prosperous place in Canada. The people are earning good salaries and are working, or they would not pay income tax. Business and industry is making profits, or they would not pay corporation tax. We would not be paying succession duties unless we had spent all the money we wanted to spend while alive and left a large sum after we passed on.

I suggest to hon. members opposite, and in particular to the hon. Liberal members, that they are not fooling anyone when they suggest that a Conservative government is a government that brings hard times. I say that without fear of honest contradiction, because it was a Liberal government in Ottawa that decided Ontario had become so prosperous they would set up an equalizing grant and give handouts to every province in Canada, the profits from the taxes they

collected off the industry, and the income and the succession duties they collected here in the province of Ontario. We got nothing, we just paid; and it was the Liberal government that worked that out.

I would not want to leave any doubt in anyone's mind that I am opposed to helping develop Canada. I am a Canadian, but I think this should be said because there are some hon. members opposite who either do not know what they are talking about or are deliberately trying to mislead the people in the hope that they can gain power by appealing to fears and prejudices of people who may not have the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I think the people are getting fed up with the very obvious attempts of some of the hon. members opposite who are trying to appeal to prejudice and who cloud the issues and distort the record.

On Tuesday, November 27, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. Mackay) delivered an address in this House that was a comprehensive report of what the government has been trying to do and what it has in mind for the future of the province of Ontario. The Throne Speech went into all phases of our economy. It outlined a programme that will make Ontario a better place for all of us to live. It draws our attention to the great increase that will come to our school boards in the way of educational grants. And when the legislation forecast in the Throne Speech is translated into actual legislation we will feel the impact of the proposals on our province for years to come.

At the present time the government is embarked on a programme to develop new industry and to expand existing industry, to provide more jobs for people, people who want to live here in the province of Ontario, the most attractive place in all Canada in which to establish a home or a business or an industry.

During other phases of the debates in this House I will have more to say about specific departments of government. I would like to say something during this session about the water resources commission on which I have had the privilege to serve for a little over a year. This commission is playing an important part, I believe, in providing the right climate for happy people, for healthy people and for industrial expansion.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that hon. members opposite will join with the hon. members who support the government and forget their petty politicking and, for at least once, support the government and that magnificent document, the Speech from the Throne.

I have sat in this House year after year and I have watched the hon. members of the Opposition vote against the proposals of every Throne Speech since I have entered the House. I have watched them vote against the proposals that are carried in every budget address since I entered the House. And I sometimes wonder why once in a while they could not vote in favour of development and progress in the province of Ontario. And I would hope that when we come to the conclusion of the Throne debate, for at least once, the hon. members will forget their politics and support the government in a programme that will make Ontario an even better place for all of us to live in.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the debate, I would just like to point out for the information of the last speaker that in the Ontario Union Farmer paper of December, 1962, quoting the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), the headline reads, "Minister Predicts Worse Times Ahead." Mr. Speaker, Tory times are hard times.

Mr. Trotter moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof, it stand adjourned until 2.00 o'clock p.m., December 19, and that rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as it might apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will take what is on the order paper and resume this debate, and we will have a night session.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.30 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, December 19, 1962

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 19, 1962

Second report, standing committee on agriculture, Mr. W. E. Johnston	443
Representation Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacDonald, first reading	443
Statement re revenue from sales tax, Mr. Allan	443
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	444
Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Spooner, Mr. Newman, Mr. Simonett, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Gomme, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Mackenzie	444
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. J. F. Edwards, agreed to	478
Recess, 6 o'clock	478

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1962

The House met at 2.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton) from the standing committee on agriculture, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendment:

Bill No. 25, An Act to provide for the inspection of meat for human consumption.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister) moves that the select committee on motor vehicle insurance and on the cost of drugs, respectively, be authorized to sit during the Christmas-New Year adjournment of this session and that the same allowances for expenses to the chairmen and members thereof be payable for such meetings as are provided by Section 63 of The Legislative Assembly Act, for the meetings held during the interval between sessions.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of the hon. government members may be interested in seconding this bill of mine, but none of them has yet indicated with assurance.

THE REPRESENTATION ACT

Mr. MacDonald moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Representation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I see that the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby) is anxious to know what the bill is. My brief explanation would be that I think

there has been a growing interest in past years with regard to the proposition of the appointment of a permanent Speaker. And I think that this interest is to be found in all political parties. This is an Act to amend The Representation Act and the purpose of it—

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the member is out of order at this point.

Mr. MacDonald: In explaining first reading of a bill?

Mr. Speaker: Only Ministers of the Crown.

Mr. MacDonald: Only Ministers of the Crown? Well, Mr. Speaker, I will have to bow to your ruling because obviously I am not a Minister of the Crown, at this point.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to correct an erroneous impression given by recent press reports as to the amount of revenue from the sales tax. The statement has been made in the newspapers that this tax will produce \$75 million more than expected in the first complete fiscal year of its operation. This of course is not so. Investigation has disclosed that the statement I have quoted was taken from a brief addressed to me by the Board of Trade of Metropolitan Toronto, which brief I may say has not yet been received by me. The board, assuming that the brief had reached my desk, released it to the press.

Here are the facts of the situation: For 1961 and 1962 first, for that portion of the fiscal year, 1961-62, during which this tax was to be collected, we originally stated in my budget statement of March 9, 1961 our estimated revenue of \$60 million, and used this figure at that time. In the budget statement of March 1, 1962—this was after some few months' experience—we revised that estimate to \$76 million and when the books for the year ended March 31, 1962 were finally closed, the revenue amounted to \$78,746,682. The change from an original estimate of \$60 million to a final amount of

\$78,746,682 is readily understandable when one remembers that the first estimate had to be made without precise knowledge of the amount of taxable sales, the actual effect of exemptions, rebates and refunds, and the effect of what is called pre-tax buying. When the 1963 forecast was made last March, at the time the budget was presented, we had the benefit of several months' actual collections and adjusted our figures accordingly.

In the budget statement of March 1, 1962—that is March 1 last—we forecast that the revenue from sales tax for the current year would be \$160 million, that is, twice the amount of the \$76 million then forecast for 1961-62, plus \$8 million additional, with the hope that there would be an increase in gross national product.

Collections so far this year indicate that the actual revenue will be modestly higher than the forecast of \$160 million, and this may be attributed to the continued good health of our economy and the consistent high level of incomes and low level of unemployment.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that the statement of \$75 million unexpected income from the retail sales tax is not correct. As I stated in the House on March 1 this year, despite the revenue from this source, the extraordinary requirements, particularly for education and health, are of such magnitude that we will still experience an appreciable short-fall in revenue.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Haskett), a copy of which I sent to him. Is it correct that the hon. Minister has approved a by-law invoking Section 89 of The Labour Relations Act so that the employees of the Victoria County jail have been denied the right to join the union of their choice?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I had received notice of the question of the hon. member for York South. The municipal corporation of Victoria county duly passed a by-law invoking the provisions of Section 89 of The Labour Relations Act that declared:

That The Labour Relations Act shall not apply to its relations with its employees or any of them.

Pursuant to Section 5 of The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act, I approved the by-law:

Insofar as it relates to a jail or lock-up.

The employees of a jail are municipal employees. If the municipality desires to invoke the provisions of Section 89 of The Labour Relations Act, that is its affair. I can see no reason why the Minister of Reform Institutions should use the authority given him under Section 5 of The Penal and Reform Institutions Inspection Act to deny the municipality is right.

Mr. MacDonald: This government gives rights with one hand and takes them away with the other.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following:

1. The 54th annual report of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario for the year ended December 31, 1961.

2. The financial statement of the settlers' loan commissioner for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1962.

3. The 42nd annual report of the Public Service Superannuation Board.

4. The report of the commissioner of agricultural loans for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1962.

5. The 16th report of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario for the 12 months fiscal period ending on March 31, 1962.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, this is the third time since I have been a member of this House that I have had the opportunity to thank you for the fair way in which you preside over the House here and the benign smile with which you look upon all the hon. members. Providing we do not have an election I will look forward to the dinner which you give the hon. members each year. I take this opportunity not only to thank you for your fairness but for your hospitality.

Since we last met there have been many new hon. Ministers. In some respects it is the same old deck reshuffled, except for a change here and there, but one hon. Minister I would like to single out for congratulations is the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton). He received most of his education in my home town of Brandon, Manitoba, and I think that that education has done him a lot of good. I wish him every success. I am sorry he is not in his seat at the moment; I do not think he will be in office too long but while he is there I hope his stay is happy and successful.

What is really significant and really important since our last meeting, Mr. Speaker, is what has happened in Huron-Bruce. I think, now that we have heard the new hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), you will know that we have an outstanding new member here in the Liberal ranks. We are certainly finding out that the people of Ontario are with the Liberal Party.

We in this party are anxious to see an election in the immediate future so the people of this province can get a new government, so that they can clean house. One just has to listen to the Speech from the Throne to realize that the government today is using the same old worn-out words without coming forward with any new policies.

For example, in just looking over one or two items on labour, here is one statement: "Industrial safety is of great concern to the government." Well, Mr. Speaker, if industrial safety is of such great concern to this government, why have they not done something about it in the last 20 years? One has only to read the McAndrew report, an investigation which was made necessary because of the disaster at Hogg's Hollow. But even after that disaster at Hogg's Hollow, with the McAndrew report, we have no really concrete legislation coming forward as yet. We were promised some, but if the last 20 years is any indication of what we are going to get, we are not going to have very much to look forward to.

Still, after 20 years, Mr. Speaker, we get such statements from the government as this: "The Department of Labour is assessing the need with a view to bringing into effect, where necessary, minimum wages for the protection of the workers of the province." Twenty years in office, and they are still assessing the need. If they do not know by now that there is a need, I suggest it is time for a change in the government of this province.

One thing I looked for in vain in the Speech from the Throne was the promise of a psychiatric hospital here in Toronto. You know, almost each year—in fact, I think this is the first year it has not been mentioned in the Throne Speech since I have been in the House—we are promised a psychiatric hospital in Toronto. The previous Minister of Health, back in about 1958, said they were going to build a \$5 million psychiatric hospital here in this city. A week after that promise the former Prime Minister said they were going to build a \$6 million psychiatric hospital here in Toronto, and gave

all the indications in a newspaper report that it was going to be built soon. As each session of the Legislature has sat I have questioned the Minister of Public Works and received the answer: "It is being planned", and that they are always allowing so much money for the hospital. But these plans are not even reported on. I suggest that this government has no intention in the near future, or possibly even in the distant future, of giving the city of Toronto a much-needed psychiatric hospital.

This is just another indication, Mr. Speaker—just as they built the hospital eventually in Goderich and Palmerston—of how, over a long period of time, they kept announcing and re-announcing the building of these hospitals, giving the appearance that they were doing something. I suggest that what they are doing, in relation to needs, is not nearly enough.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss briefly a subject which I think may come up later on in the sittings of this House, but as we on this side do not control when bills or resolutions are going to be called, I am going to say something about it now. That is the need for medical health insurance in the province of Ontario. I think one of the first things you have to ask is: Who bears the burden of illness? Where does the impact of ill health strike hardest and longest?

We hear so much how everybody in the province is taken care of, that there is no one who really needs medical health care, or assistance. I want to say emphatically that this is definitely not true. Certainly, what research has been done on this subject bears me out, that the people of Ontario and the people of Canada are not getting the health services they need.

When the federal administration of Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent in 1951 realized that very little research had been done on this subject a sickness survey was undertaken. This sickness survey was done in relation to illness, to medical care and medical care expenses. It was carried out, throughout Canada, by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics together with the federal Department of National Health and Welfare, and with the provincial departments of health across Canada. This survey was done in 1950 and 1951.

Fortunately for us, a Dr. Malcolm G. Taylor prepared for the Canada Tax Foundation in 1956 a book entitled, "The Financial Aspects of Health Insurance." He gathered together what information had been garnered from the sickness survey and prepared

this particular booklet. I understand, too, that he was an advisor to the provincial government when the conferences with the federal government took place in 1956 and 1957 on health insurance. These conferences eventually developed our present hospital scheme.

What Dr. Taylor said in his book about the distribution of sickness by income was as a result of delving into all these figures:

Large though the burden of illness is the nation's medical bill could be fairly easily borne if the incidence of illness were equally distributed among the total population. But this is simply not the case. Not only does a relatively small section of the population suffer more of the illness each year, but a disproportionate share of illness seems to strike the lower income groups.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to dwell on this point shortly for this reason, that I think it is important in planning the future of any medical scheme that we realize that the people who can least afford to pay have to bear the greatest burden of the cost. American surveys which have been carried out in the United States have shown that. For example, these figures are from 1951 and there has not been too much in the way of surveys done since that time, so in the case of incomes I would say incomes have gone up but the general principle still holds—one American survey carried on showed that people in lower income groups suffered tuberculosis about four times more than people in higher income groups; that blindness and deafness in the lower income groups were three times higher; that orthopedic impairments were two and a half times higher; that mental diseases were twice as prevalent in low income groups as in the higher income groups. And so on down all types of illnesses the principle is still the same, except when you come to a disease or an illness like appendicitis, this occurs more frequently in the higher income groups.

We as men in public life have to bear in mind the impact, the distress, the financial distress as well as the social distress, that illness causes to the family.

In the Canadian sickness survey it was found that only one family out of seven during a year did not suffer illness, and it was found in covering individuals that over 80 per cent of Canadians had some type of illness during a year, that 58 per cent were disabled at some time or other during the year and nearly 48 per cent during a year were confined to bed or home or in hospital.

So you can see that this is a very heavy burden borne by our people here in the province.

I think that the figures, in showing how the low income groups bear a heavy burden, were summed up by Dr. Taylor. From the sickness survey tables he came forth with the following summation: the average expenditure for all families having expenditures for medical care was \$95, but the average expenditure varied widely with income. The lowest income group, that is less than \$1,500 per year, spent an average of only \$58.10 per family. The low income group, from \$1,500 to \$3,000, spent an average of \$95.90, and the highest income group, \$5,000 or more, spent almost three times as much as the lowest income group, or an average of \$163.80.

So, Mr. Speaker, I base my argument on these figures, that here the high income group spend almost three times as much on medical care and yet the sickness survey shows that the low income group suffers in many instances from four, to three, to twice the illness that the high income group suffers. So hon. members can see that the burden of carrying the medical bill and the drug bill here in this country and in this province is not fairly spread over our population.

The low income groups receive much less of the doctors' care, both in terms of the proportion of persons reporting doctors' care and also in terms of the average number of doctors' calls and clinic visits per person, than did the higher income groups.

I suggest that the only way that this can be overcome is for the government to initiate a scheme which will guarantee good health services, at least the availability of good health services, for everybody in the province of Ontario.

Now at different times in our history and especially through the federal government, the Liberal governments in the past have attempted to initiate health schemes. The first serious proposal was in 1945 when the Mackenzie King administration offered a package deal to the provinces and it involved—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): It was in 1919.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He said it was the first serious one.

Mr. Trotter: Much was said about the Liberals' first promise in 1919. I may refer, and I would like to point this out, that the

original promise was made in 1919. At times the Liberals were in and out of power but intervening in that time was a major world depression and do not forget, Mr. Speaker, and may I remind the hon. member for the riding of Simcoe East, that the Liberal administration during the war had their hands full in leading this country during the war. It would seem that during the middle of the world war it would not be reasonable to initiate a health scheme of this magnitude.

The first serious proposals in 1945, of course, consisted of a package deal concerning taxes and other matters besides health insurance. It was as a result of the actions and the various conferences that took place—the actions of Mr. Duplessis and Mr. Drew, a member of this party over there and Mr. Duplessis, of course, a good friend of this party across the aisle—who saw fit that these proposals would not take place. So at that time the scheme fell through. But as an observer looking at the cold hard facts, this is what Dr. Taylor thought of the Liberal proposals in 1945—the health proposals at that time—this is what he said, and I hope the hon. member for York South is listening.

The health insurance proposals, judged by 1957 standards—

and this was written by Dr. Taylor in 1957—

—were comprehensive, imaginative and bold. It is perhaps not surprising, for the remarkable development of the nation's sinews for war had obviously convinced Canadians of their capacity to handle the problems of peace. Moreover, the approval of health insurance as a good thing by practically every organized group in the nation, including the Canadian Medical Association, the farmers' associations, the labour unions and the Canadian Life Insurance Officers Association, no doubt led governmental leaders to believe that they had general public support and approval.

After the proposals were rejected by the two major provinces in Canada, the Liberals proceeded with grants for hospitals and then subsequently came the hospitalization legislation, the proposals of 1956, when the hon. Paul Martin was the federal Minister of Health and Welfare.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the most feeble rationalization I have ever heard.

Mr. Trotter: Following consistently what the Liberal Party has advocated over the years, I feel we should continue giving the health facilities to the people of this prov-

ince. I quote from a speech of the hon. Paul Martin made on January 23, 1956, when he was talking about the proposed hospitalization programme:

This national health programme was envisaged in the minds of its authors as a great deal more than a means of encouraging the improvement of existing health services and the establishment of new facilities. When Mr. King announced the grants—

that was the hospital grants:

—on May 14, 1948, he pointed out that they should be regarded as “fundamental prerequisites of a nation-wide system of health insurance”. Indeed, he went so far as to say in the House of Commons that the grants also “represent first stages in the development of a comprehensive health insurance plan for all of Canada”.

Mr. Speaker, we advocated a comprehensive health insurance plan for all of Canada, and we now wish to bring in medical services. We are being consistent in the history of our party, of bringing in this much-needed legislation. As our country and as our resources have grown we have been able to turn a part of the growth of our resources back into social capital. And when I hear hon. members from the former CCF say that we have never advocated or done anything, I think they ignore history, because this was the plan worked upon by the Liberals long before there was even a CCF. And when they try to say that the Liberals have done anything, they live up to their old name, the CCF, “confusion carefully fomented”.

Now I know the hon. member for York South does a lot of talking and the frantic five on my left wave their arms and try hard, and the hon. member for York South is very persistent. In some respects the hon. member for York South reminds me of a poem, it must have been written for him, it is a poem of inspiration:

Here's to the man that has lost
He knows he has lost and yet he
is fighting still.

Well, I think there is no hope for the people of this province in the promises of the people on my left. If the people are going to get the much-needed legislation they will get it from the party which has given it to them in the past and that is the Liberal Party.

Now how is this to be done? We in this party passed at our last annual meeting a resolution supporting medical care insurance.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): What year was it passed?

Mr. Trotter: It was passed this year, Mr. Speaker, 1962, for the benefit of the hon. member for Oshawa—if he would just keep informed of the great public events that are taking place, he would not have to ask questions. Now this plan is to be administered by a medical care insurance commission that will include representatives of government and the medical profession. I do not know what the policy of the government is, I do not think they have a policy. They have mentioned medical insurance in the Speech from the Throne, but it is as vague as everything else.

When they presented their brief to the Royal Commission on Health in Ottawa, they did not even mention it, and the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) came out with such statements as this, saying: "Dr. Matthew Dymond insists that medical care is not the responsibility of government." Now here is where I for one in this party take issue with the Tory government. Medical care, health care, is the responsibility of government. And unless you are going to have a healthy people, unless you make possible the health facilities for all of our people, regardless of their wealth, we are not going to develop our most important resource, and that is the people of this province.

I for one in this party believe that any scheme that will involve government funds should be run by what we have advocated, a government commission. I rather suspect, knowing something of the leanings of the Tory party, that they will be quite happy to let everything remain in the hands of the insurance companies. But it would be highly dangerous to allow the insurance companies to become a quasi-public institution. To allow the control of a plan to become centralized, either in the hands of insurance companies or even in the medical profession would not best serve the interests of the people of this province.

Mr. MacDonald: That was the hon. member's own motion two years ago: to give it to the insurance companies. He changed his mind.

Mr. Trotter: There, Mr. Speaker, it just shows that the hon. member for York South, like his fellow hon. member for Oshawa, has not been reading the news properly.

Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the most important, and, of course, one of the great necessities in bringing about any plan such as that advocated by the Liberal Party is to

have the co-operation of the medical profession as a whole. And it is quite interesting to observe what has happened in Europe, how these various plans in western Europe have succeeded. I would just like to read briefly from an article by Leonard Bertin in the *Toronto Daily Star* of May 19, 1962. Mr. Bertin himself examined these plans, was over there, and spent some considerable time. And he says this:

Are doctors happy under nationalized health schemes in Europe? I believe they are in the Scandinavian countries. I think it could be said that generally speaking they are also happy in Britain, the only other country in western Europe that has a completely comprehensive compulsory plan. The general practices committee of the British Medical Association, representing 75,000 doctors stated their position clearly in 1954 after a nation-wide survey. It reported: "In general the advent of the nation-wide health service has not harmed the relationship between doctors and their patients." There may even be some improvement as a result of the absence of a money bar and increased co-operation among doctors.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we can learn from the experience of others and, after all, the cultural background of western Europe is similar to ours. If they can make these schemes succeed over there, I see no reason why we in this province—and I hope eventually in this country—cannot make a similar scheme succeed.

True, we should vary the scheme to suit our own purposes. It would be foolish to line out every single detail until one was actually bringing the plan into effect. But I think that, from the record of the Liberal Party in the past in bringing through new legislation that has been controversial, it has been shown we do not either take the Tory extreme or the socialist extreme. The important thing is to get the various elements to work together for a good cause. And we here have no intention of interfering with the doctor-patient relationship, where the doctor can choose his patient and where the patient can choose his or her doctor.

We feel that by bringing in a service plan we remove the one great bar between a doctor and his patient—and that is the fear of what it is going to cost. Today the very wealthy do not have to worry about their doctors' bills, nor do the very poor; they are already paid for. But, it is the mass of people in between. Some say, well, 60 per cent of the population of Ontario is already

insured. But, it is never the same 60 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

When we had the voluntary hospitalization scheme here in Ontario 60 per cent of the population were insured for hospitalization insurance, but a survey showed there was a 15 per cent turnover each year in that 60 per cent. In other words, as soon as anybody ran into any financial problems, their premiums were dropped. So the only way to overcome this turnover—and it was overcome in the hospitalization scheme where we have 97 per cent covered—the only way we can stop that turnover is by having a scheme that will be open to all, regardless of their health or their age. And although the private plans have done some good, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that the people who need it most can't get proper medical insurance. An individual can be paying into a private scheme for years and as soon as he reaches the age of 65, at a time when he is certain to use it, he is cut off.

So there are many reasons, Mr. Speaker, why a government scheme is essential. The long overriding one is this: if we, as men in government, are to be fair to our people, are to see that they get the best when it comes to health, such a scheme as proposed by the Liberals is the only answer. I think that it is a shame that this government, with the experience that it should have had, with the obvious illustration it has had of the hospitalization scheme—all this experience—it still ignores this problem, it still comes out with these empty platitudes that we receive from the Throne Speech.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, with all sincerity, that an election is called as soon as possible, in order that we may turn this government out of office. Twenty years is too long, so I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I hope, in the near future, to see hon. members across the aisle on the hustings.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I join with the other hon. members in congratulating you for the manner in which you conduct the affairs of this House. I would also like to associate myself with those other hon. members who have paid tribute to the members of the Legislature who have died since last session, to express sympathy to their families. Congratulations are in order to the new hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). I hope that he will be happy in his endeavours in this House. He has the honour of succeeding a man who was held in very high regard, not only in the House and in his constituency but throughout the province.

The hon. members who moved and seconded the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne are to be congratulated on their effort, and I do so. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we could refer to one as the mighty mite, and the other as the mighty mighty.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of the last few weeks, reference has been made, on a number of occasions by hon. members, to the northern trip organized by The Department of Lands and Forests. I appreciated very much receiving a number of letters from hon. members who had been with us on this trip, and I thank them for their thoughtfulness. I also wish to say how much I have appreciated the remarks which have been passed during the session. However, although I appreciate those very much I want to assure the hon. members it was because of the excellent work of the staff and the officials of The Department of Lands and Forests that the trip was such a success.

These men have great experience in organizing trips of this kind and similar functions. Certainly on this occasion they did their very best to show the hon. members some of the northern part of our province, to make their stay interesting, and their visit fruitful. We tried to show the hon. members something of the economy of the north, to impress upon them the fact that it is a very young country. Since the trip, I received comments from many residents of the north who were appreciative of hon. members of the House who were able to come with us on that trip.

We tried to show the hon. members our people at work, in the mines, in the bush, in the sawmills, in the paper mills, and in agriculture. I am sorry that I personally did such a poor job of operating the debarker at the sawmill in Cochrane. Actually there was no need to put that particular log through the chipper because I had chewed it up enough in the debarker. Another point I would like to mention at this time, in connection with the trip, is that I hope that the hon. members were not bored too much with some of my very inadequate speeches. I want to assure them I have now deleted speech No. 57(a) from my repertoire.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to deal with many of the matters which are dealt with in the Throne Speech; I want to deal with only a few items that are of particular interest to my riding. One of those is one particular segment of educational facilities in my area. We all know that in the course of a properly balanced economic development such as is required in northern Ontario there

must be full opportunity for technological training to go hand in hand with academic training. Vision and planning have culminated in the opening this year of the Northern Ontario Institute of Technology at Kirkland Lake. I welcome this as another foundation stone, to help ensure the future for the progressive people of northern Ontario.

The institute is operating in temporary quarters, at the present time, with 74 students from all over the northern part of the province taking the first-year general course. The new accommodation will be ready for occupancy by the end of January, 1963; and the second year course, starting next fall, will offer six areas of training in engineering technology, electrical technology, chemical technology, electronic technology, mechanical technology, and civil technology. Even in its initial concept, the institute will accommodate 100 students. This will be a very important starting point in the ordinary expansion of education facilities for our northland.

There is no age limit for students although they must have a basic entrance requirement of mathematics and science from grades 11 and 12 of the secondary school system. Academic fees are set at \$200 per year plus an added \$35 to cover undergraduate activities.

I can tell the hon. members that we of the north are deeply appreciative of this expansion in technological training which is necessary for the fulfilment of the industrial and academic destiny of northern Ontario. Technological education advancement is part of a planned pattern being evolved for the overall development of our north country to keep it abreast of similar opportunities in other more populated parts of the province. It is based on the premise that industrial and technical education must go hand in hand with the more liberal arts if we are to make the greatest use of our human and natural resources which, after all, form the basis of our whole economy.

This, as I have already intimated, is one portion of the mosaic of integrated regional economic planning which has received national attention following the "Resources for Tomorrow" conference of October, 1961, and the formation of the resources Ministers' council of Canada of which it is my privilege to be the first chairman. Based on the multiple-use concept of all our resources, with special emphasis on the importance of regional planning for the well-being of all our people, future as well as present, this council is unique in that all ten provinces

and the federal government sit as equal members. This was a first in Canadian governmental history.

Two volumes have been printed containing over 80 background papers by recognized individual experts and groups of experts on all phases of our industrial resources covering the fields of agriculture, water, forestry, fisheries, wildlife, recreation and regional development.

A third volume with a very lengthy descriptive title, "Proceedings of the Resources for Tomorrow Conference," is now available. It deals with a summary of reports in which Canada's renewable resources are considered in relation to national, regional and provincial roles for economic development. Some problems of resources policy, management and administration are outlined and guide lines for action are proposed. This volume is the result of the workshops and discussions of over 700 leaders in the resources field, from industry, from universities and from government.

Of the guide lines for action mentioned in the title of volume 3, last week saw the meeting of the executive committee in Montreal attended by the hon. Walter Dinsdale from the government of Canada, the hon. René Levesque from Quebec, and myself representing Ontario.

The qualifications for the important position of secretary-general were discussed, and it was agreed to advertise widely within the civil service, the universities and in the financial section of the Canadian press. In fact, we will leave no stone unturned in our attempt to obtain the best qualified person for this job. This will be done without delay and we will then proceed with the appointment of an executive officer and the other senior staff required to enable the secretariat to function. I hope that in due course of time I will be in a position to inform the House as to the progress of this very important secretariat.

Mr. Speaker, one of the very important government-sponsored operations in the north country is the Ontario Northland Railway, and I would now like to speak of this very valuable service.

It must be appreciated, Mr. Speaker, that neither the Ontario Northland Railway, nor any other railway for that matter, is permitted to favour in rates one business over another or one area of its development over another. Whatever economy is offered in rates to a new business must be held available to any other.

However, the consistent policy of encouragement and assistance is followed to promote interest and development both of our northern natural resources and any manufacturing and processing industry which can be induced to locate on ONR territory or in areas adjacent to it.

Of the traffic passing over the ONR, the local rates govern only about five per cent, the balance is interline traffic involving the CNR and the CPR and their connections. In no case do local rates on the ONR exceed the rates authorized by the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada as being just and reasonable rates by carriers under their jurisdiction. In fact, in some cases ONR local rates are lower.

ONR interline freight rates within Canada are based on the equalization scale of freight rates as authorized by the Board of Transport Commissioners in their judgment of December 12, 1952. Between ONR points and points on the CNR railway or between ONR points and points on the CPR railway, instead of the rates being made on a combination of rates applicable for the ONR distance plus that applicable for either the CNR distance or the CPR distance, they are made on the basis of what is termed the one-line scale or the through distance.

For example, say a haul on the ONR is 100 miles, a basic first-class rate for that distance is \$1 per 100 pounds. The CNR or CPR rate for the same distance is \$1. But the through rate from CNR and CPR railway points involving a total haul of 200 miles, instead of being \$2 per 100 pounds is \$1.28 per 100 pounds, which is exactly the same as would be charged by either the CNR or CPR for a local haul on their line of 200 miles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those criticizing the ONR freight rates in our opinion are confusing distance with level. In other words, we are asking the ONR to correct geographic disadvantages by artificially shrinking the mileage to our markets. We consider it clear that neither the CNR nor the CPR can consistently concur in interline freight rates from or to points on the ONR on levels lower than that in effect between local points on their own lines equidistant. It is my view that freight rates play a much smaller part in any increased cost of manufacturing or living in the north country than is generally supposed. Playing a large role, no doubt, are the costs of local distribution for this more thinly populated section of Ontario.

The Ontario Northland Railway always has, and still does, in line with its original policy

as a development road, negotiate on behalf of existing and pioneering industries with the major railway lines in an effort to arrive at economic interline rates. One of the earliest of these negotiations of importance in this category was in 1916, the setting of interline rates for Abitibi Pulp & Paper Company. One of the most recent developments, which is expected to produce annually better than one million gross tons of iron concentrates and to employ 400 men, came from the setting of rates in 1955 for the moving of iron ores and concentrates from the Adams mine property in Boston township near Kirkland Lake, which is operated by the Jones and Laughlin Steel Company.

These negotiations settled after three years of work the established rate to supply Jones and Laughlin mills at Pittsburgh and Cleveland in the United States which could compete with the moving of ores from deposits all over the country and as far away as Minnesota.

Now let me give some more examples of these negotiations by our railroad. From 1938 to date rates that had been established for Abitibi for ONR points to Iroquois Falls to assist the paper industry have been changed and amended from time to time. From 1949 to 1950 special rates for asbestos commodities from the Johns Manville mine at Matheson to USA points were set up. From 1947 to 1959 special rates were established and regular reductions allowed on pyrites moving from Noranda, Quebec, over ONR lines to USA points to ensure continuous production of the mines. In 1950 special low rates were established from ONR stations to supply the splint factory at Haileybury.

From 1950 to 1960 special reduced rates were allowed on iron and steel commodities to and from Cobalt, New Liskeard and Noranda for the cobalt foundry, the Wabi iron works at New Liskeard and the Quebec iron foundries. In 1958, the railroad established special rates on hardware moving from North Bay to the north country over ONR lines to assist George Taylor Hardware Limited, a well-known wholesale distributing house, in distributing their merchandise. In 1958, rates were established to assist the mines of Timagami, Cobalt, Elk Lake, Boston Creek and Timmins by giving special reduced rates for copper concentrates to be milled at Noranda Mines.

In 1959, the railroad established special rates to assist wholesalers at Timmins and Cochrane moving various commodities from those areas into the Moosonee area. In 1959 special reduced rates were established to

encourage the movement of limestone deposits at Haileybury. In 1960 new rates were established to encourage the movement of pulpwood from ONR to points off the line, and reduced incentive rates were established to move pulpwood to Thorold and Merrittton and Cornwall.

In 1962, the firm of Hill-Clark-Francis Ltd. received reduced rates on green, wet lumber of Cochrane, to New Liskeard for air drying, milling and furtherance. Reduced rates were also established on logs from stations north of Cochrane to the new sawmill at Cochrane for manufacturing into lumber.

In the same group, special incentive rates on lumber from Cochrane to New Liskeard were established for transshipment for milling and furtherance on the line. Special incentive rates were negotiated on pulpwood and pulpwood chips being shipped from Cochrane to Thorold. In 1962, William Milne and Sons operating a logging and sawmilling industry in Timagami received special incentive rates on pulpwood chips being shipped from Mileage 73 in the Timagami division to Cornwall.

Mr. Speaker, these points are just a few of the matters in which this government and its associated boards and commissions has worked over the years and is continually striving with all its endeavours to improve the social and industrial standards of the north country, as well as that of all of Ontario.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, may I extend not only my compliments but also my thanks to you for the many courtesies extended to me during the past year? My congratulations at this time go out to the new hon. Ministers and also to the good people of Huron-Bruce for their kind, considered and intellectual decision in adding to the ranks of the official Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one comment on a subject that is brought up every year in this House. Normally I would hesitate to raise this, but I am hoping against hope that the problem and confusion of daylight-saving time be settled on a province-wide basis, once and for all.

I would like to talk for a few minutes on a topic that has been and still is of major concern to my area for much too long a period of time, that is unemployment. Its causes are as many as the people who discuss the subject. To each person who is unemployed his reason is the most important. For all my four years in this House, I have

attempted to bring to the attention of this government the fact that Windsor has had and still has a hard core of unemployed that needed attention, yet insufficient was done. As of August 31, 1962, the total registered for employment in Windsor was 7,919—only 383 fewer than in Hamilton, a city substantially larger in population.

Using the 1949 figures as 100, the employment index in Windsor as of July 1962—the latest statistics of the Dominion bureau available to me—is 70.2 compared with 74.2 in September 1961. In other words, the employment index has not improved but rather deteriorated. For the sake of comparison, Toronto's index is 138.7; London's 139.7; Hamilton's 116.1 and the average for all Canada 125.7. Windsor's index was the lowest, or should I use the term, the least desirable, of any Canadian urban area. May I repeat—the least desirable of any Canadian urban area?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: One of the frightening aspects of the unemployment picture in my own community is that Metropolitan Windsor, with approximately three per cent of the population of this province has, as of August 31, 1962—these figures come from the *Labour Gazette* of The Department of Labour, October 31, 1962 issue—7,919 registrations for employment out of the 102,626 persons registered for employment for the whole province. In other words, almost eight per cent of Ontario's total unemployed reside in Windsor. May I emphasize—three per cent of the population with eight per cent of the unemployed.

Surely such startling statistics should merit the special attention of this government. Comments may be made that economic conditions have improved. May I state that the monthly average employment for the first ten months of 1961 was 27,273 compared with a corresponding average of 27,555 for 1962—an improvement of 282, or an improvement factor of a little over one per cent for my community. The welfare rolls still have 4,800 people on them—4,800 who are anxious to be doing their share in the advancement of the economy of Windsor, of Ontario and of Canada. Some of these unemployed are new citizens and newcomers to our shores. Such conditions make them think as to other ways of life, other ideologies. In the minds of many rages an internal conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is the responsibility of the government in a democratic society to take the lead in introducing

action for a solution. The issue today is not whether there is or is not unemployment; the issue is how best to take care of the unemployed and how best to return them to work so that the immediate needs of persons and family are satisfied and future employment is guaranteed.

Because the causes of unemployment are many and varied the provision of full employment will be complex and difficult. In the search for a solution, the government has an increasing and unavoidable obligation to lead; and labour and management have an ever-present responsibility to co-operate with one another and with government in working out that solution.

The object of their joint search and their united efforts must be full, permanent, gainful employment for the whole work force. There can be no other policy, there can be no other goal, there can be no satisfaction with anything less. The goal is to provide jobs, not power in either management or labour. Because with jobs we have a stable work force, a stable society, stable unions, stable companies, stable profits and stable businesses. Without jobs there is no business, no union, no wages, no profits, no management, and no dividends.

On this common ground of finding jobs and providing steady income all the best efforts of government, management and labour can find room for action. The task is not to assign blame for present unemployment to management, to labour, to government, to foreign competition, to changing patterns of production or to automation. The task is to recognize the challenge and stride forward for the credit of solving the problem.

In order to achieve full employment in Canada, we need more Canadians. An industrialized economy functions inefficiently supplying a small population. What Canada needs is more people, still more people, and still more again. We need millions more people. We have the raw materials of an industrial society, we have the facilities to process them, we have the knowledge, we have the desire to produce, and we do produce surpluses in everything from wheat, butter, and eggs, to iron, nickel, aluminum, copper, paper and wood.

What we lack is people to consume our production. The best place to have our consumers, and hence our markets, is right here in Canada. We need an open-door immigration policy which will attract all the immigrants we can draw to Canada, all the time.

We should not turn immigration on and off like a tap. We should seek out, invite, entice, encourage and assist immigrants to come to Canada. In the long run, Canadians will prosper more and our country will flourish best if we bring to this country enough people to consume our production.

Foreign trade is but frosting on the cake. It simply means that we are feeding, clothing or housing someone in a foreign country with certain products of our labours. Usually foreign trade is confined to the special products the foreign consumer wants at a given time and at a given price.

Domestic trade is unconfined. It supplies hon. members and their fellow citizens not only with one or two special items, but with everything from birth to death, including cradles and caskets. It does this year round, each year, every year, without the complications of currency problems, foreign government interference, or low wage rate competition, or anything else.

For example, since 1945 Canada has accepted two million immigrants. The annual expenditures on servicing these people in Canada far surpasses the value of all of Canada's foreign trade. Canadian secondary industry today is producing, exclusive of our paper products, less than 15 per cent of the value of our exports. The mass market for Canada's secondary manufacturing industry is the domestic market, not foreign markets; and the long-term solution for most of industry's problems is a larger Canadian population.

I was pleased to hear of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) in orbit over parts of Europe, Asia and the USA in search of trade. I was pleased because he took a page out of the Greater Windsor Industrial Commission's method of operation. Windsor was one of the first communities in Ontario to send a delegation to the continent in search of business—an example of the extent to which this fine community goes in an attempt to alleviate its unemployment problems. However, such employment-seeking activities at best are only temporary solutions as I pointed out previously in my remarks.

Even though my community has done everything possible to encourage industry at a local level, one great problem confronts it today. This problem is not confined to Windsor. It will be a problem of ever-increasing importance in many other communities throughout the length and breadth of Ontario—yes, and even of Canada—as new processes, ideas and facilities come to the

fore. It is now up to both provincial and federal governments to acknowledge the problem and to seek a solution in conjunction with the affected municipality or municipalities. The problem I refer to is plant movement.

A special committee on plant movements, comprising leaders of labour, management and municipal representatives, arrived at certain conclusions after lengthy deliberations. Representations were made to both provincial and federal governments. It is not my intention to read the whole report; however, I would like to put before this honourable House the portion of the report that specifically refers to the provincial government. I am reading from the report:

... whereas it is of vital importance to discourage the concentration of industry in areas of high density development;

and whereas the movement of industry to areas of relatively high employment inevitably requires the large expenditure of public funds to meet the increasing demands for highways, overpasses, bridges, schools, and other costly services;

And whereas, the indiscriminate use of rich agricultural lands for industrial development should be halted to preserve these natural resources essential to Canada's future growth;

Therefore be it further resolved that the provincial government be urged:

(14) To amend and/or supplement The Planning Act RSO, 1960, to provide an inducement and to influence industry and commerce to locate or remain in areas of high unemployment through measures designed to discourage movement into areas of already high-density development; and for that purpose to implement the useful features of The United Kingdom Local Employment Act, 1960, and The Town and Country Planning Act, 1947, including other such measures as may be expedient in the interests of balanced economic growth of the province; and more specifically to consider the following changes to The Planning Act:

(i) To make it mandatory for all cities and towns, and also for all municipalities within counties to adopt official plans. And that such plans be scrutinized by an authority within The Department of Municipal Affairs with a view not only to local needs and considerations, but also to the orderly and well-balanced economic growth and industrial distribution within the province, and that such authority be empowered to

require modifications of all official plans within the province where such modifications are required to achieve consistency between the amount and location of industrially zoned land and the amount of unemployment in specific areas.

(ii) To provide authority for The Department of Municipal Affairs to use its powers with respect to amendments to the official plans and/or the rezoning of lands within the municipalities in order that applications for such changes be judged in the manner stated in para. (i), that is, in relation to provincial as well as local considerations.

(iii) That certification by the Minister of Municipal Affairs be required of all applications which are made to The Department of Labour for approval of drawings and specifications where new manufacturing space in excess of 5,000 square feet is created, in order to ensure conformance of the intent of official plans approved under The Planning Act.

Mr. Speaker, may I just touch on the retraining of the unemployed. The programme in the city of Windsor is one of the most extensive and most successful programmes of its kind. However, there is still room for improvement. This programme is solely for the unemployed and, as such, makes no provision for the person who can see his job being eliminated in the not too distant future.

Today's temporarily employed do not have an opportunity of preparing or retraining for the day when their present type of employment will be eliminated. Again the incentive to take the course on the part of the individual on welfare is missing. The welfare recipient has too much to lose by enrolling. He is not only taken off welfare but also loses the medical and hospital coverage that is supplied to him by The Department of Public Welfare. The welfare recipient enrolled in this course should be given at least as much as he receives on welfare or he will quite often refuse to take retraining.

It is most difficult to foresee the eventual elimination of the need for retraining, not only of the unemployed but also of the employed. In such case, there is the need for permanent adult training centres, operated both in the daytime for the unemployed and in the evening for the employed, especially in the large urban areas. I would like at this time to suggest to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) that, in his consideration for a new Western Ontario Institute of Technology in the city of Windsor, he investigate the possibility of having an adult training centre built as an annex to this building. I

would have suggested that this annex be added to existing technical schools but these technical schools are used all day long at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development I would suggest that he bring a portion of the Manufacturing Opportunities Show to my fair city to show both the manufacturer and the citizen the opportunities for business that are available. Such a trade fair definitely should be an annual event.

While on this topic, Mr. Speaker, I received a comment from a Windsor-Walker-ville constituent that large quantities of ice-cream, cake and baked goods cartons are made and printed in the United States—an operation that could easily be done right here in our own country.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, now is the time to have a second look at our export-import picture. I spoke a little on this one year ago. I again raise the question—the matter of labour content or the man-hours principle in imports and exports. The dollar content of Canada's exports exceeded imports in only two of the last ten years—that is, the period from 1951 to 1961. This picture does not look too bad on a graph but when translated into the labour content, the picture is shocking.

Here is the labour-content picture for 1961. You can readily see it as one of the causes of increasing unemployment in Canada. Wheat, lumber and iron ore exports totalled approximately \$900 million. The labour content of this type of export is extremely low. Automotive parts, cars, trucks and chemical products imports totalled approximately the same, \$900 million. The labour content of this type of import is extremely high. In fact 77 per cent of Canada's total imports are in a fully manufactured condition. This situation creates jobs for workers in other countries but not in Canada. We are exporting jobs.

If we are to develop our Canadian economy and provide employment for our increasing population, we must consider the labour content of our exports as well as dollar content. We cannot provide increased employment opportunities on exports of low-labour products while we import high-labour products. Were such a principle adopted, our neighbours to the south would immediately set up new manufacturing facilities here in Canada—including the Canadian manufacture of automatic transmissions.

Mr. Speaker, we in the city of Windsor are most appreciative of the assistance given to the new University of Windsor. The new

teachers college has been a long-awaited and much needed asset. We foresee the completion of the new tourist reception centre. May I suggest that consideration be given by The Department of Public Works to the construction of a 20-30 ft. mounted policeman at this centre as a tourist attraction. Windsor is the first Canadian centre seen by a large number of these visitors and such a figure would be most impressive to them.

Mr. Speaker, I could repeat my plea for a mental hospital, for the completion of Highway 401, for a provincial public building, for the purchase of undeveloped lake-shore properties on Lake St. Clair as a companion park to Holiday Beach but I think I have taken enough of the time of this House and would like to end my remarks by wishing each and every one of you and yours the compliments of the season.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the last speaker raised some points about Windsor and directed some comments to the government. Perhaps he would be interested if I could make a brief announcement here concerning some of the things he was discussing. They are contained in a letter which I wrote to Mr. Burt, whose organization submitted that brief from which he was quoting. This letter is dated December 12, 1962:

DEAR MR. BURT:

In respect to the movement of industry from one community to another and further to the meeting with your delegation, may I say that my undertaking at that time has been fulfilled. I have had a long discussion with Mr. K. E. Scott, president of Ford Motor Company of Canada Limited, and have gone over all the ground concerning a proposed transfer out of Windsor of a part of that company's operation. They intend to adhere to their decision explaining that the move is for purely economic reasons.

Subsequently I have made an exhaustive examination of the whole problem in the light of what has caused and accentuated it and what this government in its sphere can do to assist in the situation.

Because of changing patterns and trends in a modern world it is apparent that we need to take a long realistic look at the Windsor area with special emphasis on the present position and how best the ground-work can be laid to bring about the best possible use both of Windsor's physical location and the supply of labour available.

Consequently I have asked the Ontario Economic Council to set up a committee under its aegis to conduct a full-scale inquiry with a view to formulating long-range policies to make maximum use of the advantages of that area.

Moreover, two regional development areas in that lower western Ontario section will be established by The Department of Economics and Development. Their purpose will be to foster economic progress of the whole district concerned and to promote the development of the natural advantages which these areas possess.

In addition, legislation is now before the House, the effect of which will be to promote the economic development of Ontario by a guarantee of loans to businesses, which among other things wish to establish in areas where some industrial development is needed.

The two main purposes of the guarantee provided for in the bill are to promote businesses to be financed which otherwise may not be able to obtain the necessary financing and to make available advice and services to enterprises which can demonstrate their ability to make a substantial contribution to the economic progress of the province.

Among the factors that will be considered in granting such loans will be, of course, the area in which the business or industry will locate. As this is developed its effect will be to support and encourage industry to develop in areas of the province which need some support in order to bolster the local economy.

We are proceeding with the above measures immediately and I am hopeful that we will have the support of all elements in the community in our endeavours.

There are other things I could speak about, Mr. Speaker, but I wanted the hon. member to have this information at this time.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I thank the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I should like to compliment you on the able manner in which you conduct the affairs of this Legislature. Your tact and ability are admired by all of us.

I should like also to congratulate the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney) on his recent appointment as deputy Speaker. I am confident he will carry

out his duties in a manner impartial and satisfactory to all the hon. members.

It is traditional that one extends congratulations to a number of people, and I wish to do this. Firstly, I should like to commend both the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. Both of these hon. members fulfilled ably an important duty.

The hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris), one of the youngest hon. members in this Legislature, both in years and in experience, is a credit to his riding. I am sure he will represent that riding for many years and will be heard in this House many times in debate.

The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar), who seconded the motion, is also to be congratulated on his speech and also in the efficient manner in which he represents his riding.

I would like also to congratulate the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). I am sure he will give an able account of himself, although it is unfortunate that he chose the wrong ship in which to launch his political career, as his talents could have been put to better use on the government side of the House.

Since I was elected in 1959, I have listened with interest to the many debates, and I must admit that it has been very confusing to me to listen to the arguments from the Opposition benches, to try to fathom their policy or to decide if they really had a policy, or were speaking only to be heard, or to be quoted by *Hansard* or by the press.

As a young man, I was always taught to listen to elders and to respect the judgment of people with experience. However, it seems to me that there are many in the Opposition benches who think they are in authority on all matters past and present. We have listened to many hours of debate, and I suggest that if some of the speakers would go back through *Hansard* they would find that they contradicted themselves many times, and have added very little or nothing to the affairs of this province.

In our parliamentary system, the Opposition plays an important part. It is equally important that their leader be a man of experience, one accustomed to parliamentary procedure and to the discussion of problems therein submitted.

Gladly then, Mr. Speaker, we wish the hon. leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) to hold for a long time yet the confidence of his party, and to guide it for many years as leader of the Opposition in this House. We trust that he will be sufficiently

influential with the other hon. members of the Opposition, that they in turn will admit that the problems the government is now tackling will be served more easily and more rapidly by objective study rather than by obstructive criticism.

Last Saturday the Liberals in Frontenac-Addington nominated a Mrs. Chippendale to represent them in the next election. I am sorry I was not invited to the convention, so I do not know what her platform is. Neither do I know, after sitting in this Legislature for three years, the platform of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall the hon. leader of the Opposition and many of his hon. members stating, in this House, and up and down throughout the province of Ontario, that if elected, they would assume on 100 per cent of the education costs. I naturally thought that this would be a major plank in their platform in the coming election. I was surprised, therefore, to hear the hon. Opposition leader, in his reply to the Speech from the Throne, say that they had scrapped this idea and would be in favour of a foundation programme. This particular programme, I understand from the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald), was to be a plank in his platform in the forthcoming election. Is it any wonder we on this side of the House are confused?

I have heard the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) state in this House that his party is opposed to sales tax, and yet I understand that they propose, if elected, to carry on or to increase the present sales tax.

In the preceding sessions, we have heard the Opposition crying unemployment, gloom, doom, and disaster. In their opinion, only the election of a Liberal government could correct this situation. However, this fall they are saying very little along these lines as they realize that this government, under the able leadership of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and through the efforts of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), that this situation is well on its way to being solved.

I do wish to congratulate the hon. Minister of Economics and Development for his success in his trade crusades. These efforts are recognized not only by the Conservative benches and by all the people in Ontario, but also by everyone where a trade crusade has been held.

I would like to quote from the Kingston *Whig Standard* in the issue of Friday, Decem-

ber 14, under "Queen's Park Comment" by Don O'Hearn and headed:

MACAULAY TALKS TURKEY

The hon. Robert Macaulay has been talking turkey in Turkeyland. The Minister of Economics and Development has been holding large luncheon meetings in key United States cities in connection with his two trade crusades and he has been doing us proud. Mr. Macaulay has been carrying a message that the United States has to buy more from us as well as that we have to buy more of our own goods at home. He has been presenting it in not only an able but also a statesmanlike way.

When you tell anyone that you have to buy less from him and that in essence he is not doing his share of carrying the load, you can be heading for deep trouble. Mr. Macaulay has been doing this and doing it in a way that should offend very few, if anyone. The Minister's approach has been a blunt presentation of facts that Canada's imbalance with the United States is about \$1.5 billion and that we can't continue to buy from it unless this is very substantially reduced.

He does not duck touchy points. He proposes that more United States industrialists should enter into deals for more manufacturing in Canada under licence. He notes that some United States companies prevent their Canadian branches from exporting to other markets, keeping this business for the home plant. He also notes that some companies won't permit their Canadian plants to buy Canadian parts, even though these are cheaper. He puts all of these points and others across in a thoughtful and considerate way which does not either whine or bombast, and essentially asks for co-operation.

Most noteworthy is the fact that Mr. Macaulay must be exercising considerable self-restraint when he uses such a reserved approach, for personally he feels quite strongly on some of these points as do other Canadians. In his trade crusade efforts he has had sufficient contact with our international economists by now to know that United States control of Canadian companies can in some instances be autocratic, petty and withered and he can get as mad as anyone about this, but he has managed to keep his common sense and use a patient approach. It, with the force he is putting behind it, could show some tangible results.

While I am at it, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the *Sudbury Star*, dated Thursday, November 29, 1962, under the heading "Huge Projects Stimulate Area, Provide More Jobs, More Cash."

I do not want to read all this, sir, because the paper is just full of what this good government is doing for the people in Sudbury, but I do want to read the first paragraph:

As men and women throughout the Sudbury area take stock of 1962 they are finding it was a remarkable year. Businessmen and civic leaders, industrialists and merchants, men and women on every level have been affected by the surging economy of the nearly ending year, and even a brief glance into 1963 indicates that prosperity is here to stay.

I would now like to thank the eloquent hon. leader of the New Democratic Party for his complimentary remarks during his address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. As we all know and respect, he has a wonderful command of the English language, and I was proud when he referred to me as a very swashbuckling young man who flies around and can reach a lot of territory in a short time. Perhaps if the hon. member had a few swashbucklers in his party, he would have had more representation in this House during the term in which he has been leader.

As for flying around, if he is having difficulty getting around Ontario during the next campaign, we hold an air charter out of Kingston and we would be most pleased to fly him or any of his party anywhere in Ontario for a modest fee.

Mr. Speaker, just as I am confused regarding the Liberal platform, I am also confused by the platform of the New Democratic Party.

We have heard the five New Democratic hon. members condemn all corporations or corporate bodies who, through the years and through their own efforts and financing, create most of the employment in the province of Ontario, and they lead us to believe that, if elected, many of the corporations would be Crown-owned. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is utter nonsense. In fact, in their own party, three of their hon. members are employees of three of the largest companies in Ontario. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that they would not be hon. members of this Legislature if they had not secured employment through a large corporation.

As for the hon. leader of this party, I would

say that he has very little experience in business or how it is operated other than what he has read, and I am sure neither he nor his party could replace top management in any of the corporations of this province. As for the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden), one would think, in listening to him, that he was an authority on everything. In fact he reminds me of an old saying: "Jack-of-all-trades and master of none."

Mr. Speaker, this party would also lead this House to believe that they are the spokesmen for the labour group in Ontario. I would like to state that there are many corporations in this province of Ontario whose employees have never been unionized. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have employed people since 1935, some being with me for over 24 years, and I am very happy to say that there has never been a nickel deducted from them for any trade union. I would also point out that there are many union members who do not support the union movement but are forced to be members in order to get employment.

You will recall the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party stating in this House on December 1 of last year and recorded on page 158 of *Hansard* and I quote:

However, Mr. Speaker, there are some people in these unions who are not supporters of the New Democratic Party. The constitution of the New Democratic Party lays down in very firm terms that any person who so desires can contract out so that no contributions will be made on his part. All he has to do is to sign the necessary slip or indicate it to the appropriate officer—

I submit that no labourer would jeopardize his job to contract out so that no contribution would be made on his part. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to trade unions, but I feel that it is time that trade unions co-operate with management and government so that management and government can create more jobs in the province of Ontario.

As chairman of the select committee on manpower training, it would appear to me that some unions are opposed to the training of apprentices or the certification of apprentices so that we might have more tradesmen in this province. They seem to feel that joining a union is more important than becoming a tradesman in order to secure employment. I also would like to go on record as being opposed to international unions and the monies collected from our labour forces going to a union in another country. I feel that

we, in Canada, should have our own Canadian unions and that the money be kept within our borders and be invested so as to promote more employment for our own people. I realize that this is not a concern of the provincial government but comes under federal jurisdiction. Nevertheless I would like to go on record for what it is worth.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the tourist industry in the province of Ontario. During the past twenty years, through the efforts of the Ontario government, and tourist associations and tourist camp operators, this has become one of our major industries; but I find it is seasonal and our summers are very short in this province.

I would like to commend The Department of Lands and Forests for the many provincial parks they have opened in the last ten years. These are serving a very useful purpose and I submit some of them should be developed as winter playgrounds to be used the year round. In my riding, we have developed one of the larger parks in the province of Ontario—Bon Echo provincial park on Lake Mazinaw. This park comprises some three thousand acres and encompasses an area bounded by three different lakes. This is one of the finest summer playgrounds in the province. However, I feel, it would be profitable for the province to develop this into a winter playground as well, with skiing, tobogganing, and other winter sports.

This park lends itself admirably to these sports as there are many hills and slopes but it requires someone with the necessary capital to develop it. I understand to develop a ski slope would cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$100,000, exclusive of land and clearing, and to the average business person it is an undertaking beyond his means. But, as a government venture, it is not unsurmountable and could be profitable as well as giving employment to a number of people the year round. It would keep our tourist dollars within the province, also promote building of accommodation, which would in turn give more tax dollars to the municipalities concerned.

Bon Echo is within easy driving range of Kitchener, Hamilton, Toronto on the west, Belleville, Trenton, Kingston, Brockville on the south, Ottawa on the east, and would be one of the best winter resort areas in this province. At the present time, there are many people within this area I have mentioned travelling to Quebec and to the northern part of New York state for winter recreation. This money could be kept within our province with the plan I have suggested. I

strongly urge the government to promote this development.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to take this opportunity to wish you and your family, all the hon. members and their families, all those within this Chamber and their families, a very merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, at the start of my remarks I would like to congratulate you. When you first assumed this high position we all hoped that you would show impartiality and good judgment, and I feel very sincerely, sir, that you have shown that; but I think you have also done more. In this position you have demonstrated a further quality; you have demonstrated the rare blend of a quiet dignity and a gentle humour, and I think that that, in my opinion, makes you the Speaker that will be recognized in future generations.

I would like to say, sir, that along with other hon. members I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris) and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) in connection with the part they took in moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne. I have had the privilege of sitting with both these hon. members on the manpower committee and I feel that they do make a contribution in the committee. I am sure they do in the House.

I, also, sir, would like to congratulate the hon. Cabinet ministers, the new Cabinet ministers, on assuming their new heavy responsibilities. I think, sir, that these men should be given recognition by all sides of the House because they do assume heavy responsibilities and they do make many personal sacrifices, in giving up their private life, in having to neglect their homes and their children.

I would like also to add that I think the new hon. Cabinet ministers have got a certain distinctive aspect to them in that they have joined a unique club, an expensive and expansive club. In a sense it reminds me of having the same distinction as the Bank of Commerce building had. That is, it was the largest institution of its kind in the British Commonwealth.

I think sometimes we should realize just how large this organization is, a Cabinet having 21 members. Just offhand I would suggest the British Parliament has 12, and I think that President Kennedy's Cabinet has something like six. However, sir, at this time I would like to discuss for a little while some of the tenets which I feel are

fundamental in a democratic parliament. I think that often we are inclined to ignore these and not realize it is important that we review them and reassess them. I often think if a government has been in power for a long time there is a tendency for it to become somewhat arrogant and a tendency to ride roughshod over the basic principles that are the foundations of this Parliament.

There was a gentleman who I think has some knowledge of political organization, who suggested that in Canada no government should be in power for any longer than ten years. Now in the ordinary way I am sure if some of us had not listened as much to his remarks—however, I am sure the hon. members from the other side had, because that hon. gentleman was Alister Grossart, now appointed a senator. He, on some occasions, made some very apt remarks in connection with politics and in connection with the government of Canada.

I find, sir, I have listened to the speeches in the House from the government benches, and I find that there may be an indication on the part of some of the hon. government members that they really do not have a full understanding of the fundamentals of Parliament. I notice they are inclined to be impatient with a question from the Opposition, inclined to ridicule the role of the Opposition to criticize. I would suggest to them that one of the most fundamental aspects of Parliament is that every business of Parliament should be open to scrutiny, and open to criticism. It is our role as an Opposition to criticize not only the omissions but also the commissions that we feel should be criticized.

I feel that there is a tendency with people who have been in power for a long time to perhaps feel they are infallible. They may feel it is not necessary to provide all the information so that we can have a fair scrutiny of politics. Even in this session, sir, I must say I noticed there was a tendency on the part of the government in connection with estimates being brought before Parliament. There was a tendency that they were not providing to the Opposition the full information which we should have in order that we can intelligently analyze and criticize those estimates.

I think there has been a tendency on the part of the government in connection with the bills brought forward, I felt they have been impatient sometimes. There has been impatience on the part of some of the hon. Ministers. They have an urgency and impatience to get their bills through and do not recognize that the very basis of Parlia-

ment is that these bills should be open to criticism.

Another tenet of our society which I would like to emphasize—in Parliament we should be constantly emphasizing it in all our policies—is that we should have a deep conviction that the exercise of individual judgment by citizens is itself an ultimate good of life. It means that every government measure should always be considered from the aspect of its intrusion into the private life of the individual citizen.

In a complex industrial society we must have an interdependence between its various members. There is a complex bureaucratic institution that automatically develops but I feel we should be constantly alert that these bureaucratic tentacles do not inevitably reach out and crush down the initiative of the individual. Bureaucracy affects the people of Ontario from birth to death, from making out certificates, asking for pensions and so on. I think it is very easy for the individual to be immersed in red tape and to feel frustrated in that he is unable to make an appeal over a decision of a bureaucrat.

Sir, I am sure every hon. member has similar experiences of people who have come to them as their member, and explained to them that they feel they have had an unfair decision by some government bodies and they ask help from the hon. member. I have had many people who have come to me about decisions on everything from welfare to workmen's compensation, to liquor licences and so on. I have often wondered about the many others who have not come to their member for some reason or other, perhaps because of their lack of knowledge. I would strongly urge, sir, that we should give deep consideration because of the evergrowing power of our bureaucracy. We should give deep consideration to the setting up of some kind of a grievance commission. Then it would be quite clear to a man that if he feels that a decision from a government body is unfair to him, is quite clear to him that he can go to this grievance body and have the grievance checked, and referred to the appropriate body for discussion. This is done in European countries and perhaps there is a tendency to feel we can adapt some of these European approaches.

I notice that some people previously mentioned the Ombudsman who is used in connection with grievances. We in Canada have our own peculiar and particular kind of government set-up, and it will be important for us to study this matter of the grievances of the private citizen and work out our own

approach. I mentioned, sir, that I felt that individual judgment in itself is an ultimate good of life, and I would say that this applies very much in the economic field as well as in others. I would suggest that this ability to make our own decisions is very essential in our economy. We must permit the freedom of many thousands of businesses to decide what and how to produce, for sale in competitive markets, for this is stimulating a vast flow of enterprise and inventiveness. All of this is constantly tested by the efficiency with which it is going to satisfy the desires of the consumers.

And I would like to stress this freedom of judgment also, in connection with workers who can choose occupations according to their own wishes; are able to bargain for the fruits of their own labour, and from doing this, have a strong motivation to improve their own capacity and to work in co-operation with management in the introduction of better production methods. But when I emphasize the role of the individual business to be able to make its own decisions, I would also like to say that there is a role which government must play in connection with the economy.

The Liberal Party has always considered that there is a role for government in our mixed economy. Perhaps some people find it hard to understand our role because they are used to having rather rigid planning. They are used to the idea of a form of regimentation. But I would say that the Liberal Party, because it believes in the idea of the freedom of choice, whether it is in business or anything else, stresses planning through inducement rather than coercion. We have used the word planning. It is not something that is novel to our party. I was interested in reading a book just recently in connection with the Liberal Party, and I noticed a quote from a certain gentleman who had been active in connection with the economy of our country, and he had stated:

If our national development had been left entirely to private enterprise, Canada would not have attained its present status as a nation. And unless government continues to take a lead by well planned initiatives, guidance and regulation, it will not continue to develop as it should.

That statement, sir, was made by the late C. D. Howe who I consider one of the greatest architects and builders of Canada.

So it is not a new approach in our party to suggest that there is a role for government. It is not a new approach on the part of my hon. leader (Mr. Wintermeyer) to

suggest this. In the Throne Speech he again pointed out areas in which he felt the government should take a responsibility. What my hon. leader was urging, is that the government does have a responsibility to take a hard look at our economy; to set forth objectives to achieve and then to work out long-term policies to achieve these. In the Speech from the Throne, he had mentioned one of our objectives, which was full employment, and he had developed methods by which, he considered, we would achieve this. He talked of the importance of a European Common Market, the need for a free trade agreement with the United States.

And, if we look at the recent statements by President Kennedy, if we look at the *Financial Post* and other journals, we realize that my hon. leader is ahead in his thinking. He has emphasized a department of northern development. He has urged that industry be encouraged by tax incentives, by depreciation write-offs, and lower rates for hydro-electric power. He has urged an investment and development fund, has urged an economic council, made up of top economists who will really get down and study. He suggested in connection with manpower, for example, having an inventory of skills, he suggested the encouragement of investment, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention that the government of Ontario, under the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay,) has looked at various plans that they want to develop. I have before stated that I felt that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has shown a unique approach, in my opinion, in contrast with many other hon. Cabinet Ministers, in that he has been prepared to try things. He has realized that this is the 20th century. He has also shown—as I mentioned before—a unique aspect in comparison with other hon. Cabinet Ministers, in that he has read and he has studied. I feel that he is on the right track in connection with certain aspects, but I think that he has to dig deeper, look deeper into the causes for development. We admire his enthusiasm as a salesman and we admire the way that he has been travelling across the country. He is a man of great energy, travelling around the world. I feel, as I say, that he is touching at these problems, and I hope that the example he is setting will encourage the rest of the government, before it is too late for them, to get behind some of these things. However, it is not sufficient to make just a superficial approach, but make an approach that has deep meaning and significance for the Canadian economy.

If I could take just one area that my hon. leader has mentioned, it was about an inventory. I have had the privilege of sitting on the manpower committee whose chairman is the hon. member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Simonett). I would like to pay my respects to the hon. chairman in his conduct of this committee, because he has permitted the most frank discussion and he has permitted the briefs to come forward from many sources. And I felt that, as a chairman representing government, he might have felt some embarrassment at the presentation of the briefs.

But he was determined to expose what the problems are, and I hope that when the findings are presented to the government we will get some action, because the problems in connection with manpower are many. Just taking the aspect of an inventory, in one of the briefs we learned that The Department of Labour—this is the federal department—apparently has two men researching the influences of automation, researching ways to assess the manpower situation, and so on.

And yet if we look at a country such as Sweden, we find that they have 40 top economists just doing this. I would suggest, sir, that really the Ontario government has no understanding of what the manpower picture is today in Ontario, what the inventory is of various skills. I would suggest that perhaps they had hoped to get some of this inventory from the federal Department of Labour. And if they had kept in touch with the trends that were taking place in connection with unemployment, they would realize that many industries are by-passing the national employment service and that the national employment service in this province has no real knowledge of how many people are required for certain jobs in industry and has no inventory.

I would like to say at this point, before I make some criticism of the apprentice branch, I had the privilege in the committee of meeting with some of the civil servants running the department. I admired them as dedicated men but they are against an enormous frustrating stumbling block. In some of the trades we have certification, in many of them we have no certification. We listened to inspectors who examine the qualifications of people who want to enter a trade.

I remember one inspector who appeared before the committee at one of our last meetings and on being asked he told us that one of his jobs was to look after the qualifications of barbers or hairdressers. And then somewhat embarrassed he said that really

he had no knowledge about barbering or hairdressing. He said, "The only hairdressing I ever did was with my young child by putting a saucepan over her head and clipping around the edges." And yet this poor man had to go around passing people who want to move into the trade.

May I say in connection with the training of young people moving into trades, we saw glaring examples of where the content of training is out of touch with the requirements of industry. We had the printing industry representatives appear before us. We learned that there were printing presses in vocational schools in Toronto and in Hamilton, that there are young people taking courses with these expensive printing presses. We learned from the representatives of the printing industry that, as far as they were concerned, the printing presses were obsolete, and resultanty the training was obsolete.

What does it mean when we have this utter confusion in the vocational training of our young people?

If we have no statistics on the changing patterns of jobs in industry, if we have no statistics about the effect of automation, and I could go on with other areas where we have no statistics, but if there are no statistics in these areas, how on earth can a vocational counsellor in a school adequately, and with knowledge, advise young people about the training for future jobs? The vocational counsellor is really flying blind about the industrial requirements necessary when these young people graduate.

I suggest that this whole area of vocational training, of apprenticeship training, of manpower study is something that this government should have tackled long ago. We look at the situation, sir, in Europe and realize that one of the advantages that the people in the European Common Market have is that they have got skilled workers. We realize that for too long we had not looked at our existing educational system and its weaknesses, rather we have relied on the influx of trained and skilled European workers, who have come to bolster up our economy. When the European Common Market in these countries started to grow, to expand and to prosper and we no longer had this influx of trained people, we suddenly came up with the harsh facts that we have really never looked at our own educational training, that it is inadequate and that we have not looked after the training opportunity for our own young people. If we do not have trained people, in my opinion, we will not have good secondary industry.

One other point that my hon. leader mentioned in the Speech from the Throne about industry was labour-management councils. I have listened to the hon. leader of my party fighting for this cause of harmony and unity and understanding between management and labour ever since I first entered this House. I have also listened to smug remarks on the part of people who did not have the vision, or who did not have the understanding, of what he was emphasizing. They said that it is really platitudinous. Yet, sir, when I look across at other countries in the world which are developing to the envy of us in Canada, I realize that they have been able to work out the basis of labour-management councils. I have this report, and I suggest that it is worthwhile being read by every hon. member of this House, in connection with the social conditions and social security of the German federal government, called "Germany Reports". In this report, if I could read just briefly from page 580, it describes labour and management. It describes the fact that labour representatives and management representatives meet together in a council, and it says that:

Freedom of activity—

and this is in reference to these councils:

—includes above all the right in order to conduct negotiations leading to comprehensive understandings, which are wage agreements, and to conclude such agreements. The activity of labour and management in such negotiations is not however limited to concurrence in wage agreements, rather the partners participate in the socio-political legislation, especially in the drawing up of draft laws—

Let us just pause there, sir.

The West German government gets together responsible representative members of labour and management and it says to them: "You examine the labour legislation and you draw up draft laws in connection with it because you two are going to have to live under those arrangements formed from such legislation." If I could go on:

They have, moreover, been allotted a right under numerous laws to co-operate in the setting up and staffing of both the courts dealing with labour matters and the social courts, in the forming of wage committees that made a considerable contribution in declaring wage agreements that are universally binding, and in the staffing of the organs of the federal institute for labour exchange and unemployment in-

surance as well as those of the national insurance carriers, and so on. The trade unions also participate to a certain extent in the formation and activity of the employees' representatives in the factories and in the enterprises' supervisory councils.

In other words, sir, the state says to these two partners in the economy of their country, "You two should grow up and be responsible to send representatives to work out your own type of legislation, to work out your own type of agreements, and to work together even on the basis of employment offices and in many other areas." It interest me that the area of responsibility that the state assumes is in connection with looking after safety regulations, with ensuring certain minimum wage requirements. The employers and the unions can build on this knowledge of having such a required basis. I repeat that the state is concerned with the protection of the worker against accidents at work, in connection with working hours, and in connection with juveniles and mothers, and so on.

I would suggest that there are so many areas from which we could learn in some of these countries. This labour-management council is not platitudinous, I think it is very much responsible for the harmony and the progress that has taken place in West Germany.

Let me come back to Canada again—and I am speaking from a report in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, referring to the recent labour-management meeting that took place in Nova Scotia, in Halifax. I quote from an article written by Wilfred List. It is entitled "Development under Study by Ontario":

Basically labour and management agreed "on the need for solving their own problems without government interference and set out some preliminary guideposts for their relations."

And it goes on to describe some of the points that they were going to work out together:

A moratorium on further appeals to the Legislature for amendments to The Nova Scotia Trade Union Act until all approaches to improve union-management relations had been examined by the parties themselves. Recognition of the rights of workers to organize for collective bargaining and recognition of the contribution organized labour can make to the economy. Mutual condemnation of unfair practices in cases where employees seek to organize under the provisions of labour legislation. Union recognition that management is entitled to a fair return of its investment.

That happened in Nova Scotia and it has been suggested it will set a new pattern across Canada.

I could refer, for example, to the Vauxhall works in England, and I am looking at an article from the *London Observer* in which it is again explained that, by setting up a council and having responsible representative people from both management and labour, the council can work out an agreement about their working conditions. In the Vauxhall industry—I will just mention briefly the one point that I think is so very important, it is that the Vauxhall Company set up a basis whereby the employees could elect representatives, 22 representatives, to sit with representatives of management. Some people would say this was a company union but in the article it emphasizes that this is not so, that there was freedom for any union to come in and organize in Vauxhall.

But the point I wanted to emphasize was that management, the board of Vauxhall, took this whole labour-management council extremely seriously. They had one of their vice-presidents who was constantly attuned to the needs and to the wishes of labour. It was his responsibility, not only to sit on this labour council, but he had the authority to make the decision of management right at the council. And I would suggest, sir, again, that this plea on the part of my hon. leader, for many years now, to have labour-management councils is not platitudinous, it is something that has worked to develop the progress and the harmony of many countries. I think it is time it should be started in Ontario.

If I could refer to some of the responsibilities that I feel The Department of Labour should assume, however, it is in those areas of the protection against accidents at work. It is in the areas of looking at the working hours and supervising the limits of their work hours.

Now concerning safety; I realize I am being repetitious in this, but I think if anything justifies repetition it is the shocking, glaring gaps in connection with safety-labour legislation, which this government has permitted. I have before me again the McAndrew report and I would like to say, sir, that the leaders of every civilized country have assumed that the men who toil and who work for the produce of that country, are ensured decent working conditions and that their lives are not permitted to be constantly imperilled. But when you read this McAndrew report, it is a complete indictment of the indolence and the lethargy on the part of the government to the working people

of this province. Just for the record, I am going to hit home again by reporting some of the things that the report had to say.

In examining various Acts and regulations, the report starts out immediately on page 3 by stating:

Some of the Acts and regulations were found to be archaic and outmoded. This is particularly true of The Building Trades Protection Act which is almost unknown and unenforced. Your commissioners have recommended that this Act be repealed and replaced by a Construction Safety Act incorporating Part 8 of The National Building Code.

I, sir, am speaking for the people in my riding, many of whom have had to live under jeopardy because of the indolence of the government in not examining the safety rules which would be incorporated under The Building Trades Protection Act and now The Construction Safety Act. We look at the enforcement of the proposed Construction Safety Act and of The Trench Excavators Protection Act, and again this legislation should be amended. We look at The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act and the report says:

This Act is generally antediluvian and accordingly it is recommended that much of the social legislation not relating to the safety of workers be reorganized elsewhere.

And so it goes on, in connection with The Operating Engineers Act, recommending a board of review be established to determine the appropriate amendment to the Act consistent with modern industrial equipment. It talks about safety regulations relating to foundries, and suggests that workers in these fields are not protected by legislation. It states that the high accident frequency rate in the province is in the logging industry and yet there is no legislation for the protection of workers in this field, as in sawmills. It is recommended that this deficiency be corrected by the adoption and enforcement of logging and sawmill regulations. In other words, the McAndrew report shows that this government, for 20 years in office, has completely ignored the safety conditions of the men and women in the province.

I have mentioned that another area where the government has a responsibility, is that of working hours. I would just like to quote briefly in connection with the government's sense of responsibility to working people and the law which limits working hours. This is written by Frank Drea. The title says: "Law limits work hours but enforcement

joke". It then describes an engineer's timetable:

This engineer just shrugged at the mention of The Hours of Work and Vacations With Pay Act which specifies he cannot work more than 48 hours in any seven days.

And this is what the engineer states, sir; he says:

I have about as much chance of being protected by the Labour Department as I have of seeing the sun in the winter time.

He is indoors all winter. The article continues with statements from others. The whole situation is really, sir, just one of complete disregard and negligence on the part of enforcement of this law.

I could go into other areas with The Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker. We have a new hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) now, but I would suggest, sir, that the record in the past, the record for 20 years of this government in this area, has been so utterly shocking that it will take a steady full-time occupation on the part of the Minister and the whole staff in order to revamp and ensure that the safety and working conditions of the people of Ontario are brought up to date.

While I am on the enforcement of government legislation, I would like to say something in connection with—not the working conditions of the people but in connection with their living conditions. This is very personal to me because it is referring to the area in which I live.

In my area, which is in the west end of Toronto, we have the peculiar distinction, sir, of having 488 tons of grime or dust fall on each square mile. This takes place because of the lack of teeth, the lack of enforcement, in the government air pollution Act. We have seen that this is not just a case of something that is going to be unpleasant to people, dirty the laundry, etc., it has far worse repercussions from the point of view of health.

We have seen, for example, in London recently, how its heavy industrial fog caused a great number of deaths. What is the situation in connection with a large industry that spews out smoke and grime from its chimneys? It gets a \$50 fine, and for a third offence it pays \$200. I would suggest, sir, that there are cities which with sound legislation being enforced, with adequate penalties for large industries, have been able to clean up the air and permitted people to live without danger of cancer and so on from the

grimy, clouded air. If I could refer to one of the—

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Would the hon. member close them down?

Mr. Thompson: No, I would not close them down. But I would say very seriously that I certainly would not consider, for a large industry that is spewing out this grime and dust, giving it only a \$50 fine for the first offence and \$200 for the third offence. Look at the industries in Pittsburgh. They have been able, sir, to cut down the heavy dust-fall by about 80 per cent. I do not think that Pittsburgh's industries are closing down. What they have is adequate legislation in connection with that.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member answer a question just in connection with Pittsburgh? In the course of the studies of the select committee of this House on air pollution and smoke control we visited Pittsburgh and met with the officials there, and one of the main reasons, Mr. Speaker, why Pittsburgh was able to do such a clean-up job, and believe me they have—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That is a long question.

Mr. Cowling: Yes, I will get to the question. It is quite a lengthy question.

I wonder if the hon. member knew that the results of the clean air in Pittsburgh came about because of the introduction of natural gas, they did not eliminate the smoke in any other way. Did the hon. member know that?

Mr. Thompson: No, I did not and I would say I am referring to an editorial from the *Toronto Telegram*. The *Toronto Telegram* in its report does not suggest that that could be cleared up by use of natural gas, but in their editorial they are suggesting that much of it was cleared by ensuring that enforcement was carried out on those industries spewing out this type of dust.

I would like at this point to come to the area about which I feel very strongly. I think it is the test of the government. I certainly am impressed with the material progress that a government makes, but I think in the pages of history a government will be proved good or bad by how it looked after those who are unable to help themselves, those who are less fortunate in our society.

I was interested in connection with the proposed bill on retarded children, to see

what is the philosophy of this government. I turn to the *Toronto Globe and Mail* on December 17, in its editorial. It states:

What we need in Ontario is a philosophy of government which accepts the retarded child for what he is, a rightful charge upon the state, not upon private charity. Having established that basic principle we should then proceed to provide for his needs.

That is the end of my quote, sir, but I am sure that every hon. member in this House realizes that a parent who has a child who is unable to achieve any type of learning to fit into society is going to be burdened financially and every other way. And I am sure that there are hon. members who have visited parents with such children.

About three months ago, I was at a home in which there was a mother who had a young baby that was microcephalic, I think that is the term for it, a microcephalic baby. She had three other children. Her husband at the time was unemployed, and she was desperately trying to keep the family together and to look after this child. There was no place, I might explain, where she could place the child.

I was asked if I could intercede with the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) in connection with trying to arrange for this child to be sent to Orillia or some institution. I wrote to the hon. Minister, sir, with some reluctance and asked that instead of a doctor being consulted, he supervise that the child be directed to the best care available. Politicians are used in getting children into the institutions. I appreciate very much that the hon. Minister looked after this situation, but it seems to me it should be a source of uneasiness for all of us that it is only by political intercession that in many cases children are placed in the institutions.

There is a crying need to help these parents, and this bill certainly hasn't looked after them. It will not look after the child who is unable to take advantage of any training and as the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Singer) pointed out, certainly this proposed bill is going to be of little help to the parent who has a child who has some chance of learning from training. The parent has to scrounge around, get organized with others, and still has to pay costs, when she should—

Mr. W. B. Lewis (York-Humber): Was that child you mentioned placed in an institution after your request?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, she was. I said that I thanked the hon. Minister very much in connection with this. I wrote to the hon. Minister of Health and it was taken care of.

At this point I would like to say a few words about the hon. Minister of Health. Some people feel that we on our side are just constantly criticizing but to me the hon. Minister of Health should be commended on the ideal he is trying to achieve. If there is one hon. member on that side of the House who is going to be recorded in their pages on human betterment, it is going to be the hon. Minister of Health. But it will be in a small way for he would have accomplished much more, if it wasn't for a constantly niggardly approach on the part of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) with respect to letting him push ahead. There is obviously a complete contradiction between the policies that the hon. Minister of Health would pursue and the policies of other hon. Ministers. The hon. Minister of Health, I would think would want to pull down mental institutions. I know other hon. Ministers who glory in the erection of an institution.

I remember the previous Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) suggesting in answer to me about jails, that we should have to have bigger and better jails. I appreciate the philosophy of the hon. Minister of Health in the approach he is taking to the development of community clinics, and the approach he is taking to get people out of institutions to lead a productive life. I admire it very much, and I wish that the inspiration he is giving could flow over to some of the other hon. Ministers, so that they would take a chance, make an attempt at trying—instead of always putting people in institutions—to give them a chance in society and create community resources to help them.

About the hon. Minister of Health I could say this, that I am sure, he along with me, would feel some satisfaction that the fluoridation bill was passed in Metropolitan Toronto. I cannot recall whether he, as the Minister of Health, came out saying that he agreed with fluoridation, sir, but I am sure as a doctor, and a man of knowledge, he does agree. The fact that he got the bill passed shows that his heart was in the right place. Even on that bill he was held back by hesitancy on the part of the present government, because the bill that came before Parliament is, as usual, provided with loop holes.

For example, in Metropolitan Toronto fluoridation has been passed and yet sir,

within two years we could have 6,128 people out of the 930,000 people in this area, only 6,128, could make the decision that we have to have another referendum in connection with fluoridation. This is because the bill has said that in Metropolitan Toronto it needed the ten per cent majority of the 13 municipalities, and if the seven smallest municipalities were to get ten per cent this would only amount to 6,128. They could demand that we start all over again with respect to fluoridation. I feel, sir, that this should be amended, I think it is a ridiculous situation that we should after being put to the expense of installing the whole equipment, have fluoridation held up every two years, in this manner.

I would suggest there should be an amendment, and it should be either that ten per cent of all the Metro population would have to request a referendum, or else that the Metro council itself should decide if they want this to be reconsidered.

Sir, I have just two other proposals that are very dear to my heart. If I, in some small way, can be able to contribute to the implementation of these two efforts I will feel that I fully served my cause as a representative of Dovercourt. The first matter has always concerned me. In a province such as ours, where we have the great tradition of British justice, it concerns me because I am associated sir, in many ways in my riding with people from across the world. When they come here they feel that in this country they have equality before the courts; there is equal opportunity to have their cases presented. Yet, sir, as you look at the courts of our province, I feel very strongly that there is not this equality. Now, I am not a lawyer, sir, so really I am out of my depth in this, therefore, I would rather turn to lawyers, and their remarks about it. I noticed that Sheriff Douglas Connover, of York county, I think, had said that free legal aid really doesn't provide a square deal for people, he stated that through free legal aid it is usually young lawyers that handle the cases. He pointed out that the people who had to apply for free legal aid, I brought this up two years ago, if they are single applicants have to earn less than \$1,200. If they are married applicants they have to earn less than \$1,800.

It seems to me that it should be fundamental in our society that every man should have the opportunity of a fair defence. Not only myself but the dean of magistrates in 1958 had suggested that there should be some programme of a public defender. I asked the previous Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts) about this, and he replied I remember, that he

would consider it, but had considerable reluctance about passing it because he said there was a conflict of principle.

You recall, Mr. Speaker, the then Attorney-General said that he did not agree that the same source of funds should pay both the prosecutor and the defender. And I pointed out to him that, in a sense, he is doing this now when he gives funds to the Free Legal Aid Society. Then he made the further point—that we are not going to have public defenders in every city throughout this province.

I could appreciate this point, to an extent, but I am sure that in some ways this question should be given examination and where there is a population that might warrant having even a referral lawyer to whom they would go for advice, I think that this would be a great service in ensuring that people feel that they get justice. I had cases in my office in my own riding—mostly European people, frankly, who seem to be somewhat bewildered about the process of law that took place. I think particularly of one very prominent criminal lawyer to whom I have talked, perhaps now that he is out of politics I could mention his name. I am referring to Arthur Maloney, a man, frankly, whom I personally respect a great deal. I admired his contribution while he was in politics and I admire his humanitarian approach, both in his legal profession and in all his endeavours. I regret in many ways, although I certainly was happy to see that the Liberal candidate who is an outstanding man won, I regret that Mr. Maloney left public life. But he, I know, feels that there is not a fair opportunity for everyone appearing before the courts, and that we should have some kind of provision made. And I ask that the new Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) may perhaps be more receptive to this. I am not saying that the previous Attorney-General was not, but he was dubious about the idea at the start.

My last point, sir, is one about which I had jumped to my feet about two weeks ago, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) suggested that I had given some kind of an outburst. In one sense I apologize in connection about the outburst, but on the other hand I think that some of us should feel strongly about certain situations. And, frankly, I do feel strongly about this. I am talking about the drug addicts.

I am talking about this because I had the opportunity to meet with a number of these people. I must say, as I said that night, that I have a great admiration for people who

have struggled to overcome difficulties. I somehow think that if things are too easy for us, we do not develop the nobility that we see in people who have struggled against desperate odds. I have, sir, a great admiration for these people who are struggling to cure themselves of this soul-searing and degrading disease. I feel, sir, that there is nothing more despicable than the men who are profiteering from selling drugs and passing drugs to people. According to the drug addicts I have met, there are approximately 500 of them in Toronto. They told me that they could buy drugs in Toronto. They also informed me about the kind of money that people make out of selling drugs. They also suggested to me that if there was not a profit motive in connection with drugs, that probably the trade would dwindle.

They also told me that they had gone to England, two of them who have been able to cure themselves to some extent had gone to England, in order to get treatment. I would suggest, sir, that we should look very closely at the idea of trying to think of some method to take the profit out of drug trafficking. We would need some kind of a clinic set up where drug addicts could go. Where people, sir, could get treatment and supervision and rehabilitation.

I realize there are no votes with this small group but we do not try to help people for that reason. And I am sure that every hon. member in this House feels there are certain causes that transcend political considerations. And I think one cause is where we see human tragedy and suffering because of the trafficking of drugs. Therefore, sir, I appeal to the government side to give consideration to this in order that these people may be able to be helped to get back on their feet again.

Sir, I have talked about a number of topics. You have been kind enough to listen to me patiently in your usual manner. I will sit down now, sir, but before doing so, I wish to wish you a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and also to extend to every hon. member my sincere wishes.

Mr. G. E. Gomme (Lanark): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this Throne Speech I want to join my hon. colleagues in thanking you for your courtesy to me at all times and I hope this session will be one of pleasure and satisfaction to you.

I am not one, Mr. Speaker, who has filled the pages of *Hansard* since I came to this House, as I was always taught it is better for people to wonder why one did not speak than to wonder why one did. This session will

no doubt be filled with political speeches, but I would ask all hon. members to realize the work of Parliament must be carried on and let us do this in the most business-like way. Let us never forget that we are here as the servants of the people of Ontario and their interests must come first.

In reading the Speech from the Throne, naturally I wondered how much of this will benefit the people of Lanark whom I represent and I find it is a speech filled with benefits for both my people and all the people of Ontario, but I will only take time to speak of a few.

We have a large hospital school in my riding with approximately 2,300 retarded children. It was my pleasure to attend the annual Christmas concert last Friday when these children provided a concert second to none.

There was a bugle band, several choirs, dance teams, acrobatics and dramatics, and to me the highlight was the nativity play with all the Christmas carols. This is a great tribute to the superintendent, Dr. Frank, and all his assistants who spent many hours in training.

To those in this House who want to rush more help for retarded children, let me tell them we must always see that trained help is available and these civil servants are trained by experience, many of them spending their off time in hours of study. These are the people who will train others and I am very pleased with the new Homes for Retarded Children Act. May I say a sincere thank you to those 900 faithful civil servants in Lanark who serve in the Ontario hospital school.

The forecast of assistance to municipal roads will be of great help. We need several new bridges—one over the Mississippi at Almonte, one over the Rideau at Rideau Ferry.

Development roads are of great importance to us. This is an appeal I have taken to every Minister of Highways and I will continue to do so. Our county and townships are in need of greater assistance in this way for no council can provide from its own resources money for through traffic to resort areas which may be in the next municipality. I could elaborate on these but I would like to remind the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Quilty) that the greatest expenditure on development roads for any county in Ontario has been in his county and probably it is time for some of the rest of us to have more. I will tell the hon. Minister I will be at his door continually.

Mr. Speaker, as a non-farmer but as one who has been associated with the agricultural industry on a very personal basis over several years, I would like to make a few comments.

I come from the county of Lanark where the dairy industry is an important segment of our agricultural economy. We are concerned not only with the whole milk production in Lanark county, but as well we have a great many producers who ship to concentrated plants, to cheese factories and to creameries. Unlike some of the hon. members in the Opposition, I do not have any personal interest, other than a desire to serve my constituents, in the dairy industry. On Thursday, December 6, the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) took certain exception to the suggestion that politics was involved in some of the current dairy problems.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure this House that the dairy farmers from all four groups in the county of Lanark are personally interested and desirous of an orderly milk marketing programme for this province and, for that matter, the whole of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to assure this House that these same farmers are very much aware of the political shenanigans and the road-blocks which are now becoming quite obvious when dairy groups are attempting to co-operate to solve their problems.

Being a non-farmer, maybe I am more aware of the feelings being expressed by the dairy farmers on the back concessions. They are becoming critical. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure this House that this criticism is being directed at the official Opposition of this government and at their helpmates out in the country. It is a sad situation when the welfare of an industry as important as dairying to the province of Ontario becomes a plaything of an Opposition whose very philosophy is destruction rather than construction.

On Thursday, December 6, the hon. member for Bruce quoted a notice, under date of October 4, 1962, to all distributors in Ontario with reference to an increase in producer prices. And I quote from *Hansard* of that date:

Notice to all milk distributors in Ontario. Reference increase in producer prices. Please take note that in each market covered by a collective bargaining agreement or board award which provides for a basic price to be paid to producers based on the formula there will be, in accordance with the terms of the formula, an increase of 19 cents per hundred pounds in pay-

ment for milk on and after November 1, 1962. Please check your market agreement and make any necessary change in producer payments for milk purchases commencing November 1, 1962.

The hon. member for Bruce is an experienced milk distributor and sent a letter to the *Warton Echo*, which was published under date of November 1, 1962, and which reads as follows:

DEAR SIR:

Inasmuch as I feel that the public of Warton and area deserve some explanation for the increase in milk prices going into effect all over the province today, I wish to give the following information to you.

All dairies in the province recently got the following letter from the milk industry board of Ontario dated October 4:

"Please take notice that in each market covered by a collective bargaining agreement or board award which provides for a basic price to be paid to producers based in accordance with the terms of the formula, there will be, in the formula, an increase of 19 cents per hundred pounds in payment for milk on and after November 1, 1962."

Signed

C. M. MEEK,

Director of Fluid Milk Division

I have shown this letter to several people and without exception they have suggested that I let it become public knowledge, the fact that this is one of the most dictatorial orders that is possible for any industry to receive and give the same industry no chance of bargaining whatsoever, under these circumstances I felt that your readers should have some explanation and hence this letter.

Yours very truly,
ROSS WHICHER,
Warton Dairies.

I would like to point out first that this letter, attributed to Mr. Meek, as sent to the *Warton* paper, was not complete, with an entire sentence left out. To my way of thinking, the original letter was quite diplomatically worded and was not in the least dictatorial.

However, the hon. member for Bruce, as an experienced distributor, must be aware that this is the same form letter which was sent out on previous occasions when the formula indicated a price change. He did not tell his readers this. Nor did he tell his readers that the formula was merely a guide

and that they were quite free to meet with their producers to renegotiate or not to accept any price change. As a matter of fact, he suggested the opposite: "and give the same industry no chance of bargaining whatsoever."

To a person aware of all of the facts, one cannot help but form the opinion that the Wiarton dairy may have deliberately wished to withhold some of the information. I would hesitate to suggest that there is any significance in the fact that the operator of the Wiarton dairy is also the hon. member for Bruce.

The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes), a whole milk producer, has been quite vocal recently as well. He apparently feels that he can increase his popularity through wallowing with the current events rather than standing up and giving some courageous leadership to the industry of which he is a part.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Good speech the hon. member wrote, yes?

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): These words are being recorded, as the hon. member knows.

Mr. Gomme: I understand that he played a very active role with a recent delegation of fluid milk producers and distributors who were requesting the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) to give some consideration to classifying multi-milk, a concentrated product, as a fluid milk product. Apparently he was most sympathetic and gave the producers and distributors the impression that he was 100 per cent behind them. Evidently this multi-milk product, which has cut severely into the northern fluid milk markets, as much as 25 per cent in some markets, is of great concern to the whole milk producers and distributors. There is also evidence that it may spread even more to other markets in the province.

It is rather interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that this product is being produced and processed in the home constituency of the hon. member from Oxford.

An hon. member: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. Gomme: These producers have served notice on the milk industry board that they have no desire to receive more money for their milk going into this multi-milk product.

We wonder what the hon. member for Oxford says to these producers when he

meets them. I think we can assume that he will be his usual, sympathetic, understanding self and continue to talk out of both sides of his mouth as is the usual practice of the Opposition.

As I mentioned at the outset, I am not a farmer but I have lived in an agricultural county over the years and have heard what farmers are saying. The whole agricultural industry is of the opinion that the whole milk producer in this province has received more protection than any other section of the agricultural industry.

Distribution areas are limited. A new distributor would have very great difficulty getting a licence to sell milk in the town of the hon. member for Bruce. New producers have great difficulty in getting on the whole milk market.

A whole milk formula was developed by The Department of Agriculture, not by the industry, and then when it was approved by both producers and distributors it was contained in a regulation to act as a pricing indicator for each whole milk market. It has operated successfully for almost ten years and yet, when some action was taken to save the whole milk industry from itself, when the suggestion was made that the industry should take a little breathing space and take a look at its own problems, this was welcomed as a splendid opportunity by some of the fact manipulators to create confusion and distrust.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers in Lanark county have worked hard over the years. The cheese producers have shared in bearing the burden of a fairly substantial levy of one cent per pound or more of cheese, to export surplus cheese from Ontario, surplus cheese which was actually a part of the surplus dairy picture for the whole of Canada. The cream producers have continued to produce cream for butter in the face of dietary fads and unfounded medical criticism. The concentrated milk producers are struggling with prices influenced by the production of other provinces and world supplies.

The producers in Lanark county realize that the dairy industry is a big industry in Ontario and that Ontario is only one-third of the rest of Canada from the standpoint of milk production. They realize that there is going to be a lot of give-and-take, necessary not only between the milk groups but between the provinces. There is a growing feeling that it is rather pointless for the various dairy groups in the province to compete with each other and not agree to a common solution. There is not much doubt that, in

the minds of most fluid milk producers, the competition from multi-milk and similar products with their current pricing policies, could spell eventual disaster for the whole milk industry, not only in Ontario but in other parts of the country.

On the other hand, looking at the situation from the standpoint of the concentrated producer, he is not too keen to give up control of a product which is finding acceptance with the consumers, merely to protect the fluid milk market. The concentrated producer is aware that most of the larger milk processing plants could start to produce products similar to multi-milk. While \$3.25 a hundredweight may not seem a lot of money to some fluid milk producers, it is a lot of money to those manufactured shippers who have been used to receiving considerably less.

As I interpret it, therefore, the attitude of the concentrated milk producers is that they have no desire to give up this product which they regard as rightfully theirs purely to protect a section of the dairy economy which, in their opinion, already has received too much protection. Our producers in Lanark county realize, through advice they have received from the cheese producers marketing board, that much more cheese could have been exported to the United Kingdom this year than was actually the case.

It is rather hard for the farmer who is involved, with little spare time, in the day-to-day operation of his dairy farm, to understand why we should have a surplus in certain products and be short in others. Again, being a non-farmer, I can't propose the solutions. I do know, however, that there is a growing realization that some changes are necessary and that these changes will never take place so long as the leaders in the dairy industry, whether they be producers or processors, continue to look at the short-term aspects of the situation and, possibly, from a personal standpoint rather than from the overall good of the industry.

Governments can only go so far in creating climate for change and co-operating with those people concerned, when public opinion is such that the majority are desirous of changing a particular situation. This is our democratic way of life and, if any of the hon. members of the Opposition have any different theories, I would suggest that they have not yet gained contact with the thinking of the average citizen of this country.

Again, speaking as one from the sidelines and a non-farmer, I believe a great deal of leadership has been given over the years by The Ontario Department of Agriculture, not

only with the dairy groups in this province but beyond provincial boundaries as well. A close working relationship has been built up with the province of Quebec and this is good. I have lived in proximity to this province for many years and the people of Quebec are a fine people.

Ontario and Quebec are the two most important dairy provinces in Canada, and between them produce over two-thirds of the milk in Canada. Possibly the solution to our dairy problems may lie in some working agreement between Ontario and Quebec, or some solutions may come from the Canadian conference in Ottawa in the latter part of February. In any case, in all sincerity, I would suggest to all concerned that no one can afford to mix partisan politics into this industry which is a \$1 billion industry in Canada and which affects the lives of so many Canadians.

During the past few weeks and months I have talked to many dairy farmers on the back concessions of Lanark county. I appreciate their problems. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Toronto to this session this fall, I had not intended to make any comments with reference to the dairy industry but I must confess that, having listened to the hon. members of the Opposition since the opening of this Legislature, I felt that some comments were needed and appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has attempted and admittedly with some success to make a political football out of the current dairy situation and the dairy industry. I do not believe that the personal aims of the Opposition should be allowed to jeopardize the stability and the safety of the dairy industry in this province. However, from the standpoint of political football, judging from the plays that have been called to date, possibly the Opposition needs a new quarterback. It might be safe to suggest as well that the Opposition appears to be as enshrouded in fog as the teams were in the recent Grey Cup game.

I would further suggest, however, that the Opposition not depend too much on the strength of the hide covering the football they have created because, rather than being covered with the usual pigskin, the Opposition may find that it is encased with the hide from the male of another of the four-legged species. It might even be suggested that, as time passes and the Opposition continues their aimless kicking of this political football, it may burst, releasing in their faces all of the hot air with which they have filled it.

The political game, like the game of football, requires teamwork. This does not appear to exist in the official Opposition. Mr. Speaker, it takes more than cheer-leaders to make a winning team. We have seen some of the cheer-leaders from the opposite side attempting to turn cartwheels in their verbal exchanges. There is very obviously a lack of conditioning and the Opposition will need a bit more practice to avoid falling flat on their faces in the mud of their own making.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to resist the temptation to take another kick at the political football of milk marketing, but I can hardly resist the temptation to take a kick at the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Gomme). I would like to begin—

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): That man does not know what democracy is about.

Mr. Nixon: —by congratulating you on your appointment not only as Deputy Speaker of the House, but as chairman of the committee of the whole, and I look forward with great pleasure to seeing you in action during the long winter nights that lie before us as you preside over this House, and if you are as efficient at that as I remember you to be at presiding over a bridge table somewhere south of Moosonee, then we can look forward to good direction indeed.

I would also like to congratulate the hon. member who sits on my right for the excellent speech that he presented to this House yesterday. In my opinion it was the best one presented yesterday—it had good meat in it, and I feel that we are fortunate in this party in having his services, and the people of Huron-Bruce are fortunate in having such an excellent representative (Mr. Gaunt). Last year, in debate in the Speech from the Throne, there were two or three items that I brought to the attention of the government. They took them in hand so efficiently that I have enough courage to suggest a few more and I hope they will be treated with as much dispatch.

It is my intention to confine my brief remarks to the area that I have the honour to represent—the riding of Brant—through which runs the Grand River. The famous valley of the Grand River is something that I would like to discuss with you at this time. The river of course was the original highway opening up the rural heartland of Ontario to settlement, and some of you might not realize that the first permanent settlement beyond what

has been called by historians, the Front, that is, the lakeshore along Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, was settled by a band of Menonites who were seeking and found religious freedom in this heartland of Ontario. Their descendants are still farming very successfully north of Kitchener.

Of course, this area, after settlement had gone on to some extent, was granted, supposedly in perpetuity, to the Indian supporters of King George IV, forming the great Indian reservation that occupied the land on six miles on each side of the Grand River. Since that time, great changes have occurred. At present, the river is in a state of terrible pollution to the extent that there are even government orders forbidding its use for irrigation, for fear that they might contaminate the crops so irrigated. But certainly the Ontario Water Resources Commission is doing considerable work to correct this and I am told that the first trout have been caught under the Lorne Bridge in Brantford, so the treatment of the sewage has certainly been beneficial and we look for great things in the future.

But in this connection, I would like to say that the Grand River valley, because of the richness of the farmland surrounding it, provides many things for the urban areas of the Golden Horseshoe of Toronto and Hamilton, and the other cities nearby. But the thing that it provides, that is perhaps most valuable, is the beautiful rural countryside that is getting harder and harder to find in this province. Because of this, the future of the area must be great. It is near the centres of heavy population. The demand for the product of this area is bound to expand in the years ahead. More important than anything else, this area, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is one which the government should be looking to as a laboratory for some of their theories on conservation and the development of recreation areas close enough to the urban areas so that they can be of real use.

I mentioned a moment ago something about the work of the Ontario Water Resources Commission in controlling the pollution of the river and development of sewage disposal plants. I am told by the people who know about these things that one of the greatest difficulties in the operation of these plants is the fact that detergents used by housewives are of a stable type, stable in that they are hard to change—not that they are also used in washing cows or something like that—and for this reason, the water that comes to the sewage disposal plants, containing these stable detergents, is difficult to purify. And

the detergents themselves go through the plants relatively unchanged.

The bacterial action that is supposed to break down the detergents so that they are harmless and ineffectual in polluting the water further, cannot act on these chemicals, although I am informed by authorities that such detergents, which can be broken down by bacterial action, are available. I feel that the Ontario Water Resources Commission, backed by the government, should, in the near future, bring in legislation which would prohibit the use of these stable detergents that are actually polluting the water in the very water table of this province itself.

I have visited the new sewage disposal plants and I have seen ten to 12 feet of foam riding on the tanks which the experts say is due to this detergent contamination, and I hope the water resources commission is taking definite steps to remove this contaminant from the water. One other thing along the line of the river itself is the need for flood control and strict conservation practices in the Grand River valley and in the river itself and in other valley authorities. In the particular case with which I am familiar, this responsibility rests with the Grand River Conservation Commission which, I understand, is supported by certain urban municipalities and it also appears to rest to some extent, and certainly to an overlapping extent, with the Grand River Conservation Authority, which has the support of all the municipalities in the area.

Now, I have been told that the lack of co-operation that exists between these two conservation organizations is embarrassing in the extreme. They both have plans for controlling the river by dams which are different and in fact mutually exclusive. The two boards cannot even sit down together to discuss what these plans should be, and the government should take immediate action to investigate this and set up a proper authority so that the control of the waters of the Grand River and other river authorities is clear and effective.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? Is he aware of the fact that the commission and the authority have very definite responsibilities and were formed by different legislation? I would also ask if he is aware of the fact that the matter of combining them has been investigated?

Mr. Nixon: I am aware of the fact they are set up under different authorities. I am also aware of the fact that one of the bodies

has a plan for the dam control of the river, if you will pardon the expression, which has been in existence for some years. The other authority has a new and more modern approach to the thing. I am also aware of the fact that the co-ordination has been investigated and it has been referred to with regret that the change of Ministers in The Department of Lands and Forests was effected before the differentiation of their authority was actually brought to a definite conclusion.

An hon. member: Nice try, Wilf.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Informed, but not well informed.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Be careful there.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to say something about the roads that are associated with the Grand Valley itself. The river, of course, is the natural north-south highway of the original development and opening up of the area, but the east-west highways are of great historic importance. I think of the Governor's Road and the famous No. 2 highway which connects Toronto with London and points west. I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), although he is not here, the fact that the bridge that carries No. 2 highway over the Grand River at Paris was at one stage in the past two years actually closed to traffic because it was unsafe. It has been shored up somewhat, it has been narrowed to the point where there are only two usable lanes and the speed limit is only 15 miles an hour. Every time I cross it, I wonder whether we will get the family car over safely. I hope the department is considering the construction of a new bridge on this site.

Also running south from Brantford towards the remnants of the Indian reserve is the famous Cockshutt Road, which is in fact a county road, but urgently in need of redevelopment. Crossing the Grand River there is the Cockshutt Bridge, named after a former Lieutenant-Governor of the province, and former member of Parliament. About this time last year my opponent in the recent by-election was able to come to Toronto, Mr. Speaker, and speak to the then Minister of Highways (Mr. Cass). He came back waving a paper in his hand in triumph, saying that The Department of Highways would undertake and complete redevelopment of this road, and we are looking for development along this line with much interest.

Now, as we follow down the Cockshutt Road, which is passable, I must admit, Mr. Speaker, we come to the Indian country, the famous Six Nations Reservation which you have heard about frequently both from myself, and from the former member for Brant. This is where I must say I am glad to see that the government has seen fit to examine legislation, particularly to do with community services and has amended it, at least it is in the process of amendment, so that these community services are made available to the people of the Six Nations. I particularly refer to The Park Assistance Act, The Indian Welfare Services Act, and last, The Community Centres Act, which are in the process of amendment.

I assume, Mr. Speaker, that all of the legislation has been examined by someone to see that the policy of the government as it now is does in fact extend to the Indian population all of the community services to which all citizens have a right.

Now there has been some suggestion that the Indian reservations should be organized as municipalities and this suggestion is not a popular one on the reserve because with this word goes the idea of certain responsibilities that the Indians do not seek, nor do I feel should be inflicted upon them.

I had the honour of being invited to a session of the Indian council, and, sir, I must say it was a very efficiently run session indeed. The Indian chief and his councillors do business much like a reeve and council and do it very expeditiously and in excellent fashion. The one shocking thing about it is that right up beside the chief on his elevated podium sits the representative of the Crown, in fact the representative of the federal government, the Indian Agent. To see the Indians defer to this stranger in their midst in matters small and large is a shocking thing indeed in this day and age and in this democratic country. Certainly we should look, in the near future, to the governments, both provincial and federal, co-operating so that the Indians are given management of their own affairs to a greater degree.

Some developments on the reserve that might be of some interest to the hon. members of this House have to do with a recent oil strike on the reservation which unfortunately does not appear to be as rich as we had hoped. Nevertheless the deep drilling has indicated the presence of oil and we hope our Indian friends are sitting on a pool as large and rich as that of the Indians in Oklahoma. Certainly the natural gas de-

posits on the reservation are made available to the Indians and the lease under which this gas is provided for them is, I understand, presently under renegotiation.

Hon. members might be interested to know that under the present terms of the lease the gas that has been withdrawn from Indian land was paid for by the leasing company in the amount of \$61 over a two-year period, even though the deposits are relatively extensive.

Certainly the increased awareness of the hon. members of this House and the people of this province with human rights has been to the great benefit of the Indians on all reservations. We see in the papers even today the interest taken by the people of Canada and the hon. members of our Parliament in Ottawa of the plight of the Indians in Manitoba.

I was interested to read that there is a suggestion that a community development officer might be made available on these reserves. This is something that the provincial government, certainly under The Department of Public Welfare, might seriously consider. The services of a community development officer and a properly developed adult education programme would do much to bring along the general development of the Indians on reserves.

My hon. friend from Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson) says they do it in Manitoba and perhaps we should be appealing to the federal government for this in addition to the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing having to do with the valley of the Lower Grand which is associated with the Indian reserve, which is more important than really I can express. This has to do with the development of the tourist industry there. It has become very big business and could become much bigger yet if the area were properly serviced by good roads. As hon. members know the famous Indian road, which has been under discussion in this House probably for 15 years is presently under construction. I am sorry that I have to say that the construction seems to be lagging and certainly no area—any other area of the province—would put up with the hardships the Indians are experiencing during the construction.

The main road into Ohsweken, which is at the centre of the reservation, is practically impassable and anybody who wants to visit this town should do so over the other roads maintained by the Indians themselves. However, we must go through these periods of

difficulty during such difficult construction and we are looking for a good road within the next two years. During the past federal election campaign the hon. George Hees said in the area that he considered the Lower Grand a reasonable place for great tourist development; and I hope the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) will be able to co-operate with him in this pursuit.

Actually this is where the Grand River leaves the riding of Brant. It then enters the riding of Haldimand-Norfolk where the river is no doubt well looked after by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), as he represents that riding. He came into the reservation last fall to be granted an honorary chieftainship. I forget the Indian name, he is not in the House to tell us, but I presume it was Chief Money Bags. At the same time the hon. Postmaster-General for Canada (Mrs. Fairclough) was made a princess of the Mohawk tribe. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, they made a handsome couple indeed as they did a dance on the stage. A very successful dance too, because it rained within a half hour.

So the Indians know that their interests are well looked after, if not on this side of the House, in other quarters. I feel that their general welfare is certainly in the mind of hon. members.

I feel that the future of the Grand Valley as a conservation and recreation area is tremendous. There are many committees of interested private citizens and organizations of government that have been set up to plan for this future and implement it. To list a few, there is the Niagara-Iroquois Tourist Association, the Niagara Regional Development Association, the Ontario Water Resources Commission, The Department of Lands and Forests, the Grand River Conservation Commission, the Grand River Conservation Authority, and last, and I hope most important, The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act.

But I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that is inhibiting this development more than anything else is the very multiplicity of these organizations, the fact that their terms of reference overlap and that there is no strong over-all direction to their activities. It appears that it will take the strong new broom of a Liberal administration to set this right, clear out some of these organizations that have outlived their usefulness and plan effectively for the development of this important area of the province and for the province as a whole.

An hon. member. How did hon. members like that?

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to reply to the Speech from the Throne, I would first like to convey to you my appreciation of the courtesy and kindness which you have always shown to me not only in the course of your duties as Speaker, but also in other ways over the years gone by.

At this time I would also like to convey to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne my congratulations on their able and interesting speeches.

It is a privilege for me, Mr. Speaker, to extend my congratulations to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) on having chosen such a group of fine and able young men to the elevation of the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, before I proceed, as I look around this Chamber and assembly it is with a feeling of great personal regret that I recall the loss we have sustained in the passing of men who were my personal friends—the late members for Halton (Mr. Hall), Huron-Bruce (Mr. Hanna) and Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Lyons). While I am on my feet I would like to extend a welcome to the new hon. member, the young member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt).

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recall the time before the redistribution of my riding when the great riding of York came down almost to Eglinton Avenue—or York North rather—and the problems which were confronted in those days. I can recall some of the causes which brought about the formation of Metropolitan Toronto, such as the lack of water and sewage facilities, unpaved roads, and great and growing needs for more schools, police and fire facilities and of the anxieties which faced not only the municipal authorities but the provincial as well to provide funds for these services. As an experiment this has worked out as an outstanding achievement in municipal government. As occasions such as these always produce persons of great ability, I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Frederick Gardiner for the work accomplished in the formation of what has turned out to be a very fine success in municipal government.

As I have been dealing with what was formerly the southern part of my riding, I would now like to come for a few minutes and deal with York North as it is now constituted, which has as its southern boundary Steele's Avenue on the south, the county of Peel on the west, the county of Simcoe and

Lake Simcoe on the north, the county of Ontario on the east.

I would like to point out the phenomenal growth of the towns and municipalities along Yonge Street, such as Thornhill, Richmond Hill, Maple, Aurora, Newmarket, and on up north; and of the villages of Markham, Woodbridge, Sutton and of the other fast-growing and thriving communities such as the villages of Nobleton, Kleinburg, Schomberg, King City, Thornhill, Unionville, Stouffville, Queensville, Sharon, Keswick and Pefferlaw. These all have their problems and growing needs in housing, schools, roads, water and sewage facilities.

I would now like to say a word as to the strictly rural parts of my riding. I might say, Mr. Speaker, in my travels I have never seen any finer agricultural land as a whole, than the county of York. It is with pride that I would like to mention here the outstanding and magnificent herds of dairy cattle such as the Holsteins, Jerseys and Ayrshires. These are truly world famous. We have also the finest beef breeds such as the Herefords, Short-horns and Aberdeen Angus. Although perhaps we are not one of the largest hog producing counties in Ontario, yet we have a great number of hog producers as well.

Then there is the Holland Marsh development—a unique area in the county. It represents a great victory for man in that it was once a wasteland and now produces a great amount of the province's vegetables which are known the world over for their quality. I must give credit to the men who had the vision and courage to promote this wonderful development which resulted in the building of processing plants and thus has given employment to great numbers of people in the area. In passing I might say that this year alone, almost half a million bags of onions have been exported to the old country. In passing, Mr. Speaker, I might also say that this marsh area of which I am now speaking is divided almost equally between the hon. member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. Evans) and myself.

I would now like to speak on our roads and transportation system. As we all know, we have a very fine system of provincial highways running through the length and breadth of the county; such as Highway No. 50, the famous Highway No. 400 from Toronto to Barrie, Yonge Street, Highway No. 48 running up the easterly side of the county, Highway No. 7 running from Ottawa to Sarnia and I might mention at this time another proposed new four-lane highway which will be another great development, a

proposed road running up the east side of Lake Simcoe. It is being surveyed now and the land purchased.

I would also like to speak of the system of roads which we have and of which we are very proud and that is the Toronto and York Roads Commission where we have a very fine system of county roads, and of the splendid work and development which has taken place over the years under their direction. I personally would like to convey my appreciation to the commission, the government, and Metropolitan Toronto for their assistance in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I was indeed interested, in listening to the Speech from the Throne, to hear that the great arterial highway from Windsor to the Quebec border would soon be completed and more money would be available for development roads. Commenting on this, if I might now appeal to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), I hope he will keep on a very high priority list, the extension of Highway No. 9 from Schomberg to Newmarket, which would be a great boon to the people from the central and western portions of the province from Schomberg to Lake Huron and also serve all that country to the east as far as Ottawa. This indeed would be a wonderful impetus to the development of the central part, not only of the county of York and the immediate municipalities, but the province as a whole, and I am again making an appeal that this be constructed at the earliest opportunity.

With further reference to development roads, I know assistance could be given to another road which might be constructed at the foot of Cook's Bay, joining the county of Simcoe. It would be a great convenience and facilitate the travelling of people around Lake Simcoe. I might say to the hon. Minister of Highways, as well, that the road is now up to the edge of the Holland River on the York side.

While dealing with transportation needs, I was more than pleased to learn of the committee formed to deal with transportation problems concerning the city of Metropolitan Toronto and the surrounding municipalities and of proposals for a greater use of the existing railways in my area and their possibilities of being used for commuter service.

That great project, the marshalling yard running through the southern part of my riding, is being brought to completion and more room is being made available for railway facilities in the more congested areas of downtown Toronto. I am hopeful that this

can be brought into being as we all must realize the great convenience it will be to the people who live north of the city limits, especially the municipalities along Yonge Street, such as Thornhill, Richmond Hill, Newmarket, Aurora and Barrie and on up—the CNR to the east, near the villages of Agincourt, Markham and Stouffville, and to the north and west the Canadian Pacific line servicing the town of Weston, village of Woodbridge, and so on. Not only these communities but Toronto would receive the benefit. Those who have had to fight the congested traffic situation will readily understand what an improvement it would be.

While I am speaking on this, I would hope that the committee will take into consideration more rapid transit to the outlying portions of the Metropolitan area so that people who wish to do business in the Metropolitan area could park their cars and travel on a rapid transit railway or some other rapid means.

I would also urge that Highway 400, that is the great highway coming from Barrie which ends at Highway 401, could be extended into the heart of the city in order that some relief might be given to the congestion of Highway 401.

If I might deal for a moment with The Department of Lands and Forests; I would like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of my favourite departments. My dealings have always been of the most cordial nature.

I would like to commend the department, forestry experimental station at Maple, which is conducted by the provincial Department of Lands and Forests with the co-operation of the federal authorities. I would also like to mention the outstanding York county forest of over 3,000 acres, which is operated under the supervision of The Department of Lands and Forests. This, at one time, was mostly wasteland, and to see it now covered with a magnificent forest is a credit to the county of York and The Department of Lands and Forests. With this effort I might say that land values here have increased.

I might point out the value of this reforestation, not only in material terms but in other benefits such as the reclamation of the water supply—where at one time a creek was dry and is now a running stream. This has enhanced the area tremendously.

I would like to commend the department, especially the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), for the formation of the junior forest rangers programme which

has given thousands of Ontario youths a good foundation in self-reliance. During the past five years, many Ontario boys have been introduced to our outdoor life in the north-land as junior forest rangers. Next year, I understand, the number enrolled may be doubled.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel strongly on this and very much in favour of this. We see throughout our province that the youth of the country, especially boys around 17 years of age who are not employed, are all right for a few weeks of the summer holidays. Then they get restless and want something to do, and this to my mind is one of the outstanding ways in which we can give useful employment to our boys. It is not only for the benefit of their minds but of their bodies as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would personally like to thank the former Minister (Mr. Spooner) and his department officials for the fine arrangements during our visit to north-eastern Ontario last September. I only wish I had more time to speak on the impressions which I gained there, and the potentialities of the north country. What impressed me greatly was the use being made of the poplar tree, which at one time was considered a weed tree and is now becoming very valuable.

It is with regret to note that the elm tree now seems doomed to destruction in having contracted the Dutch elm disease. I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests that consideration should be given to producing and supplying a suitable replacement tree to the owners who have been affected by the loss of this beautiful tree.

Mr. Speaker, I have always taken a very keen interest in the wildlife of our province. Perhaps at some other time I might be permitted to say a few words about our game and fish.

With regard to our resort areas, we are indeed fortunate in having such a beautiful lake as Lake Simcoe, the southern shore of which is practically all in my riding. Here there are splendid boating, swimming and fishing facilities.

I would now like to pay tribute to the formation of the Metropolitan conservation authority which was started after that disastrous flood known as Hurricane Hazel. To those of us who witnessed that catastrophe, seeing what were once peaceful streams overflowing their banks and causing untold damage and loss of life—I will be forever

grateful not only for the assistance which was received by our people from the province, but from the public at large. I remember seeing that night—one never to be forgotten—homes in the village of Woodbridge, where I live, floating down the stream. I was called to visit the Holland Marsh as dawn was breaking. There I saw that most fertile land completely submerged and the homes being carried away. Mr. Speaker, we will all be very grateful to this government for coming to the help of the sufferers in that disaster.

As a result, in the course of a few years, the Metropolitan conservation authority was formed and has done exceptional work in the planning and channelling of streams and flood control systems. Already the result of their work is being noted. I would like to comment here on the formation of the authority and of the men and women who are dedicated to the splendid work they are doing. It would be an inspiration, I am sure, to you all, to come and visit some of the parks surrounding the city of Toronto which are now in existence.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with something which affects us all, and that is The Department of Health. In the county of York we have a very fine health unit. We already have one hospital at Newmarket and another is being built at Richmond Hill; these will serve and help to alleviate the care and suffering of those in ill health.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not say a word in praise of The Department of Public Welfare under the able and sympathetic guidance of hon. Mr. Cecile, and his deputy, Mr. James Band. If I might say to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) he kind of stole my thunder, because I, too, have an Indian reservation, and was going to comment a little on that; you will forgive me if I perhaps interlude a little here.

I might point out that I have in my riding an Indian reservation on Georgina Island. The reservation there, and the hon. member for Brant will appreciate this, consists of the islands of Georgina, Snake Island and Fox Island in Lake Simcoe. I am very pleased indeed to note that a bill has been introduced whereby all Indian mothers will receive the same assistance which is provided to the rest of the community.

A few years ago a cable to the reservation was completed enabling a supply of electricity to reach this area. I might say, Mr. Speaker, on their behalf, that this was very much appreciated by them. I feel very proud indeed of this community and perhaps at some other time I could say more concerning their welfare.

However, Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, due credit must be given to our hydro-electric system which has been a great factor in the wonderful development of our province. In my own riding particularly, and I can say this truthfully, there is no place which is not served with electrical energy, and what a great boon indeed it has been to everyone.

I would like at this time to convey thanks to the civil service of this government for the courtesy that I have received over a great number of years, their kindness to me, and how it has always been a pleasure to come in their offices.

I want to come to another little instance in my life. York county has always been well known for its historical past, and the important part the men of York played in the history of our country. It was indeed a privilege and honour for me to be present last October at the ceremonies of the 150th anniversary of the battle of Queenston Heights; and as I took part in this service on the Sunday morning on the lawn at the Church of England by the side of that magnificent river, the Niagara, what thoughts passed through my mind—of the part the York militia played in the defence of our country on that memorable day, and of the last words of General Brock: "Push on, York volunteers."

In conclusion, I would like to pay tribute to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and to say what a pleasure and pride it has been to serve under his leadership. How he has demonstrated his ability as a government leader and one who will assure that the present government will be here for a very long time to come.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6:00 of the clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, December 19, 1962

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1962



CONTENTS

Wednesday, December 19, 1962

Rehabilitation and development of agricultural lands in rural areas in Ontario, bill to provide for, reported	481
Co-operative Loans Act, bill to amend, reported	481
Inspection of meat for human consumption, bill to provide for, reported	481
City of Oshawa, bill respecting, reported.	481
Village of Bath, bill respecting, reported	481
Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec, bill respecting, reported ...	481
Presbyterian Church in Canada, bill respecting, reported	481
City of Belleville (1), bill respecting, reported	482
City of Belleville (2), bill respecting, reported	482
Chatham Community Young Men's Christian Association, bill respecting, reported	482
University of Windsor, bill to incorporate, reported	482
Conclusion of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. J. F. Edwards, Mr. Bryden, Mr. Singer, Mr. Yaremko	482
Third readings	517
Royal assent to certain bills, the Lieutenant-Governor	519
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	520

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1962

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock p.m.

Clerk of the House: 18th order, House in committee; Mr. D. Morrow in the chair.

DEVELOPMENT OF LANDS

House in committee on Bill No. 10, An Act to provide for the rehabilitation and development of agricultural lands in rural areas of Ontario.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, in regard to section 10, I would raise the question with the hon. Minister as to whether this section does apply to the establishment of manufacturing industry in any particular rural area?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Well, Mr. Chairman, I would not say it was the intent and purpose of the bill to establish manufacturing industries in rural areas, but I think that the hon. member would agree that where an industry could be established in a rural area and would provide a means of employment for the people of the area, every consideration should be given to the establishment of such an industry. It does seem to me that the intent and purpose of the bill is to, as far as possible, provide additional sources of income for the rural people in areas where particular land areas do not lend themselves to intensive agricultural production.

Sections 10 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 10 reported.

THE CO-OPERATIVE LOANS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 31, An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 31 reported.

INSPECTION OF MEAT

House in committee on Bill No. 25, An Act to provide for inspection of meat for human consumption.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, section 6 was amended by the committee on agriculture by the deletion of clauses (b) and (c) and the substitution of these new clauses (b) and (c):

(b) The performance of the government of Canada on behalf of the government of Ontario of functions and services under this Act that are the responsibility of the government of Ontario; and (c) the payment of money required for functions and services performed by the government of Canada under clause (b).

Section 6, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 7 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 25 reported.

CITY OF OSHAWA

House in committee on Bill No. Pr1, An Act respecting the city of Oshawa.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. Pr1 reported.

VILLAGE OF BATH

House in committee on Bill No. Pr4, An Act respecting the village of Bath.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill No. Pr4 reported.

BAPTIST CONVENTION

House in committee on Bill No. Pr6, An Act respecting the Baptist convention of Ontario and Quebec.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. Pr6 reported.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA

House in committee on Bill No. Pr7, An Act respecting the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. Pr7 reported.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE (I)

House in committee on Bill No. Pr8, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. Pr8 reported.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE (II)

House in committee on Bill No. Pr9, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. Pr9 reported.

CHATHAM YMCA

House in committee on Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting the Chatham Community Young Men's Christian Association.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Is there not an amendment?

Clerk of the House: If you will look in the amended copies in your book, following the original copy.

Section 3 agreed to.

Bill No. Pr16 reported.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR

House in committee on Bill No. Pr36, An Act to incorporate the university of Windsor.

Sections 1 to 33, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. Pr36 reported.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Throne speech, I would like to join with those who have already paid many tributes to the efficient

manner in which you have conducted the affairs of this honourable House. Also my congratulations to those who have come into the House on by-elections and to those who have been promoted to Cabinet rank in the government.

I am convinced that the people of this province, the press, and the majority of this House are well pleased with the subject matter in the Throne speech given at the opening of the Legislature.

In view of the announcement by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) of a group being named to make a study of transportation problems including both major railways' representatives as well as Metro and department officials, I am prompted to bring to this House a few thoughts regarding transportation not only in the Metro area but in the province as a whole. I do think a little background would be quite fitting at this time. For many years I have noticed that railways, possibly through their own failure to keep abreast of improvements and face competition on a realistic basis, have lost a great portion of their business as a result.

I live in a small town, Palmerston, which has been a railway centre since 1875 or thereabouts, till lately. Stratford, one of the finest cities in the province—well known as the festival centre all over America, and also a part of my riding—once had a railway employment of over 1,200, now reduced to around 200. This has all come about in a period of 11 years after giving real service for a period of over 75 years. It is interesting to note that back in 1875 or thereabouts the municipalities had paid for the building of the railways of the time. Palmerston had paid \$15,000. The town of Listowel had paid \$30,000. Palmerston, in fact, became a town by a special Act of Legislature in 1875, as a result of two railways running into it at that time. We must pay tribute to the backing of such a venture when that amount of money was so hard to come by in those days.

Back ten or 12 years ago, many speakers, including myself, advocated better railway services in the province including commuter services, which have deteriorated rather than gone ahead on many of the lines since 1930. Let us for a few minutes picture Palmerston, one of the many—Lindsay is another, and I could name many divisional centres all over the province—rail centres with lines to Stratford and London, to Kincardine, to Owen Sound, to Durham and to Guelph and Toronto. Back in the early 50's the branch lines out of our town on the CNR figures earned profits between \$350,000 and

\$400,000. The business alone out and into Owen Sound amounted to over \$1 million.

Prior to the latest cut, the officials visited most of the places served, with the idea of selling bukke cars to service the area. They were not told of cuts coming, but only of a speed-up in service. At that time at one place, Wingham, the express officials stated that their express alone paid for running the trains. However, also back in the early 50's, the mail was taken from the trains, through collusion on the part of the federal post office department and the railways. At that time the postal department was informed by the CNR that the trains were being discontinued. In fact, half of them are still running. The result: mail clerks were moved or retired; mail contracts were given to trucking interests; men of many years' service were forced to sacrifice their homes to follow a job if their seniority would entitle them to one.

The small pensioner who formerly supplemented his earnings by carrying the mail to and from the station was removed, but, above all the railways lost \$30,000 to \$40,000 on each line by losing three contracts.

Then came "dieselization". It is interesting to note how quickly all the fine locomotives, such as the "six thousand" class, which ran on the mail line, were cut up for scrap. Roundhouses were torn down. They say we shouldn't stop progress, but maybe we should, however, take another look. Time will tell.

Since then, the railways have been allowed to go into the trucking business, carrying both their freight and express by trucks, and we have to admit many trucks which have given real personal service have gained and earned a large percentage of the business.

The freight sheds have been completely removed from our town. Yet where would you get a better or more central geographic centre to serve an area, even on a truck route? Now our passenger service amounts to one train a day each way—but a limited service designed, one would think, to discourage all local traffic. Anyone from Palmerston or north, in order to go to Georgetown or Brampton, would have to get off at Guelph and take a bus two hours later to complete their journey to Georgetown as the train doesn't stop between Guelph and West Toronto. And the same happens in reverse returning at night. This same train, to which the two dayliners are attached and which comes from Palmerston, originates at London. It does not stop at St. Mary's on the trip down, which is a town of great importance in our riding. There is no connection except

via Guelph in the morning to go to London.

There is a Sunday night train which arrives in Guelph 20 minutes too late to make connections for Stratford and London and west. It would seem the CNR officials from Montreal are determined to make it so inconvenient to travel that they lose the passenger business or show it operating at a loss—then they apply to the Board of Transport Commissioners for permission to curtail the lines. This permission, I understand, they never requested in cutting the service in half—incidentally Palmerston and Listowel are nine miles apart and have no direct passenger service except via Guelph and Stratford with long stops at each.

The CNR is subsidized anywhere up to \$75 million per year while the CPR, a private company, received \$25 million to equalize rates. They were built to give service in all areas, but it is rapidly being curtailed in southwestern Ontario which could result in hardships in the future. Stratford has been fortunate in securing many new industries as a result of a diligent mayor and council and an active board of trade. St. Marys, Listowel, and Mitchell also have added industry, making many positions open for those displaced from railway service.

One of the things most essential to the acquiring of industry is the availability of transportation in its various forms. The Mid-Western Ontario Development Association, which is supported by this government, is trying its best to induce industry to establish itself in the counties of Huron-Perth-Waterloo and Wellington.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure hon. members all will admit living in our rural and urban areas in mid-western Ontario has its many compensations. Population is increasing in the towns I have mentioned. New homes, new schools and new industries have made them all more progressive.

It is my submission that the committees named should make a study involving a much larger area than Toronto to Oshawa—Toronto to Hamilton.

In the past we have seen people drive from Palmerston to Malton and return daily—also from our area to Woodstock and return. Many still drive from Palmerston to Stratford and return daily. Let's see why. The CNR, at least, does not want to serve all the people. They apparently want only the cream of the business. Possibly they only want to be in the hotel business.

There is no business I know of which does not have losses of some kind—some skim or milk only. It is rumoured that railways and

their presidents, in a lot of ways, wield more power than governments formed of elected members, federally and provincially. Is this right? I can quote an incident which maybe proves this point.

We hear and have seen these problems past and present for quite a number of years. In the mid-forties it was my lot to write both railways and the Toronto terminals regarding the possibility of putting the Gardiner Expressway over the rails elevated on steel right from the Humber to the Don. This was in the early stages of development at that time. All three replied they were not interested—see the employment for miners and mills involved, also the amount of money involved in buying property which would have been saved.

Now I am one who thinks that the railways can still play a prominent role in the further development of this great province of ours. Let the committee have a look at this.

I do think the railways should be capable of moving steel, cement and logs and heavy loads from our highways, and also moving people. There are too many box-cars now on our highways—which in some cases were never meant to carry such heavy loads. Maybe we should take a look at the size of trucks allowed.

On the other hand, we see the railways advertising special return rates good on Saturday only, taking customers from our local merchants in the smaller towns.

Many people in our area would certainly prefer to travel on the train. Why not fill up the cars, passenger express, at rates people can afford to pay—every day? Let us see that the courtesy and service we read about on CNR property actually means something.

I would urge this special committee to extend its studies throughout the province—co-operate with development associations, boards of trade, and those interested in the development of all Ontario.

In closing, I would hate to have this opportunity pass without informing the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) and his party that I have been informed the call for tenders for the hospital for retarded children in the Palmerston area will be called on December 28 next. The service building contract was awarded to Anglin-Norcross at a cost of some \$490,000 and is almost completed.

Now to all—a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join with the many others

who have preceded me in this debate in extending my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and to the new hon. Ministers who are now sitting on the Treasury benches. I would also like to express my regret that three of the members who were with us up until the last session are no longer here.

May I congratulate the newly elected member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), and in particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate him on the constructive and provocative contribution that he made to this debate in his maiden speech last night. I think there was a very important lesson to be drawn from the illuminating description he gave of the problems of his own constituency. I have no doubt that this lesson will be lost on the government, but I think other hon. members should consider it.

We have enjoyed in this province a considerable degree of industrial development over the last 20 years. Fortuitously and by the grace of providence there happens to be located within Ontario the natural industrial centre of Canada. With the industrialization that has taken place as a result of World War II and the events that followed it, there has naturally been very significant industrial expansion in this province. The government spends a great deal of the time of this House congratulating itself on that expansion although in fact it had practically nothing to do with it.

What is more important, Mr. Speaker, is that they permit this phenomenon to conceal from them certain other phenomena. When one just takes the total figures for the province, one is talking essentially about a very small section of the province, particularly this Toronto - Hamilton - Niagara nexus. The rapid expansion in that area has produced an overall total that has certainly led the government, and many of the rest of us, to ignore the fact that in other areas of the province there has been very little development.

In fact, those areas which have economic characteristics similar to some of the other provinces of Canada have had very much the same sort of experience, notwithstanding all the self-congratulatory remarks of representatives of this government. This is one of the major problems that is facing Canada and Ontario in the years to come, the entire problem of overdevelopment in some areas and underdevelopment in others. Unfortunately this government in this province is not even prepared to admit the problem

exists, but it does exist and some day it is going to have to be tackled.

Mr. Speaker, I, like the others who have preceded me, would like once again to congratulate you on the dignified manner in which you have conducted the proceedings of this House. I imagine that to be Speaker requires the patience of Job, and I must say that in my observation you have certainly been in the same league as that worthy as far as patience is concerned.

Unfortunately, there have been occasions when things have got a little difficult to deal with. Indeed, in the past few years this House or this Legislature got rather a bad reputation in the public view, partly I think because of the rather distorted reporting in the press on some occasions, but it got the reputation of being a centre of almost perpetual rhubarbs. In fact, I can recall a year or two ago I was at one of the annual showings of the review "Spring Thaw." One of the scenes there was a very short and simple one. It consisted of a tape recording of something that sounded like bedlam for a minute or two, and at the conclusion of that one of the actors said, "Ladies and gentlemen, we have just brought you an excerpt from the proceedings of the Ontario Legislature." This provoked gales of laughter among the audience. I may say there was just enough of an element of truth in it to make at least one member of the Legislature feel somewhat uncomfortable.

I think if one looks back through the record, Mr. Speaker, one will find that most of these incidents, which I think might properly be deplored, have usually originated from the benches to my immediate right. The legislative assembly would be a very dull place if there was not a certain amount of cross-fire in the proceedings. But there is a reasonable limit to everything, and I must say that no one can say anything that even remotely smacks of criticism of the Liberal Party or its so-called policy without being subjected to a barrage of cat-calls and juvenile witticisms.

Time after time, Mr. Speaker, I have seen you rise to your place in this House and in your calm and dignified way appeal to hon. members to give other hon. members their opportunity to say their piece in reasonable quiet. I think every single time you have been constrained to do this it has been because of some blow-up on those benches there. As a matter of fact, I can remember a couple of years ago, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan)

was presenting his annual budget statement that the cat-calls and interruptions got so bad that we on these benches could not even hear what the hon. Provincial Treasurer was saying. Finally the Prime Minister of the day (Hon. Mr. Frost) was constrained to rise and plead with the hon. members on the other benches to give the hon. Provincial Treasurer a chance to present the very important document that he was trying to present to the House.

As I understand it there is an age-old tradition in all British parliamentary institutions that, though one may interrupt from time to time on most occasions even though it is not technically in order, there are two occasions when by tradition members do not interrupt. One is when a member is making his maiden speech, and the other is when the Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Finance or Chancellor of the Exchequer, as the case may be, is presenting the annual budget.

There is an obvious reason for that. The budget is a difficult enough document to present without the presentation being interrupted and without the member of the Cabinet who is presenting it being distracted by irrelevancies. In most assemblies the members recognize that fact and have courtesy to hold their peace no matter how much they may disagree with what is being said, but not so these hon. gentlemen here. They carry on their same barrage of cat-calls and witticisms even when the hon. Provincial Treasurer is presenting his budget, and without consideration of any of the British parliamentary traditions or of even the basic tenets of common courtesy.

I will say, however, Mr. Speaker, that in my observation and apart, perhaps, from this continuing and no doubt interminable aberration to which I have just referred, the dignity of these proceedings in this House have improved substantially even in the short time that I have been here. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this has to a considerable degree been due to the manner in which you have conducted the proceedings. To speak for myself, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I have not recently been called a snake in this House, although I was on one occasion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I will also say that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) has not been subjected to the kind of continuous, calculated and almost unbelievable abuse that he used to be subjected to in previous years in this House.

For example, when he dared to call the attention of this House and of the people of Ontario to the deplorable conditions that existed a few years ago in the reform institutions of this province, the answer of the members of this House at this time was to subject him to a persistent campaign of scurrilous vilification such as I venture to say has been unequalled in any other British parliamentary assembly.

On another occasion, or on many other occasions, he suffered the same treatment, but I will refer to just one other. I would like to refer to some comments that were made in this Legislature in March, 1959. I am going to read a few phrases from the *Hansard* of March 18, of that year. All of these phrases were applied to the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party. Here are a few of them:

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): You mean the CCF Party.

Mr. Bryden: Well, the hon. member for Bruce wishes to have it completely accurate—he was then leader of the CCF Party and was carrying on the same distinguished job in this House that he is now carrying on.

Mr. Whicher: Why did you not protect him at that time? You were in Saskatchewan then.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member is usually misinformed and his error on this occasion is as egregious as most of his errors.

An hon. member: How true.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Bryden: Here are some of the statements that were made with respect to the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), and I am quoting:

He just likes yelling down an empty barrel. Let him get up and not sit there and chitter like a pig in a trough. The hon. member is so used to wallowing in the gutter—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: We heard you before.

Mr. Bryden:

—let him yammer away and get down into the sewer and get himself covered with it.

This is the sort of statement—

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Who said that?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, and some of the gentlemen over there think it is very amusing; they think that this adds to the dignity of the legislative assembly of Ontario. And what was the occasion that gave rise to this?

Mr. Whicher: Was he talking about you?

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for York South had called public attention to the shenanigans that had been going on in the financing of Northern Ontario Natural Gas. This we will recall was an incident that ultimately led to the resignation of three Cabinet Ministers and I judge, Mr. Speaker, it is not even yet a closed book. So the hon. member for York South in accordance with his public duty called attention to what was going on, and what was the reaction on the benches opposite? The reaction was to try to distract attention from the abuses to which he was calling attention by heaping abuse upon him. And then they had the gall to accuse him of indulging in abuse.

This has been the experience which he has had to put up with and I admire him for the courage with which he has suffered it for many years; but I believe that this situation is changing as far as this House is concerned, at any rate. Subject again to the one aberration to which I have previously referred, that sort of thing does not seem to go on here any more. I trust that it will also cease out on—

Mr. Whicher: Careful, Matt.

Mr. Bryden: —the hustings outside this House in the election which, no doubt, will be coming up in the very near future. It seems to me that the members of this House should be able to present their views and opinions to the electorate and to criticize the opinions and the policies of other parties, and criticize them vigorously by all means without indulging in personal abuse, without vilifying their opponents.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bryden: I hope that this will be the case. I must say that sometimes when I watch the performance, not in this House so much but outside this House, of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) I sometimes wonder if this will be the situation.

For example, I recall that in January this year, during the recess of the previous session of the Legislature, the hon. Minister in a speech to the Toronto and District Young

Progressive-Conservative Council stated, or let us say implied, that the hon. member for York South was involved in some sort of conflict of interest. I would like to read two or three paragraphs from the report of that speech as given in the *Toronto Telegram* of January 23, 1962—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I think we need no further proof of the point I was trying to make a little earlier as to the source of the rhubarbs in this House. The first three paragraphs of this story in the *Telegram* read as follows:

A \$6,000 party contribution puts provincial NDP leader Donald MacDonald in a conflict of interests position, Energy Resources Minister Robert Macaulay hinted last night—

Note the word "hinted". If a man has something to say I prefer men who have the courage to come out and say it. He said:

The Legislative Assembly Act forbids a member from "knowingly accepting directly or indirectly any compensation in respect to any matter brought before the House". He argued that the \$6,000 Mr. MacDonald gets comes indirectly from the labour unions that support the New Democratic Party financially.

And then a little later he said, or was quoted as saying—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: —that he was not alleging anything, he was only asking a question.

Now, obviously, Mr. Speaker, such a trumped up charge hardly merits any consideration. Obviously its purpose was to create suspicion in the minds of the public in regard to facts that were perfectly capable of explanation. Everybody knows and has known for a long time that the New Democratic Party, and before it the CCF—in my opinion, quite properly—decided that it would pay a supplement of \$6,000 a year to its leader since it requires that leader to devote his full time to the affairs of the party.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): In other words, I have not got a dairy to provide a basic income.

Mr. Bryden: And I may say that the hon. member for York South, the leader of the New Democratic Party, although he is entitled by decision of the executive and council of the party to receive this amount,

actually accepts \$4,000 per year of it. Why it should be wrong—

An hon. member: That is all he is worth.

Mr. Bryden: Why it should be wrong for a party to pay money in accordance with the decision of its properly elected representatives to any official of the party is something that the hon. Minister did not explain and could not explain. He suggested that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party was involved in a conflict of interest involving violation of The Legislative Assembly Act of this province. If he really believed that, why did he not raise it in this House and have it referred to the committee on privileges and elections? Surely that is the place to deal with matters involving the position of any hon. member of this House.

That is the proper way of dealing with it, it is the only proper way of dealing with it. We waited all through the resumed portion of the last session of the Legislature, and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development did not once refer to this incident. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the reason he did not do so was that he knew as well as anybody else that there was not anything in it whatever. He raised it only on the basis of the theory that if one throws enough mud some of it will stick.

If there was anything in the charge then almost every hon. member of this assembly could be charged with some sort of remote indirect conflict of interest, because no one would be able to have any outside employment or to operate any kind of a business without receiving money from some outside party. To suggest that that would involve the member in a conflict of interest is certainly beneath the dignity of any hon. Minister of the Crown and certainly the type of thing that does no credit to this assembly.

Mr. Singer: Now let us get down to the speech, let us start.

Mr. Bryden: It is customary in this debate, Mr. Speaker, for members to refer to matters in their own constituencies. I am not going to do that at any great length, but there is one recent event in my constituency to which I would like to refer. I would like to use it to raise a matter of even broader import.

To begin with, I would like to mention the fact that shortly before the opening of this session of the Legislature, Mr. George Hogan of Toronto was chosen as the Progressive-Conservative political candidate in Woodbine constituency. I would like to

congratulate him on his nomination and to welcome him into the lists. I think it is a fine thing for any man to receive his party's nomination and to offer himself for public service.

If news reports of the nominating convention are to be believed, Mr. Hogan issued a challenge to me to debate with him on the policies of the government as they affect the people of Woodbine.

That was about four weeks ago. Since then I have waited patiently for some sort of communication from Mr. Hogan advising me formally of his challenge. To date I have received nothing.

In order that no one will be in any doubt, however, I would like to repeat now what I said at the time when radio station CKEY asked me for my comment: namely, that I will be happy to debate with Mr. Hogan just as soon as he has finished debating with his own party.

I would appreciate it if, as a matter of courtesy, he would tell me and the public before the debate takes place which side he proposes to take. I do not, however, lay that down as a condition. I merely suggest it as a method to avoid confusion.

I was rather interested in a condition that Mr. Hogan himself laid down. As I understand it from press reports, he proposed that the debate should not take place until after the present session of the Legislature. I do not know if he has an inside story and is quite satisfied that this session will carry itself through to the normal conclusion. At any rate, his proposal was, and quite specific as the newspapers said, that the debate should not take place until after this session has been completed.

I can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that although Conservative administrations have been in office in this province for more than 19 years, Mr. Hogan cannot find anything in their record which he thinks would provide him with useful debating points. To that extent he and I are on common ground.

Apparently he was hoping against hope that the current session might provide him with some sort of a case. If he has read the Speech from the Throne, and I have no doubt he has, he has undoubtedly been gravely disappointed and that may be the reason why I have not heard from him.

Be that as it may, it is a welcome innovation in the Conservative approach to public policy, that Mr. Hogan would even contemplate a debate.

In numerous previous elections in the eastern part of Toronto, various public spirited organizations, as for example Donlands United Church, have tried to arrange meetings at which candidates of all parties would confront each other and present their platforms to the voters. In most cases such meetings were designed to cover the two neighbouring constituencies of Woodbine and Riverdale, Donlands United Church being almost on the border of the two constituencies.

Such a procedure, in my opinion, is highly desirable in the interest of democracy, but unfortunately it had to be abandoned. Why? Because there was not a single occasion when the Conservative candidates could be induced to appear and the sponsoring organization decided, quite properly in my opinion, that it might get itself into the position of appearing to be involved in partisan politics if it sponsored political meetings at which the candidates of one major party did not appear.

Mr. Hogan appears to have indicated that he no longer adheres to that old Tory policy of hiding from the opponents. Admittedly the situation is substantially different now from what it was then. In those days the Conservatives were the sitting members. They were on the inside and the rest of us were on the outside. Now, as far as Woodbine is concerned at any rate, the New Democratic Party is on the inside and the Conservatives are on the outside, both federally and provincially.

I do not, however, believe that this is the reason why Mr. Hogan is challenging me. I choose to believe that he, like I—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it really is not appropriate for the hon. member for Woodbine to carry on a debate when the other party of the debate is not here to answer him. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman should accept the challenge and debate.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hon. member for London South was asleep when I indicated that I had accepted Mr. Hogan's challenge and will meet him any time. Surely now the hon. gentleman is not concerned that I am now making some references to Mr. Hogan when he in his acceptance speech at his nominating convention, although I was not there to answer, directed a torrent of abuse towards me and then accused me of being abusive. This is a typical Tory tactic. I hope it is not a foretaste of the type of campaign he intends

to put on, because I will say that in Woodbine and Greenwood in the past, although we have some very hotly contested elections they have always been on the highest possible level without personalities of any kind. I am hoping they will stay that way. As far as I am concerned they certainly will.

However, I was saying that the situation is now different than it was then. But I do not believe that it is merely because he is on the outside rather than the inside that Mr. Hogan has decided he wants to debate with me. Rather, I think that he, like I, considers it to be in the public interest for candidates for public office to confront each other in the full view of the electorate.

For my part, I agree. As far as the New Democratic Party is concerned, we believe that procedures which are valid when we are on the outside are just as valid when we are on the inside.

Now that Mr. Hogan has started the ball rolling I would suggest that the procedure might very well be extended to a larger arena. Surely what is appropriate at the constituency level is appropriate also at the provincial level. Undoubtedly the most important single issue in the province of Ontario today is Medicare.

Two distinct policies on this issue have emerged. On the one hand, there is the policy of the present government, which is to make public funds available to provide medical care insurance to an unspecified number of people who are considered unable to provide it for themselves and to leave the rest of us to the tender mercies of the insurance companies and the doctor-sponsored plans.

On the other hand, there is the policy of the New Democratic Party which was so eloquently enunciated in this House a short time ago by my hon. leader. That policy is to provide medical care for everyone, other than a small number of people such as members of the armed forces, inmates of institutions, etc., whose medical needs are already provided for. The cost of this plan is to be covered partly by premiums and partly by taxes scaled to ability to pay.

I think the best possible way to contribute to public understanding of these two distinct policies is through the medium of public debate. I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been authorized by my hon. leader to challenge the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) to debate the Medicare issue with him, preferably on television, but if that is not possible then in a public hall at a mutually

convenient time and place, and I hereby issue the challenge.

I have every reason to believe that the hon. Prime Minister will accept this challenge.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the members that the member for Woodbine has the floor and he should have the attention of the other members.

I think all members have had the opportunity to take part in the debate and those who have not taken part certainly had the opportunity at one time. On that basis I would ask all the members to give attention to the member who has the floor at the present time.

I would point out that when the Speaker sits down it is no sign for the members to break out once again. I can assure you the Speaker will always rise very quickly and he can stay on his feet for a long time.

Mr. Bryden: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I can sympathize with some of the hon. members. When they had an opportunity they did not take too good advantage of it so now they are trying to improve the situation.

I was saying that I have every reason to believe that the hon. Prime Minister will accept the challenge I have just issued. After all, we have been told repeatedly that he is a new man with a new approach. If that is so he has undoubtedly abandoned the old approach of avoiding public debate with the Opposition.

One minor complication is that some people might consider this would be unfair to the hon. leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Wintermeyer). This complication would be more than minor if the CBC were to carry the debate because the CBC has a firm policy of giving time to all parties whether they have anything to say or not.

Obviously it would contribute nothing to public understanding to involve the hon. Liberal leader in a debate between the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party and the hon. Prime Minister on the issue of Medicare. The hon. Liberal leader has no policy, unless a continuous process of trimming one's sails in an effort to catch every conceivable breath of wind is considered to be a policy.

Happily, I have found a way out of this dilemma. I propose that the debate between the New Democratic leader and the hon. Prime Minister should proceed so as to bring the issue squarely before the public, and then, to meet the requirements of equal time

without confusing the issue, arrangements could be made on a separate occasion for the hon. Liberal leader to debate the issue with himself.

Alternatively, Mr. Speaker, arrangements might be made for the hon. Liberal leader to debate the issue with the various factions within his own party. Personally, however, I would not be inclined to recommend this alternative. It would be more likely to be a donnybrook than a debate.

It is time, in my opinion, that all parties took the public into their confidence on the Medicare issue, not merely by pious platitudes but by stating exactly what they have in mind. My hon. leader has done that on behalf of the New Democratic Party earlier in this debate. Apparently his brilliant performance on that occasion has dumbfounded the other parties. At any rate, he has struck them dumb. Not one word of comment has been heard from either of them since he presented our detailed plan to this House. And neither party has had the courage to present a detailed plan of its own.

I can appreciate the difficulties under which the other two parties are labouring. Try as they might, they have not been able to find any flaws in the plan presented by the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, so they have tried to pretend that it is not here. But it is there, and the other parties cannot ignore it.

It is not good enough for the government to make a brief inadequate reference to Medicare in the Throne Speech and then run away from the issue. I was amazed that even the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), though as usual he made an interesting and informative speech in this debate, did not once mention the Medicare issue. Apparently the government is adopting the same policy of evasion on this vital issue as it adopts on almost every issue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: As you can see, Mr. Speaker, I get support from all sections of the House, from different sections at different times.

And for the Liberals, my hon. friends who have just applauded me, they continue to prate about this issue in the same vague generalities they have been using for the last 40 years. This is the same party that, prior to the federal election of 1945, introduced a bill in the federal House of Commons and brought it as far as second reading for the purpose of establishing medical or health insurance, as it was then called, in Canada. The Liberal government of the day then

dissolved Parliament and went to the country with the claim that they were ready to bring full health insurance to Canada. As proof of their insincerity they referred to the bill that had got as far as second reading and said in effect to the electorate, "Return us and you will get health insurance." As it happened, the people did return them, and that is the last we ever heard of that bill.

It is the same party that, as recently as last summer when the chips were down in the province of Saskatchewan, lined itself up solidly with all the forces of reaction including sinister racist and Birchite groups of the lunatic fringe in a desperate effort to destroy comprehensive Medicare in Canada before it ever became established. This is the party that would have us believe that they are ready to lead the fight for Medicare. All we get from them is talk and doubletalk ad nauseum.

This afternoon, the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson)—I am sorry; the hon. member for Dovercourt is a very fine fellow but it was not his fine speech I intended to refer to, it was the speech of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter). He went to great pains to prove that this country and province need full medical care insurance. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is no longer necessary to prove that elementary point. That has been proved and accepted long ago by almost everybody except the people on the Treasury benches. What we need, then, is not proof that a plan is needed, but a concrete plan. The leader of the New Democratic Party has provided this House and the people of Ontario with a concrete plan in full detail. If the hon. member for Parkdale believes what he said, when he said that Canada and Ontario need Medicare, then I suggest to him that he ought to get behind the plan presented by the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party and do what he can to bring it into effect in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some observation with regard to what I consider to be one of the most important issues in Ontario. It is an issue of long standing, about which, unfortunately, the government has done very little over the years. I am referring to the legislation relating to minimum wages and maximum hours of work, which is so antiquated as to be a laughing stock. Moreover it is so full of loopholes and so poorly enforced that even the totally inadequate standards it purports to establish often mean practically nothing.

I am afraid that we may have been lulled into complacency by the fact that reasonably

good wages are paid under union contracts in sections of the manufacturing, transportation, construction, mining and lumbering industries. Let us bear in mind, however, that union agreements apply only to a minority of the working force of this province. They represent the top of the iceberg. Beneath is a large dark area of naked exploitation and human misery.

In a few minutes I will give some concrete examples, out of hundreds that could be cited, of disgracefully low wages and long hours of work that are in effect in Metropolitan Toronto right now; but first I would like to discuss in more general terms the legislation that is now in effect.

Hours of work are regulated in the main under The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, a statute that has been on the books without any change in the basic standards it imposes since 1943 or 1944. I am not quite sure of the date, I think it is 1943. Ostensibly the Act limits working hours to eight per day and 48 per week, but an employer can, with little difficulty, get a permit from the industry and labour board authorizing him to exceed the 48-hour limit by 12 hours a week, making an actual work week of 60 hours, in the case of employees engaged in so-called non-productive work, and by 100 hours a year in the case of other employees.

Turning now to minimum wages, if we ignore The Industrial Standards Act which has been invoked only for a small number of employees in the clothing industry and in barbering and in some of the building trades in some centres, Ontario has the doubtful distinction of being one of the few provinces in Canada that has no minimum wage at all for men. For women the prescribed minimum is little more than a joke. In Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, Windsor, London, and environs, it is the munificent sum of \$30 a week for up to 48 hours of work—62.5 cents an hour. In other centres it is still less, tailing off to \$26 a week in municipalities with a population of less than 3,000.

As if these rates were not low enough it is possible for up to 20 per cent, and in some cases even more, of the work force in any establishment to be paid as much as \$4 a week less on the ground of being inexperienced. Heaven help us, Mr. Speaker, if a rate of \$26 or \$30 a week is seriously considered to be adequate pay for an experienced employee.

The standards are bad enough but the enforcement is even worse. As far as minimum wages are concerned, the department

has no regular inspection service of its own but relies on mail questionnaires and on inspectors of the Unemployment Insurance Commission to discover violations. And what happens if a violation is discovered? Nothing very much.

The offending employer is asked to pay what he should have paid in the first place. Rarely is any penalty imposed on even a persistent offender. For example, the 1959 annual report of The Department of Labour states, and I am quoting:

There was one charge laid in court for violations of The Minimum Wage Act during 1958-59. The charge was withdrawn after full settlement of arrears of wages owing had been made.

There is no reference to prosecutions in the 1960 annual report, the latest available.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if an employer is intent upon depriving his employees of the wages due them under the law—and there are always some who are—he really has nothing to lose. If he is caught he is merely required to pay what he should have been paying all along; if he is not caught he can save money at the expense of his employees.

As far as hours of work are concerned, there appears to be no regular inspection at all. Therefore, action to eliminate violations of the law is usually taken only when an employee complains.

But even where employees are fully conversant with their rights under the law, and many of them are not, they are notoriously reluctant to lodge complaints. Being by no means certain that they will remain anonymous, they are always fearful that the only effect of their complaint will be that they will exchange a poor job for no job at all.

As a result, there are employers in this city and province who are regularly driving trucks through the labour laws of this province. And even where the laws are being complied with, standards are disgracefully low in many places of employment.

A year ago last summer, the situation was brought forcibly to the attention of the government and the public by a widespread and sometimes violent strike of workers in the residential construction industry in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

This upheaval resulted in the appointment of the Goldenberg commission to inquire into labour-management relations in the construction industry. Goldenberg recommended, among other things, the creation of a construction industry wage board to establish

minimum wages and maximum hours of work in the industry.

As with most of the Goldenberg report, the government has moved at a snail's pace to implement this recommendation. Indeed, I am not sure that they plan to implement it at all. But if they do, they are certainly moving at a snail's pace.

In any case, the residential construction industry is by no means the only one where wages are unduly low and hours unduly long. In fact, its conditions, bad as they are, are probably not as bad as those in some other industries. It merely happens that workers in that industry have been somewhat more determined to secure justice for themselves.

Let us take a look at some other industries; for example, the wholesale fruit and vegetable industry centering in the Ontario food terminal in Etobicoke township. Here is a specific case. A man with a family to support, whose name and address I have on my file, regularly leaves home at 3 o'clock every morning, arriving at work at about 3.30 a.m. or slightly before. He is usually able to leave for home at about 3.00 p.m.—12 hours later—or slightly before. If he is lucky, he will get home at about 3.15.

Sometimes he has to make deliveries on the way home; there is no option about this, he has to make them; in which case, he may not get home until 4.00 p.m. or 5.00 p.m. having left home at 3 o'clock or earlier in the morning. This is his regular routine from Monday to Friday inclusive.

He usually gets Saturday off, but almost always he has to come in on Sunday; and he claims that he does not get more than four or five Sundays off in a year. He does not have to report as early on Sundays as on weekdays or stay as long, but his Sunday work usually amounts to at least four hours.

In addition, he is subject to call at all times and often is called in as late as 10.00 p.m. for a couple of hours of work. It is impossible to calculate his weekly hours accurately, because of the irregularity of his work. It would appear that he usually puts in at least 60 hours a week and often considerably more. He is paid on a weekly rather than an hourly basis, with his weekly pay being the same regardless of the number of hours he works. His pay appears to be enough for his family to live on, but in relation to the number of hours he works it only works out to be about \$1.10 or \$1.20 an hour.

Now I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this man's working conditions

are by no means the worst at the Ontario food terminal. In fact, there are many other employees who work just as long hours as he does for considerably lower wages, making as little as \$45 or \$50 a week for 60 hours of work or more.

Three or four of the firms at the terminal have union contracts and their rates of pay are somewhat better. They, however, are the exception rather than the rule.

It is also time that something was done about the hours of work of many stationary engineers in Toronto. The Toronto *Telegram* of December 7, 1962, carried an article by Frank Drea to which a brief reference was made this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for Dovercourt. Mr. Drea cited the case of a man—a stationary engineer—who regularly works 11 hours a day and 60 to 70 hours a week. He estimated that there are at least 200 other middle-aged stationary engineers working under similar conditions in the downtown area.

Mr. Drea raised the question in his article as to whether a permit, authorizing hours in excess of 48 hours a week, had been issued in respect of the man about whom his article was written. The information I have is that a permit was issued, shortly after Drea's article was published. Whether my information is correct is a question that only The Department of Labour can answer.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) is not here to listen to this.

Mr. Bryden: Some of the service industries are more urgently in need of attention than those I have just mentioned.

This is particularly true of the restaurant and catering industries. Waitresses in scores of restaurants in this city receive only 65 or 70 cents an hour for hard work that often involves split shifts, meaning that the whole day is really ruined, and the evening too, probably. They are often cheated out of holiday pay because they do not stay long enough in any one establishment to build up credits, and because in any case The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act is rarely enforced except on complaint.

A few years ago the minimum wage was raised to \$30 a week for female employees. As it turned out, this was of little benefit to most waitresses. Employers who previously had not been charging them for their meals, now began to take advantage of section 2 of the minimum wage order under

which they may charge up to \$8 in a week. As a result, the money wage turned out to be only \$22 a week. The employee, however, has to pay income tax on a wage of \$30 a week, with the result that her take-home pay increased little if any.

It is sometimes alleged that waitresses can supplement their meagre wages with tips. Personally, I am strongly opposed to the proposition that anyone should have to rely on tips to eke out an existence. But in any case according to my information, the pickings from tips are very slim indeed except in the relatively small number of more or less swank restaurants. Moreover, the male employees who work in the kitchens do not receive any tips at all and their wages are hardly any better than those of the waitresses.

For example, the commonest wage for pot washers is about \$35 or \$40 a week for a 48-hour week. For second cooks, it is about \$50 or \$60 a week. These low rates are by no means confined to what is sometimes described as the greasy spoon type of restaurant. In fact the greasy spoons often do not hire anybody, the proprietor himself often does the work. Some very well-known restaurants in this city pay wages of the type that I have just described.

It is doubtful if the average take-home pay of employees in the restaurant industry in Toronto has increased by more than \$3 or \$4 a week since the end of World War II, even though we know that the cost of living and general wage levels have increased greatly since then.

In the catering end of the industry, hourly rates tend to be somewhat higher. However, hours are considerably less, so that the employees are probably not even as well off in terms of total income as those in restaurants. I am now referring specifically to the section of the industry that provides cafeterias in office buildings, industrial plants and various institutions.

This industry is now pretty well under the control of three or four quite large firms that ought to be paying good wages. In actual fact, wages of 70, 75 and 80 cents an hour for waitresses are commonplace, and rates of \$1.00 an hour are rare. When one considers that these waitresses are able to get only four or five hours of work a day, it can be seen that their incomes are distressingly low.

No doubt it will be claimed that these women are only working for pin-money and that therefore their low incomes are no cause for concern. Even in the few cases where this may be true, I cannot see why the em-

ployee's reason for working should have anything to do with the wages she receives. Everyone who contributes service should receive adequate compensation. In any case, the term "pin-money" is very misleading. Admittedly most of the women in this industry are married and their earnings do not constitute the main income of a family. Even so, they constitute an essential part of that industry.

Usually these women go out to work because the earnings of the main breadwinner in the family are not sufficient to pay the mortgage or otherwise provide a basic standard of living for the family. Moreover, many of the women in the industry are widows and others are solely dependent on their wages for sustenance. Many of them are older women whose alternative employment opportunities are severely limited by the insensate prejudice that now exists against older workers.

The cafeterias to which I am referring are employee cafeterias which are located on the premises, and for the benefit of many well-known and well-respected firms that ought to be ashamed of themselves for permitting such low wages to be paid under contracts that they have entered into with other firms.

For example, I could cite the case of a man, working in the kitchen of the cafeteria of a large firm with its head office in downtown Toronto, who gets 95 cents an hour. In view of the short work week involved, this brings him in less than \$30 a week, with which he is supposed to support a family of four. It happens that he is a fairly recent arrival in this country. His lack of familiarity with our language and ways, and his dire need to find any sort of employment for survival, is mercilessly exploited for the profit of others.

A small number of these employee cafeterias operate under union contracts. In these cases wages are somewhat higher than in the overwhelming majority of cases. Even so, a union operating in an industry that is mainly unorganized is severely limited in its capacity to raise standards, and even in the unionized cafeterias wages are only about \$1.05 to \$1.15 an hour.

It is now becoming more and more common for industrial and commercial firms as well as public institutions to contract out their cafeteria service. The result is that the cafeteria employees are often paid at a much lower rate than other employees in the same plant or office building.

For example, de Havilland Aircraft now contracts out its cafeteria service while Lever

Brothers continues to operate its own cafeteria. In de Havilland the cafeteria employees, even under a union contract, receive 60 or 70 cents an hour, less than even unskilled labour in the plant. In Lever Brothers I understand they are paid according to the same scale as the plant employees.

More and more employers are finding they can provide cafeteria service more cheaply by contracting it out. This, they persuade themselves, is more efficient. No doubt efficiencies can often be achieved by having a service provided by a firm specializing in it. In the present situation, however, a large part of the saving is achieved through substandard wages which the main firm itself could not ever get away with.

The question may be asked as to why the employees in the restaurant and catering industry do not organize and thus obtain the benefits of union protection enjoyed by workers in many other industries. Part of the answer is that employees in this industry are notoriously difficult to organize because of the large number of relatively small units and the rapid turnover of employees. In these circumstances, which are difficult to begin with, The Labour Relations Act of Ontario makes organization in the restaurant and catering industry almost impossible.

On more than one occasion in past years the hotel and restaurant union has signed up the eight or ten employees in a specific restaurant only to find that by the time the labour relations board got round to dealing with its application, all the employees concerned had been fired or had otherwise departed.

Discrimination and intimidation is often the order of the day as soon as the employer gets wind of the fact that his employees are contemplating union organization and The Labour Relations Act, I regret to say, provides no real protection at all.

The representative of the restaurant local of the hotel and restaurant union in this area told me that employees in specific restaurants have frequently come to him pleading for organization. Sooner or later, however, the inevitable question comes up: can he guarantee that they will not lose their jobs if they join the union? In all fairness, he has to tell them that he cannot; indeed, the probability is that they will be fired.

In the catering industry, employers operate on a much larger scale, but the problem is almost as difficult because of the labour relations board's insistence that the union must make out an application for certification for each individual location, and each firm

will have scores of them, rather than for the employers' operations as a whole.

The standard contract between a catering firm and the firm contracting for its services contains a provision whereby either party can terminate the arrangement on 30 days notice. Therefore even when the union has gone through all the red tape and delays of labour relations board procedure and has secured certification for a group of employees in a specific location, the catering firm can get out from under the whole thing simply by giving 30 days notice and closing up its operation at that location.

The situation is not helped by the fact that many public authorities are quite ready to enter into contracts with these firms regardless of the conditions under which the employees are required to work. The ultimate in hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, has been reached at the Canadian National Exhibition in Toronto. The CNE has a contract with a non-union firm for catering at the Queen Elizabeth Building, including the directors' dining room. On Labour Day, however, it has a different policy. On that one day of the year, in deference no doubt to the great tradition of fairness to working people that Labour Day represents, the directors bring in union employees to serve the Labour Day luncheon. Then, on the next day, they go back to the non-union firm.

Certification procedures in The Labour Relations Act are designed mainly for industrial plants and other operations with relatively stable work forces. Even in those cases the procedures leave much to be desired, but in other situations they are impossible.

The strike of residential construction workers and the Goldenberg report forced recognition of that fact in the construction industry and at the last session we amended The Labour Relations Act to make special provision for the construction industry. I would suggest to the government, Mr. Speaker, that special provision should also be made for the restaurant and catering industry. Otherwise employees in those industries will never be able to claim the benefits of union organization.

Substandard wages unfortunately are by no means confined to the service industry. They are also prevalent in manufacturing, in unorganized plants. For example, a large toy manufacturer in this city has been paying women workers 65 cents an hour for the day shift and 75 cents an hour for the night shift.

But I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any further examples are necessary. Surely my

point is now well established and surely the department knows it in any case, that disgracefully low wages are being paid in large segments of the employment market, not only in remote areas of the province but right here in Metropolitan Toronto.

And what does the government plan to do about it? The Speech from the Throne gives its melancholy answer:

The Department of Labour is assessing the need, with a view to bringing into effect, where necessary, minimum wages for the protection of the workers of the province.

How many times does this government have to assess well established facts? Does it take a blow-up like the residential construction strike to induce it to take its head out of the sand?

Legislative action is clearly required right now. I do not particularly blame most of the restaurant operators for the wages they are now paying. Many of them undoubtedly want to pay the best wages they can. In fact I am sure of this, I know many of them and they want to do the best they can, by their employees—but they are in a tough competitive situation. If they get too far out of line in wages, they will be out of business, because there will always be some other fellow on the next corner who will undercut them on wages.

The answer to this, surely, Mr. Speaker, is a law requiring all of them to pay reasonable wages. That will prevent competition from taking the highly undesirable form of competition at the expense of employees.

The proposal of the New Democratic Party is that a basic minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour and a maximum work week of 40 hours should be established by law. We had begun to hope that we had converted even the Liberal party to this constructive and humane programme, at least as far as the minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour is concerned. Unfortunately, it has now become clear that the old process of weaselling, so dear to the hearts of Liberals, has once again set in. In his contribution to this debate the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) had this to say at page 61 of *Hansard* of this year, and I am quoting: "I am again introducing a private bill," and I presume he meant a private member's bill, "to establish a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour for men in the metropolitan areas of Ontario."

He did not define what he meant by the metropolitan areas of Ontario, but presumably he was referring to something like that

which is described as zone 1 in the present minimum wage order, namely, Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, Ottawa, London and their immediate environs.

Why, Mr. Speaker, should the \$1.25 an hour minimum apply only in this area? Why should it not also apply in Kitchener, at the Lakehead, in Sudbury, North Bay, Niagara Falls, or numerous other centres I could name?

Above all, why should it apply only to men?

The hon. member for York Centre says I am knocking down a straw man. I am quoting his hon. leader's very words: "\$1.25 per hour for men in the metropolitan areas of Ontario."

Mr. Singer: The hon. member should make his own definition of "metropolitan areas" and build his attack on that.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I think that the hon. member for York Centre and I will agree on the interpretation of "men". We know the difference between men and women. I think even the hon. leader of the Opposition knows that.

I am asking, Mr. Speaker, why this minimum wage rate of \$1.25 an hour should apply only to men. I have already indicated that some of the worst exploited employees in the province are women. Are they to continue to suffer under the present so-called minimum wage of \$26 to \$30 a week; and even less for inexperienced employees?

Section 5 of the Ontario Human Rights Code makes it an offence for a private employer to discriminate between his male and female employees in the matter of rates of pay.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): They do not know that.

Mr. Bryden: Admittedly there is a joker in this section that makes it unenforceable. Even so it stands at least as a declaration of public policy. Apparently the Liberals would fly in the face of the declaration by having us discriminate against women in our own legislation.

We of the New Democratic Party do not propose that our proposals for \$1.25 an hour and a 40-hour work week should be made effective immediately. Obviously employers who are now paying 65 or 70 cents an hour, or are working their employees 60 or 70 hours a week, or both, need an adjustment period. We insist, however, that the necessary legislation ought to be passed now

giving notice to all concerned that these minimum standards will become effective by a specified time, say three years from now.

The law should also set forth intermediate standards that must be reached progressively during the three-year period.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Could I ask the hon. member a question? Is it right to assume then that they do not believe in this legislation now? They do not believe in the minimum wage—

Mr. MacDonald: He said it should be passed now.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I do not think the hon. member will answer the question by—

Mr. Bryden: Neither will the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I am asking the hon. member, he is saying he believes in a minimum wage, and now he is saying he does not believe in it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the same as the meat inspection.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, as usual the hon. Minister is so preoccupied with reading his own speeches he does not really listen to what is going on here.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I was reading one of the hon. member's, trying to correct the syntax.

Mr. Bryden: Is that right! Well, I do not pretend to be any expert on syntax, but I would shudder to think what might happen to my imperfect syntax if the pedantic hon. Minister of Economics and Development ever got hold of it.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Would the hon. member answer my question?

Mr. Bryden: I would be happy to answer the hon. Minister's question. It has already been answered, but I will answer it again for his benefit.

I have suggested that we ought to have a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour and a maximum work week of 40 hours.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: But not now.

Mr. Bryden: I believe it would be desirable to have it now, but in view of the fact that there are innumerable establish-

ments in Toronto with wages as low as 65 or 70 cents an hour and hours ranging up to 60 and 70 hours a week due to the persistent neglect of this government, it is obviously impractical to put the standards I propose into effect suddenly. I suggest we pass a statute now, which would warn those employers they will have to meet these standards within a specified period. I have suggested three years, and that there should be stages set forth in the law which they will have to reach during the three-year period.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. member does not believe in it, that is all that matters.

Mr. Bryden: Obviously the guilty conscience of the hon. Minister is troubling him. I may say the procedure I am suggesting is not of my invention. It has been used very effectively by the federal government in the US on numerous occasions and it is obviously a very sensible procedure. It gives employers an opportunity to adjust their situation to the new situation that is going to arise and it gives them full notice that that situation will arise. This is our proposal. If the hon. Minister of Economics and Development would prefer to put a minimum of \$1.25 into effect immediately, I would support him, although I think it might be a rather drastic step.

I am afraid, however, that what he has in mind is to continue the present situation where the minimum wage for women is 62.5 cents an hour, and the minimum wage for men is zero. I think that is what he is trying to argue about, Mr. Speaker.

Our proposed minimum of \$1.25 will of course be a basic minimum applicable to all employees, male and female for whom better standards are not prescribed. I believe, however, that special orders should be passed to deal with special situations. For example it would in my opinion be reasonable to set a minimum wage of \$1.75 an hour in the construction industry, in view of the onerous nature of the work involved in that industry.

In addition The Labour Relations Act should be overhauled to facilitate union organizations in industries where it is now impossible. Working from the floor established by law, unions of employees in these industries could steadily improve working conditions. Finally, The Industrial Standards Act should be broadened so that wages and other working conditions that become established by union agreement in a preponderant

part of an industry like the restaurant industry in an area like Metropolitan Toronto, could be extended to cover the entire industry in that area.

Through a process of this kind, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, only through such a process, can gross exploitation of working people be eliminated.

In this Christmas season, when all men seek peace and goodwill, perhaps even the hard-boiled Tory administration can be induced to think for a moment of the other fellow. If it does, it will take steps to bring to an end its interminable process of assessing the situation and move to action that is long overdue. With that note, Mr. Speaker, and with that appeal to the government, I will conclude my remarks and express to you once again my appreciation of the many courtesies you have extended to me.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, in common with the other hon. members who have spoken in this debate, let me pay my tribute to you for the fair and equitable manner in which you have conducted the proceedings of this House. It seemed a little peculiar to me, as I listened to the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) first paying you the elaborate compliment that he did, then breaking into the rather unwarranted and uncalled for ridiculous attack that he did, directed particularly to us members of the Opposition. Apparently he rather likes the hon. members of the government and I suppose that his mock concern—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I listened to his speech; I have listened to his speeches until I really get a little bored with them. We have little chance to listen to many other speeches.

Well, the mumbling, grumbling five are on their way again. Now if you want to stop mumbling and grumbling we will talk for a bit. If you want to get up and speak, we will sit down and let you speak.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: I am being as fair as I can. It is very difficult.

An hon. member: Where is that order you were complaining about?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the mock concern the hon. member for Woodbine expresses so frequently in this House is

a sign of nothing else but the tightness of his halo which really bothers him very much.

An hon. member: The captain of the ship.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on Friday last when the debates were continuing in the House, I recall the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) leaning over and, in a rather loud whisper—it was not loud enough to get into *Hansard* saying: "Just wait until the results from Manitoba come in."

An hon. member: They are in, I think; are they not?

Mr. Singer: I think, Mr. Speaker, that those results are in and I thought it might be of some interest to the hon. members to just see what those results had to say. It seems to me that while the Conservatives won not only with a substantially reduced majority in its seats, in a more substantially reduced majority in the percentage of the vote, our brave friends from the NDP fell flat on their faces in that election again.

An hon. member: Did you say on their faces?

Mr. Singer: I do not too often resort to quoting editorials, Mr. Speaker, but there was one in the *Toronto Telegram* of December 15 that I thought expressed the message that came from those results rather well. It said this:

The voters of Manitoba in re-electing Premier Roblin's government to a third term sent three messages of significance to the nation's political parties. To the successful Conservatives that Roblin has a political star, the quality that may be useful eventually in the federal field. To the Liberals, they are considered the alternative to the government where local situations or personalities have turned the voters against the Conservatives. To the New Democratic Party, it is a dead duck.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: And that was Ontario's favourite paper said that.

Mr. Singer: Not only a duck but a dead duck. One other paragraph, Mr. Speaker, in that editorial might be of some interest to my friends, the intrepid five:

Twenty-two of the 38 NDP candidates lost their deposits yesterday—

An hon. member: Where did they get the money?

Mr. Singer:

—and where they did win their margins of victory were very slim.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it amazes me that all that sound and fury can come from a party that signifies so little.

There was another by-election in the far western province, in the province of British Columbia.

An hon. member: What happened there?

Mr. Singer: Well, in the riding of Point Grey some four candidates ran and a gentleman by the name of Patrick McGeer, the Liberal candidate, won that riding—with a total vote just about as large as the combined votes of the Conservatives, the Social Credit and the NDP.

An hon. member: See where you are going?

Mr. Singer: There is a gentleman by the name of Edwin Bollwell, who writes in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, and in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, Mr. Speaker, of December 19, Mr. Bollwell had this to say—he writes from Vancouver and it is obvious from reading his column Mr. Bollwell is a very well informed man on the political affairs of British Columbia. This is what he said:

Another surprise of the by-election was the poor vote polled by New Democratic candidate Antony Holland. The NDP brass never expected him to win simply because Point Grey has always been a stronghold of free enterprise but neither did they expect him to run such a bad last—

An hon. member: They always run last.

An hon. member: Be quiet, you don't run at all.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bollwell continues and says this:

A poll-by-poll examination of the votes indicates that Mr. Holland lost many supporters of the old CCF, especially in the riding's lower middle class east end, to the Liberals.

An hon. member: Just like Hazen Argue.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. The mumbling, the grumbling, the nonsense that comes from the intrepid five does not change the situation, does not vary one whit from the fact that they were unable to produce a candidate in the riding of Huron-Bruce—

An hon. member: They did not even try to get one.

Mr. Singer: —they were—and that there is really no point, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit a question?

Mr. Singer: No, I will not permit a question.

An hon. member: No, you fellows never do.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I would point out to the members that we do allow a great deal of laxity, and we do go far afield in the Throne Speech, but I think we should try to confine our remarks, if we can, to the province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in coming to my aid. I would have thought, though, listening to the introductory remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine and the stern lecture that he read us, particularly we this bad group in the Liberal Party, that the intrepid five would have deigned to keep quiet when someone else was speaking. However, it is obvious that the hon. member for Woodbine was expressing tonight as he always does in this House mock concern. He really does not mean what he says in his remarks tonight or at any other time.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of privilege, surely that type of comment is completely uncalled for.

An hon. member: You are talking more here than you did in Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Bryden: The suggestion that I do not mean what I say is quite unworthy of the hon. member and if he were a gentleman he would withdraw it.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Another hon. member: If you were a gentleman you would sit down.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if I imputed any motives to the hon. member certainly I withdraw those remarks. Let me phrase it this way. It is very difficult to get any constructive train of thought from what the hon. member puts on the record of this House.

An hon. member: Why do you not go back to Hamilton?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to listen to the hon. leader of

the group of which the hon. member for Woodbine—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I am very happy that the hon. member for York South mentioned you know where the enemy is—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Yes, we do.

Mr. Singer: I am going to deal with that before too long but I thought, having listened to the remarks of the hon. member for York South in the Throne debate, having read them, that he certainly knew where the enemy was.

Mr. Speaker, on December 5, the hon. member for York South spoke in this debate. I would guess that more than 50 per cent of his speaking time was devoted not to the government; but after all these gentlemen were elected, these honourable gentlemen were elected to oppose the government—

An hon. member: The hon. member is wrong. Remember that order that your member talked about. Donald Duck—

Mr. Singer: And then, Mr. Speaker, when he finished this noteworthy speech, noteworthy because he spent such a substantial portion of his time attacking not the government but the Liberal Party, he moved a most unique amendment to the motion.

An hon. member: Quack, quack.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, here is an amendment to the amendment to the main motion. It contains some five clauses—two of these clauses were attacks on the Liberal Party. The other three were attacks on the government. Mr. Speaker, it is rather fascinating to note—and I have done some substantial research on this—that this was the first time in the history of this House that any group in Opposition has taken the trouble or the concern to move, as part of an amendment to the amendment in the Speech from the Throne, a vote of lack of confidence in the official Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I have done some research in the annals, in the history of the British Parliament, and again that precedent has never been established there. There is no point really in quibbling about whether or not this manoeuvre was in order—the record speaks for itself. Our good friends to the left are concerned not about the government; they are in league with the govern-

ment, and part of a conspiracy to defeat the Liberal Party.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Strange bedfellows!

Mr. Singer: While I thought the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) would enjoy that—that was partly for his benefit—there is more to come. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the various speeches in this debate I was particularly attentive to the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) among others, and the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root).

Now, both of these hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, spent a great deal of their time, almost all of their time, in the one case giving a history of past elections won, and in the other case, after an exhaustive study of financial statistics ranging back over a period of 30 years, a comparison of how much money was spent in the years before 1943 as compared with those sums of dollars spent after the year 1943.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have noted with me that as people grow older, they tend to dwell in the past. As they begin to lose their grip on current affairs, they refer to what they think were past glories and past tribulations. They tend to collate these past histories to their own benefit because they look better in their own eyes, and they tend to speak more and more about the distant past. So, it is not unusual, Mr. Speaker, that in listening to the remarks of such people as the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin, that we were treated to a history of events that happened some 25 years ago. This was a generation ago, Mr. Speaker, when most of the hon. members on this side of the House were not even of voting age.

I feel certain that the people of Ontario are not interested in what happened in this Legislature 25 years ago; they are not interested in what happened in this Legislature ten years ago; what they are interested in, Mr. Speaker, is what is happening in this Legislature today and what the plans are for the future.

It is a sign of a government that is old and tired in office. It has grown old and tired, as people have grown old and tired. To refer to events of a generation ago—these speeches are making a mark on the people of Ontario, and these speeches will be reflected in the future votes that are held in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather fascinating to

note very carefully that we have three vacant seats in this House. The seats for Halton, Hamilton Centre, and for Sault Ste. Marie are all vacant and have been so for some considerable period of time. Mr. Speaker, the party on your right makes great speeches on how it believes in the democratic process, and how it believes that the people of Ontario should be represented and have a right to have their opinions expressed on the floor of this Legislature. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government is afraid to call a by-election in the ridings of Halton, Hamilton Centre and Sault Ste. Marie.

They know full well what happened in Huron-Bruce. They know full well that what happened in Huron-Bruce will be repeated in the ridings of Halton, Hamilton Centre and Sault Ste. Marie, and are afraid to call those by-elections.

I thought that perhaps a few words might be said about the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. It has been rather interesting to observe the efforts that have been taking place—I do not know that they were government-inspired efforts—to convince the people of Ontario that either something is going to be done about Metropolitan Toronto or something is not going to be done about Metropolitan Toronto. Whatever it is, this government has no responsibility for it.

We had a fascinating news story reported in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* on September 27, 1962, which said: "Robarts won't order an amalgamation vote, but he promises a tax study." I do not know what that means, Mr. Speaker—what the tax study is. We have not heard about it in this House, and we have not had anything more from the hon. Prime Minister on what is going to happen in Metropolitan Toronto.

One of the most charming little essays in setting up straw men and knocking them down, is being conducted between one of our afternoon papers and the government. And in the *Toronto Telegram* of December 7, 1962, in a front page story, this appeared:

BRAINTRUST IS STUDYING ONE BIG CITY

A super-commission to make a lengthy study on amalgamation for the city and the 12 suburbs will be appointed soon by the Ontario government. Members of the commission will make a one- or two-year study of the future of Metro and will be the "very best municipal experts that can be found".

Those words, "very best municipal experts that can be found", are in quotation marks.

This sounds like a very authentic story, Mr. Speaker.

Members have not yet been selected [and again in quotation marks] "but we will search all over North America for the best people to serve" [end of quotation marks, and guess who said it?—a government source said today.

Well, this goes on and we hear about this government source who was going to set up this braintrust.

Then we move from the Friday—I think that December 7 was a Friday—to the Saturday. On the editorial page of that same newspaper, there is an editorial headed: "Reform For Metro—Renovation Of The Threadbare Fabric Of The Government Is In Sight"—with the report that the Ontario government will soon appoint an expert commission to inquire into the administration of this area. The editorial goes on at that rate, in that manner, for some length. But the man who wrote that editorial and depended on the front page story quoting this high government source, had neglected to read what was appearing on the news pages at the same time. The news pages said this:

ROBARTS DENIES BODY SET UP ON MERGER

Premier Robarts yesterday denied a report that the government has decided to appoint an independent commission to study the amalgamation of Metro's 13 municipalities.

There is another story dealing with the same subject:

METRO SNUBS SUPER-COMMISSION

Several Metro officials last night gave a cold shoulder to the provincial government's proposal to establish a super-commission. However, Premier Robarts denied that his government will set up a commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we play this little game of quoting high government authorities who are going to reform or not reform Metro, we must bring in context various other stories we have heard about what is going to happen in Metro. At one stage it was reported that a committee of Cabinet Ministers was going to sit and determine what was going to happen to Metro. Each one of the Toronto daily newspapers has had definite opinions and has voiced them forcefully. Some hon. members, even on the government side, have had some opinions and have expressed them in this House. But, Mr. Speaker, the source from which we expect to hear an answer has been silent. All we have is this mysterious and unnamed high government authority who

is going to do something about Metro, then subsequently a denial comes forward from the hon. Prime Minister.

To add to the interesting confusion of this whole situation, there was a story that appeared in the *Toronto Daily Star* on December 10, and it reads this way:

MPPs To Study Metro

Metro's amalgamation will probably be studied by the Legislature select municipal committee. Chairman Hollis Beckett has discovered that the Act which set up Metro comes within his committee's terms of reference and so does the question of amalgamating the area's 13 municipalities into one super-city.

It concludes with these remarks:

"Undoubtedly our terms of reference include The Metro Act", Mr. Beckett said, "but I never realized it until last night."

I thought that this was an amazing revelation. I am sorry that the hon. member for York East (Mr. Beckett) is not in his seat, Mr. Speaker; I know that his wife has taken seriously ill and that you and all of us will join in the hope that she will make a speedy recovery. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member for York East is not here to give an explanation to this rather unique quotation that is attributed to him because, Mr. Speaker, as a member of that committee I know, as I am sure the chairman knew just as well, that we received several briefs from Metropolitan elected persons dealing with suggested reforms for Metro. We received them, we discussed them and we promised the person who submitted them that their case would be carefully considered. But it took the hon. chairman of this select committee until December 10 to suddenly say that last night he discovered that the select committee had the power to look into Metro.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there has ever been a more complete exercise in frustration than this select committee on municipal affairs. We have sat long hours, we have gathered together I would imagine as great a quantity of material as any select committee has ever gathered together. We have not as yet arrived at any conclusion. In my opinion it is unreasonable and unlikely to expect that, other than minor changes in certain of the Acts affecting the municipal statutes of this province, we are likely to arrive at any major conclusion.

What is needed, Mr. Speaker, in this regard, and this should be known to the government—but I recognize it is very diffi-

cult to get these facts across to the government, particularly in this important department—it is difficult to get it across to the government because in the last 12 months we have had three Ministers of Municipal Affairs. No sooner has one gone than a new one has come in and as soon as the new one has begun to reasonably get his feet under the desk and find out his way around the department and his way around the municipalities than he is off to another department and we have a new Minister to come in.

Mr. Speaker, the job of directing municipal reform lies within the government's control. It will not be done efficiently or capably by any select committee. The same problem exists with Metro. They are not going to solve the problems of Metro by issuing, or by pretending that a committee, a select committee of the House, a committee of Cabinet Ministers or a super commission is going to solve it. What I had hoped to hear in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, what I had hoped to hear in the remarks from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), were some positive suggestions as to how he and his department were going to cope with these problems. But we heard none of this.

We had introduced into the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, or the announcement was made, concerning the setting up of a commission to discuss the transportation problems in the general Metropolitan Toronto region. The general Metropolitan Toronto region is roughly defined as the area Oshawa on the east, Barrie on the north, Hamilton on the western end.

I am quoting from the press release: "Because the initial study will be directed towards investigating transportation problems of Metro the committee includes Metro representatives." The release goes on to tell who the representatives are. Heading the committee is the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton). I suppose, Mr. Speaker, there is some reason to put an hon. member who represents the rural riding of Huron at the head of such a committee. The committee consists as well of the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Auld). I think, Mr. Speaker, there must be some reasonable thought for putting the hon. Minister of Transport on this committee. After all, he comes from the town of Brockville and that is reasonably close to Metropolitan Toronto. He should have some good ideas about transportation in the Metropolitan area.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. The hon.

Minister of Municipal Affairs is a very fine gentleman. He conducted us on a very fine tour of northern Ontario and did a very good job and I compliment him for it. But I would suggest that even the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs would agree with me in the remark that he is not as conversant with the affairs of Metropolitan Toronto as perhaps some of the other hon. members of this House might be.

I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it is the same intelligence that would take a Bay Street lawyer and make him the Minister of Lands and Forests that would lead to the setting up of this sort of a committee to investigate the problems of Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of Metropolitan Toronto are indeed serious. This government has seen them talked about, has nibbled at them, but has been afraid to say what, if anything, they are going to do.

I think it is high time that the government took some stand on the policies of Metropolitan Toronto and the future of Metropolitan Toronto. They created Metropolitan Toronto and at the time it was created it served a very excellent purpose. There has been strong criticism of its present set-up. If the government is satisfied with its present set-up, let it say so. If it is not satisfied, let it so indicate and suggest what it is going to do about it. This is long overdue and this government must say something about it.

One more point about The Department of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker. We did hear under the aegis of the previous Minister, I think it was the previous one, the second one in the last 12 months, that a departmental reform was taking place. I would have hoped that someone would have been able to stand up in this House and tell us what the reform was going to be, why it was needed and how it was going to take place. But it is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, indeed, to follow all these machinations and all these procedures because we have not had a Minister stay with the department long enough that there can be any one consistent policy.

Mr. Speaker, there was a very excellent report delivered to us by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, called "A Better Place to Live." This is the final report of the group set up by the department under the second previous hon. Minister (Mr. Cass) when he was Minister. It is a very good report, very well conceived. The persons who made it up spent a lot of time in study and they introduced in this excellent

report, draft statute reforms and draft municipal bylaws that will take care of the very serious problem of preserving homes in the province of Ontario.

Other than the delivery of this report to us, Mr. Speaker, it seems somewhat strange that we have not heard a single indication from the government benches as to whether they like this, whether they do not like it, whether they are going to act on it, whether they are not going to act on it and, if they are not going to act on it, what is the alternative?

Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a department in government that cries for reform and not a succession of Ministers it is The Department of Municipal Affairs, and we get nothing from the government.

Mr. Speaker, when I mentioned our trip into northeastern Ontario and complimented the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs I perhaps should have said a word or two about the unique northern type of municipal organization, the unorganized municipalities.

It is very difficult to affix a term to this type of organization because it is not an organization that has been created; it does exist. But because a group of people have gathered together—other people call these areas unorganized municipalities—well, they call them unorganized villages or unorganized townships.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Unorganized territories.

Mr. Singer: Oh, unorganized territories. Thank you.

In any event, outside of Kapuskasing, Mr. Speaker, there are two unorganized territories; I think that was the word. These unorganized territories cannot be defined in the statute because they do not exist; they are unorganized and they are not defined. One named Brunetville and the other named ValAlbert. Am I wrong? Well, would the hon. Minister correct me?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Brunetville is unorganized territory but ValAlbert is organized as an improvement district. Let us get it straight.

Mr. Singer: All right. Mr. Speaker, now that I am straightened away, let me just confine my remarks to the unorganized territory of Brunetville.

Mr. MacDonald: Why does the hon. member not get the facts?

Mr. Singer: No, this is very confusing. If the hon. member for York South will pay attention I think even he will be concerned about this sort of thing. In the unorganized territory of Brunetville there are, what, 500 people? A couple of thousand people?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was deliberately keeping my figures low so I would not overstate the case, but there are a lot of people living in the unorganized territory of Brunetville. The unorganized territory of Brunetville apparently, because it is unorganized, does not pay any municipal taxes to anyone. This is a very happy state of affairs, one would think. And I suppose that is because it is unorganized.

As the hon. Minister of Economics and Development says, there is no one to pay them to. Since there is no one to pay them to, what do we have in the unorganized territory of Brunetville? We have open ditches which carry raw sewage. We have no fire protection, we have no police protection, we have no water supply, we have no municipal organization of any kind.

There are more than 500 people living there, perhaps a couple of thousand people living there. This government knows the situation exists; this is in the back door of the territory of the new hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and this situation is allowed to continue. There are hundreds of youngsters, Mr. Speaker, in this province of Ontario wallowing in the open ditches running with raw sewage and the government thinks this is amusing. The government has no concern, Mr. Speaker, with the health and the welfare of these good citizens of Ontario. They treat this matter of unorganized territories as a great joke. Well, I do not think the people of Ontario are going to treat this as a joke much longer.

An hon. member: Not up there anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in listening to the other speeches in this debate, I paid some particular attention to the remarks of the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Lewis) and the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly). Both of these hon. members were billed or are billed in the newspapers as rebels. They threw challenges at the government to do something about this margarine problem.

The hon. member for Eglinton suggested in his remarks last evening, Mr. Speaker, that he was prepared to introduce a bill to allow the colouring of margarine at its source of manufacture. Mr. Speaker, I think that this problem is a problem that has been ducked, collectively, by all of the members of the Legislature.

I do not think any of us have any reason to say that we do not know why it has been ducked. Opinions split through all three parties; there are different opinions here amongst my hon. colleagues, Mr. Speaker, there are different opinions on the government benches and there are different opinions in the intrepid group of five, as to the solution to this problem.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I personally agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Eglinton in this regard and I would hope that he would do as he said and introduce this bill. I would urge, I would challenge—no, I would urge, urge is the better word—upon the hon. Prime Minister that when this bill is introduced that he call the bill, that he allow a vote to take place, that he allow an open vote to take place, a free vote of all the members of this House.

And I would say this, Mr. Speaker, to indicate my seriousness in this regard, I am prepared if necessary to second the bill to bring this matter before the House. The hon. members who spoke in regard to this matter have very fixed opinions. The fact is that we, the 95 of us here in this House, represent all the people of Ontario and they are entitled to have a verdict of their representatives on this very serious matter. The only way that it is going to be solved is if this matter of coloured margarine is dealt with in a bill and is dealt with by a free vote.

And in order to avoid any embarrassment, perhaps as a method of procedure when the vote is called, it could be recorded starting at seat No. 1 and running through all 98. In this way, Mr. Speaker, we would get a verdict of all the members of the House and by this verdict, all of us, no matter what our opinions are, would be quite prepared, I am sure, to abide by it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to refer just very briefly before bringing my remarks to a close, to the amendments put forward by my hon. leader in connection with the main motion in this debate. And he said this:

I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be

amended by adding thereto the following words:

But this House:

1. Regrets that the government has failed to enunciate a positive programme of tax adjustments and incentives for industry that will enable industry to meet the challenge that is being imposed by the common market and The United States Trade Expansion Act.

Mr. Speaker, that first clause of the amendment speaks for itself and is a most cogent reason why this government should not be supported in any vote of confidence.

2. Regrets that the government has failed to strengthen job security for Ontario's working people by: (a) establishing a minimum wage for men of \$1.25 per hour.

And in repeating this I bear in mind the pious remarks—and I think this is the only description that can be attached to them—the pious remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine.

(b) promoting the collective bargaining process, and (c) protecting, in legislation, the vested interests in their jobs of workers engaged in a legal strike.

This is the second most cogent reason this government should not be supported.

3. Regrets that the government has neglected to strengthen the competitive position of Ontario industry by failing to encourage management-labour co-operation through management-labour councils.

For this third most valid reason, Mr. Speaker, this government should not be supported.

4. Regrets the chaos inflicted on Ontario farmers in the marketing of their products as a consequence of the government's lack of clear-cut, long-range farm policies, and the failure of the government to check vertical integration and the threat it poses to the continued existence of the family farm.

For this most important fifth reason, Mr. Speaker, this government should not be supported.

5. Regrets the failure of the government to introduce a comprehensive prepaid service plan of medical care insurance without a means test for all of the people of Ontario.

And again, Mr. Speaker, this government should not be supported because of its shameful neglect of this important problem. And finally, Mr. Speaker,

6. Regrets the failure of the government to make available, through fair and equit-

able financing, equality of educational opportunity for all pupils in Ontario's tax-supported schools.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons we in the official Opposition—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Well, I can. The hour is late and I am sure all the hon. members—

An hon. member: What are you fellows going to do when you have to go back to work?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for High Park knows I am a most co-operative person, and if he wants I will go on for another half-hour. I think the story has been told, the facts tell it. This government has lost the confidence of the people of Ontario. This government is afraid to call a by-election before a general election. This government will not be supported if it goes to the polls, and it should not be supported in this House.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, it is for me, as it has been now for a number of years, a privilege to stand up in this House and to say a few words.

I, too, join in the tribute that has been paid to you through these past weeks. It was one of my extreme good fortunes to have sat next to you for a number of years, and I count those years, Mr. Speaker, well spent. The reason you keep order in this House to such a fine degree and dispense equality so well is not just because you know the rules but you know human beings and how to deal with them. I congratulate you on having done a splendid job sometimes under most arduous conditions.

I will pay one more compliment to you, Mr. Speaker, but it will be later so you will have to stay around.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to pay a compliment to another fine gentleman, one of the most gracious gentlemen in this province, the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario (Mr. Mackay). I cannot help but be impressed on every occasion that he enters this House with the dignity of his office. My position in the government and personal circumstances have brought me into contact with him through many years. In fact, when I was a junior member of the bar I had the pleasure of sitting next to him at the time of his momentous decision. The people of this province are fortunate indeed, to have Her Majesty's representative in him.

Right from the very beginning I want to assure the hon. member for Beaches (Mr.

Harris) and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) that despite the impassioned address of the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Singer), their motion is going to stand.

It will not really need too much from me to maintain that position, but I am going to speak facts and figures, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to have exhibits this evening. I have three exhibits before me. Exhibit No. 1, *Hansard* No. 1, containing the Throne Speech, 12 pages long, November 27, 1962. Exhibit No. 2, *Hansard* No. 6, containing the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer), a speech of 13 pages. Exhibit No. 3, *Hansard* No. 7, the speech of the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald).

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, how long do you think that speech is, how many pages do you think that speech is? Twenty-two pages.

We have heard a great deal about going to the people. Do you know that if there was not so much business of this province to be attended to in the interests of the welfare of this province, I would be willing, I say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), to go to the people on the basis of these three documents.

I would say to the people, here is the Throne Speech, 12 pages long.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I feel that it is very regrettable that the Speaker of this House does not have the authority of a baseball umpire in fining the members. But since he does not, he has to implore the members to co-operate with him and try to maintain order and dignity in this House. On this basis I ask for that dignity and order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, Exhibit No. 1, the Throne Speech, all meat, and lean meat with all the fat trimmed off it. Exhibit No. 2, the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, it may be a good shepherd's pie with just a little bit of meat in it but lots of potatoes. Exhibit No. 3, the speech of the hon. member for York South; one of those overgrown puffballs, hon members know, it looks big but there is nothing much, not a calorie, in the whole thing.

Mr. Speaker—and that is not an opinion that I share, you know—all that the Opposition really had to say when the Throne Speech was read was that it was long. Coming from a man who made a 22-page speech, the Throne Speech was long!

But other people take stock, Mr. Speaker, and on opening day there was as one of your guests sitting under the Speaker's gallery there, a member along with his associates, of the ethnic press. They are a small press in numbers when considered with the tremendous metropolitan dailies, but they are where the editors are right down with the people. It is translated from my mother tongue of Ukrainian. I can send it over and somebody can have the translation checked, but this, Mr. Speaker, is in translation. The editor reviews the Throne Speech and he goes on to say this:

In a word, the new legislative programme of Premier Robarts' government covers all important questions connected with the life and welfare of this province, offering constructive solutions and, as such, deserves the careful attention of all Ontario's citizens.

And then he continues.

Unfortunately the Opposition, instead of submitting the programme to substantive criticism, dubbed it offhand as an election tool and noisily demanded an immediate provincial election, declaring that the present government has been in power too long and it should step aside.

In our view, this is not a serious approach to a very serious matter. The government programme of work described in the Speech from the Throne is not a pre-election leaflet, but the fruit of careful study and mature reflection.

And I am still quoting from this man-of-the-street, Mr. Speaker, the man who really sizes up the Opposition.

In this connection, we must not forget that the present government is the heir of the government of Premier Leslie Frost which, for many years, successfully led the province in the path of growth and prosperity and whose main credit, amongst others, is its constant friendly attitude to local ethnic groups.

And I bring the attention of the Opposition to the final sentence:

Undoubtedly, there exists the possibility of an early provincial election, but in order to win it, the Opposition will have to come forward with a much more convincing argument than the one which says the present government has been in power too long.

Mr. Speaker, they have failed to do that in debating the Speech from the Throne. The Opposition seem to be obsessed with

the idea of a provincial election, and hon. members know what people who have an obsession do? They do some strange and weird things, as I will demonstrate before too long.

Mr. Speaker, we have had some talk about ages in this House, but more outside of this House than inside this House. It was mentioned by the hon. member for York Centre and I would not really want to take time out because these things are inconsequential, but when people make a big play about it, one sort of has to take up time to look at the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of this administration. I am proud to sit in the geographic centre with one of the youngest, most vigorous administrations, not only in this province but of any province in the Dominion. Mr. Speaker, the average age of the government, of the members of the Cabinet at the head of departments is 52.5 years of age.

I will take the front row of the Opposition, of all the Opposition. I think there is some big significance—at least I have been led to believe that there is some significance—to the front bench of the Opposition. Do hon. members know what the average age of the front bench of the Opposition is? It is 54.5. And the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Now I will once again ask for order.

I do not think it is fair for any member in this House to have to speak over the noise of many other members. I would point out that I distinctly heard one or two members throughout the proceedings tonight and I am sure if their words were added up during the evening, they would come to as much as some of the members who have actually prepared speeches.

I do not think that is fair for the members who have taken part in the debate. I would ask once again that the members give those who do speak their attention and some order and dignity.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of my hon. colleagues in this administration: one is in his 30's, there is not an hon. member in the front row in the Opposition in his 30's. Eight are in their 40's, six in their 50's and four in their 60's.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is a government of the 40's. Mr. Speaker, the Opposition—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, I never saw anyone dig themselves a hole and bury themselves as neatly as that.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I don't know how else to ask for order and dignity from members of this House, and quite frankly, it is getting beyond me. I do have the authority, you have given it to me, however, to adjourn this House at any moment when I believe it is not good business to carry on.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South seems to forget that life begins at 40.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, does it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Some more interesting figures, Mr. Speaker: The oldest man in either the opposite benches, or in the government, sits in the front row opposite. He is the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon), a very distinguished hon. member of this Legislature, of the age of 74—and I say that in spite of what his hon. colleagues say about age, and perhaps his—I think he should run and give the people of Brantford a run for their money in the contest.

One of the most interesting things about this administration is that the Conservative Party is so virile that it produces men from within itself continuously. There is not a member of the 1943 Cabinet holding a Cabinet position. In the flux of time their places have been taken.

Mr. Speaker, only three were elected prior to 1951, seven were elected prior to 1955, and of the seven elected prior to 1955, Mr. Speaker, five have an average age of 42.5 years. There are in the "class of 1951", sir, led by the hon. Prime Minister, who is the youngest leader of any of the three parties, himself who is only in his mid-forties and elected at the same time to this House, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), in his 40's; the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), in his 40's; the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Auld), in his 40's; and your humble servant, also in his 40's.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Well, why do you not act your age?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, young in years but great in experience. And this is interesting: The oldest living Cabinet Minister in this House is none other than he who sits in the front row of the Opposition, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). Age and experience, Mr. Speaker, because

you will know that the other day when all of those—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Mr. Wintermeyer, you made your speech.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have a great respect and regard for the hon. member for Grey South. The other day when a bill was being introduced, it was he who was paying attention, not like the so-called young bucks—not so young—near him. It was he that brought up a point which the hon. Prime Minister thought was a valid point when a certain bill was sent to a committee.

That comes from experience, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that there are on this side of the House members who can run around the block any time of the day—the hon. Minister of Transport—any time they want to.

The other day the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Belanger) paid a tribute, I think with tongue in his cheek. But I do it most sincerely to some of the senior hon. members of the supporters of this government. Men who were elected in 1943 and 1945 and 1948 and who have served the people of this government well through those years. I pay a personal tribute because in ten years—no, it is 11 years now—they have given me very solid advice, taken me aside and told me about the things of this province, I tell the House, they have done more to nurture and foster good government in this province than any educational institution in the country. I pay my tribute to them tonight.

Mr. Speaker, they will all be back after the next provincial election, whether it is called this year, next year or the year after.

Now the Opposition is so far from fact that it is amazing. One would think that they would at least take time out to read.

I will read from the speech of the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich. He talked about the old guard, and you know the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Letherby)—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): East!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: East! Stand up, there, elected in 1954. The hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich has his times confused. He is not on pension, I will tell hon. members that much. Then he mentioned the name of three other individuals: the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Daley), the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Phillips), the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), and he said, "How often were these recognized by the previous

Prime Minister when making Cabinet changes?"

Did hon. members ever look back, in the three years they have been in this House, to see who have been the members of the government in these past three years? The longest Minister of Labour that this nation has ever seen, serving with distinction, was the hon. member for Lincoln. Take time out and read the facts!

Mr. Speaker, a few more figures in connection with this obsession with elections the hon. members of the NDP always talk about. If certain figures were kept nobody would be elected on percentages.

I was listening to the other hon. member, the one for Wentworth East (Mr. Gisborn). He was talking about percentages and he was saying that no member of the Legislature would be elected on this basis. Well, he was right, to a degree. He could speak, for he got 51 per cent of the vote that was cast. The interesting thing is that the hon. member to his right, the hon. member for Woodbine, Mr. Speaker, only got 44 per cent, and he got 3,000 fewer votes than all the others.

That is, there were 3,000 more votes cast against him than for him, which is interesting.

I would point out to the hon. member for York South that he has never had a majority in his riding, and he never will have. As a matter of fact, it was 47 per cent.

Mr. MacDonald: I have had it!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is all the hon. member for York South got, 47 per cent of the vote.

I will tell the hon. member, if he wants some figures about the member for Bellwoods—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is misrepresenting the facts. The hon. member for Wentworth East was talking about percentage of the eligible voters, not of the votes cast. Why doesn't the hon. Minister read the facts and get them straight when he is dealing with the issue?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the attitude the NDP group takes, not just on the one occasion; they always talk about the votes cast against the government. I have given the percentage for York South, I will now give you the percentage for Bellwoods riding. It is not a bad figure, the member for Bellwoods got 55 per cent of the votes cast. He got

1,000 votes more than all of his opponents combined. I was pleased to see in the great riding of London that the hon. Prime Minister also got 55 per cent of the votes; he got 1,600 more votes than all of his opponents combined.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting point again on election funds—I was interested to know that there was a bill introduced by the NDP about the amount of campaign funds. I was also interested to see an article the other day in the *Telegram* by an NDP writer for the *Telegram*, Mr. Fisher, where he says this: "Money is a campaign necessity." I think all of us will agree.

I was interested to note in some of the disposition of the funds that the hon. member for York South gets in his capacity of something or other, I was not quite clear in the sum of \$4,000. He takes \$2,000 of that and turns it over to the riding association of York South, that is \$2,000 he gives to the riding of York South.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever an occasion of a man taking his money from one pocket and putting it into another pocket it is that proposition. I say to my hon. colleagues, in the House: Wouldn't they like to have \$2,000 a year for their associations to spend in their ridings? Put that in the bill?

Mr. Speaker, one final note on elections, and here I must say I am deviating from fact. Everything else I am going to say tonight is fact, but this perhaps is hearsay: I cannot vouch for this actually having taken place. It was reputed to have taken place in the cloakroom of the hon. members of the Opposition. The hon. member for Bruce says to two of his colleagues, "I had a dream last night. The good Lord came to me and in a blaze of white light told me that I was going to be leader of the party, after the next election"—

Mr. Whicher: I must have been dreaming.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And the hon. member for York Centre—

Mr. Whicher: I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that is not true.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And the hon. member for York Centre said, "That's funny; I had the same dream."

Mr. MacDonald: Well, there were five of them in the hon. Minister's party.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Then the hon. member for Sudbury says, "Maybe so, but I don't

remember talking to either of you guys last night."

Mr. Speaker, we were talking about the obsession about elections. The hon. leader of the Opposition has an obsession, and obsessions make men do strange things. He is hungry; he knows the chips are down, Mr. Speaker. Headlines are what he wants, and I have a dandy before me. Can you read it, Mr. Speaker? "We Will Outlaw Strike Breakers—Wintermeyer." A speech given at the Ontario Federation of Labour educational conference—is that the name of it? I had the—

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, that's right, you ask me. I will give you the facts. You will make up the rest.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I had the pleasure, Mr. Speaker, two years ago, I believe it was, in participating in a similar function. The hon. member for York South was there, the hon. leader of the Opposition, and myself. Mr. Speaker, I could well understand this headline when the story came out because at that time the hon. member for York South stated his case and he was with a bunch of friends. I stated my case on behalf of the Conservative Party. And the hon. leader of the Opposition: "Me too, me too", was all he said. "Fellows, I am on your side; believe me, I am for you, me too."

I never saw a man who wanted to be loved more than the hon. leader of the Opposition on that occasion. What happened after I do not know, for on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, after this time the headlines did happen.

The Toronto *Daily Star* assesses what happens to a man when he is obsessed. "Shifting The Balances" is the title of their editorial and they referred to "Mr. Wintermeyer's Proposals". The Toronto *Daily Star* says this: "They are unwise in terms of the general public interest." I say that was a very kindly expression to use. And then it went on: "This is contrary to what we believe is sound public policy."

Mr. Speaker, this is the leader of one of Canada's parties, one of the great traditional parties. But you see what happens to a man! Not only does he become irresponsible, but the public interest goes by the board.

But then there were some second thoughts, I guess. He came back to Toronto and some of his colleagues had a caucus with him after the editorial and then we got the wriggings and the twistings and the turnings how to get out of this but not lose friends. "I still want to be loved," he says.

Then this is what the hon. member for York South said in the House:

To escape the dilemma the Liberal approach is for legislation under which the only agreement that would be considered valid after a strike would be the one negotiated by a certified union that called the strike. Thus a company would not be able to sign an agreement recognized under the law with any other union or employees association.

This is the explanation of what the hon. leader of the Opposition, a member of this Legislature, was going to do. The hon. member for York South picked up one angle on it, but he missed another angle and I am going to just bring the attention of the House to it.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister knows all about the angles.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read to you a document.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that there was no mention of this by the hon. leader of the Opposition in the Throne Speech. I will read a document—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will just read something to you, Mr. Speaker:

No employer, employers' organization or person acting on behalf of an employer, or an employers' organization shall so long as a trade union continues to be entitled to represent the employees in a bargaining unit, bargain with or enter into a collective agreement with any person or another trade union or council of trade unions on behalf of or purporting, designed or intended to be binding upon the employees in the bargaining unit or any of them.

Passed in 1954! Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the hon. leader of the Opposition that before he goes to speak to any labour group he should first read The Ontario Labour Relations Act.

Mr. MacDonald: It may be in the Act, but the Act is ineffective.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He proposes to do something this Legislature passed eight years ago. Perhaps the better suggestion for him is not to go himself but send at least the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) or

perhaps—and I am just going to say this not because I feel too harshly about it—the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Gould) might be sent along next time because the hon. member for Bracondale once ran in the riding of Bellwoods—a great riding—and he ran as the future Minister of Labour for the Liberal Party against the present member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He did. He took a new riding, Mr. Speaker. I was interested in reading the *Labour Review* the 1962 convention where they summarize: "The convention heard Ontario Liberal Leader John Wintermeyer go out on a limb during the question period by promising to outlaw strikebreakers."

Mr. Speaker, do you know what happens to people who go out on a limb? Somebody saws it off!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Look at the men who sawed the limb off! His own colleagues, his own colleagues—sawed off the limb!

Mr. MacDonald: That's par for the course.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, just one further note on The Labour Relations Act and I am just going to speak to the hon. member for York South for a moment. He should speak to some of his friends whom he meets from time to time. I meet with them but perhaps not as often as I would like to; perhaps I would have more influence on them. Members of the Ontario Federation of Labour are always ripping into The Labour Relations Act. You know the same *Labour Review*, some time ago when this House passed legislation amending The Labour Relations Act, said this:

But it must be pointed out, particularly to the craft unions, that the select committee reserved its most vicious attack for traditional craft rights of picketing. The drastic revisions suggested by the select committee are contained in section 42 of its report. If they were enacted *in toto* they would wipe out completely much of the craft rights and make picketing virtually impossible. The Conservative government went as far as it dared.

Mr. Speaker, do you know who voted for section 42, which was called by the Ontario Federation of Labour, the "most vicious attack"? The hon. member for York South. I say, Mr. Speaker, I say this: If ever I saw a person climb out on a branch—honestly

for once—that was sawn off behind him by the same group. My friend Doug Hamilton—the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree), sat on that committee. I can say the department is in capable hands, but do not let these members on the other side ever try to put the knife into that Labour Relations Act. Improve it, but do not let them put the knife in it. But here is my friend Doug Hamilton, at the time of the Royal York strike—I am reading from the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, September 22, 1961:

Douglas Hamilton, secretary-treasurer of the Ontario Federation of Labour, suggested Mr. Johnstone was a little over-optimistic in expressing the expectation of an early decision by the Ontario Labour Relations Board on the union's application for permission to take proceedings against the hotel.

That is supposed to be a responsible member of a responsible union ripping into the Ontario Labour Relations Board. And you know, Mr. Speaker, on the next page of the same newspaper is a headline.

BOARD PERMITS UNION TO PROSECUTE HOTEL

The Ontario Labour Relations Board has granted permission to the hotel and restaurant employees' union to prosecute the Royal York hotel.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that those gentlemen make up their minds. Either The Ontario Labour Relations Act is a good Act, deserving of having people come under it or it should be scrapped. Let them make up their minds once and for all and not mislead the hundreds of thousands of good, honest working men who belong to unions, into believing that they do not have a fine Act, because they do. It needs only to be improved, and it will be improved, Mr. Speaker, from time to time.

Mr. MacDonald: They are not being misled; they know the situation.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, exhibit No. 4. I hope not too many members have been familiar with this in a personal way; this is a hospital bill. The patient is one Yaremko, John; length of stay in hospital, 42 days; total bill, \$1,232; paid by the patient, \$116; paid by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, \$1,116.

Mr. Speaker, in the middle of that account is the statement, "We trust Ontario hospital insurance has served you well." Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. members of this House that the Ontario hospital insurance has served me and will serve the other 98 per cent of the people of this province well.

It is one of the finest schemes on the continent and, Mr. Speaker, I say this from personal practical experience, there was no care that I, as an ordinary patient, wanted for under the Ontario hospital insurance plan.

Mr. Speaker, medical care. In the Throne Speech is, "My government endorses the principle of medical health insurance," the soundest sentence, perhaps, of this decade, one of the greatest sentences that will come from this administration, Mr. Speaker. I received a letter from a constituent:

I wish you could do as much as you can about medical health insurance. I am sure there are a great many people who would benefit if it was in effect. Health comes first, then everybody gains in every way.

Mr. Speaker, I speak from experience: 42 years without a single day of illness and then 42 days in the hospital; health does come first. And this government is going to do something about it.

The hon. member for York South, as the leader of his party, put forth his plan for medical care, and he described it in some detail. I would like to go into it. It got the headline in the paper: "Medical Care For 30 Cents A Week". Earlier this evening the hon. member for Woodbine used the expression, "This party has taken the public into its confidence." I thought for a moment he was going to be honest and say, "This party has taken the public in," because, Mr. Speaker, that is what they propose to do.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): That's pretty low. Be fair.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As a matter of fact, there is no one I would rather speak to than the hon. member for Oshawa, a very reasonable, logical-thinking man. Mr. Speaker, we heard about how this medical care is going to be paid for. It was detailed, yes, it was detailed by the hon. member for York South. It is detailed on page 108 of *Hansard*, and I would like to go into it.

Mr. Speaker, there are going to be premiums, 30 cents and 60 cents. There is going to be a six per cent surcharge income tax and a three per cent corporations tax. Mr. Speaker, that is the statement. But take the package deal of the NDP group. Do you know what is in that package that they try to sell to the public? They are going to abolish sales tax. They are going to put medical care into effect by putting these taxes on with the right hand, and with the left hand they say they are going to abolish the sales tax. \$160 million they are going

to abolish? Where are you going to put that in? Do you know what that means, Mr. Speaker? One per cent corporations tax by the hon. member's figures produces \$16.6 million. He will have to impose an additional corporations tax of ten per cent to get that \$160 million back. Where are they going? They are going to drive every business out of this province. Where to, Saskatchewan? No hope. Does the hon. member say he is not going to abolish the sales tax? I heard Emile Blouin. Do you know him? The NDP candidate—the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Gibson) is not here—the NDP candidate there was for abolishing the sales tax. The new party programme. The new party platform. Remember? Now they are going to keep the sales tax?

Mr. MacDonald: Surely.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, why have they been going around to the people saying they are going to abolish it? You see, Mr. Speaker, here is the NDP platform, of a new party for Canada—this is what they were going to do: they were going to increase "fair" taxes—so says the heading—they were going to increase the personal exemptions for lower income groups. I was interested to see the figures the hon. member for York South was using. Does he increase the exemption for the lower income groups? No, he puts an income tax on them.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to take a lot of money. Here is an interesting figure. I listened to those figures. In the same edition of the Ontario Federation of Labour's *Labour Review*, they have some interesting statistics. The hon. member should have read it before he quoted his statistics, because there is a memo here headed: "Cost of Saskatchewan medical care." Mr. Speaker, this is the cost—and this is the interesting thing—that it is going to cost per capita in Ontario \$26.25. In Saskatchewan the per capita cost is \$24. Now here we have families with incomes of \$7,000 or more—and this is the Saskatchewan figure—"families with an income of \$7,000 or more will pay approximately \$100".

The hon. member for York South comes into this House. He has a scheme and the figures are on page 108 of *Hansard*, for a family with an income of \$7,000 in Ontario, Mr. Speaker—we are led to believe—it is going to cost only \$71.76. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why and how is it that the hon. member for York South can promise a bargain rate, a discount price, of \$28.24 as opposed to the Saskatchewan plan? I can read figures. I will read this

just to make it clear. Families with an income of—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Does the hon. member mean the people of Ontario are going to get theirs cheaper than in Saskatchewan by his plan? Mr. Speaker, let them try to weasel out of that one.

Mr. Speaker, just one interesting conclusion to medical care. I was very interested in listening to the hon. leader of the Opposition to hear that he is going to impose some sort of a tax although he is keeping it a deep, dark secret. He does not know himself, perhaps, what kind of a tax. We will be interested to see where his tax is going to come from. But the interesting thing is that he is going to reduce not all of the sales tax, but just up to \$25. And do you know what else he is going to do? He complains about the debt that he once referred to: "Ontario Debt up 200 per cent—Wintermeyer." And do you know what he promised up in Sudbury? He is going to borrow money to build roads. He is going to reduce the debt by borrowing money.

Mr. Speaker, there was a butcher in Kansas, and a woman shopper came in to buy a ham. She said, "I would like a six-pound ham," and the butcher went into his cooler and found he had one ham left. He brought it into the store and put it on the scale. It weighed four pounds. And the customer said, "That is too small." So he went into the cooler, he scratched his head and said, "How am I going to get out of this one?" So he waited for a few minutes and—remember that the hon. leader of the Opposition is going to reduce debt by abolishing taxes, yes, he is going to do the two things—then came back into the store and he very quickly put the ham on the scale and he said, "Six pounds," and he took it off. And the customer said, "Fine, I will take both of them." That is a neat trick if the hon. leader of the Opposition can do it. I will take reduced taxes and—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Woodbine wears a halo. It gets a little tight at times and he can be a little sanctimonious. I know where he catches it, he catches it from his hon. leader, who the other day was berating the doctors of Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not sit in judgment. I do not—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Who was berating?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member's leader was.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity of reading the Saskatchewan Act. I do not know whether the doctors committed any breach of the law, I do not believe they did. The hon. member for York South: did he get up and did he talk about them, flouting the law and everything else!

Well, I was interested in the double morality that that party subscribes to. We had an election and one of the members of the NDP group, a man by the name of Charles Millard—no stranger to this House—erected posters on his lawn, Mr. Speaker, in defiance of a municipal bylaw. Now law, bylaw or statute of the province, it is still the law, and Charles Millard, a distinguished—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, it hurts a bit. A double standard of morality. Preach to others but have a double standard of morality!

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say a couple of things in an affirmative way and I just want to refer very briefly to the Throne Speech—all that lean meat.

But, just to take the attitude of the Opposition: it is true that the Opposition have their role to play and we know the role, because we have been lectured in this House on the role they are supposed to play. The only thing is they forget to carry out that role. Nothing this government does is ever right. They scoff at it, they scorn it and they do everything against it.

Mr. Speaker, I was in this House when the hon. member for York South was talking about the parks programme and he said this: "We have listened to the government explaining that Ontario has a greater per capita area of public parks than any other jurisdiction in the North American continent, and I am certain that, at some time or another, that expansive spread of arms came—they would say 'in the whole world'."

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity of telling the hon. member for York South that the parks programme of the province of Ontario under this Conservative administration, as continued today with a \$200 million acquisition programme, is the finest in the world.

I give the House for a moment another exhibit, an exhibit which was developed a year ago. I see a puzzled expression on the face of the hon. member for Grey South.

Perhaps he has not seen this map "Roads to Recreation". Mr. Speaker, we have the finest collection of parks anywhere in any jurisdiction in the world.

Mr. Speaker, in 1957, and we will not go back beyond those days, there were 35 provincial parks with over two million visitors. In 1962, 75 provincial parks with eight million visitors. In the five years there were 30 million visitors to provincial parks alone.

Then I ask the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley), who knows the St. Lawrence parkway system. Has he ever seen anything comparable in any jurisdiction? Go to the provinces to the east, to the west, and to the states to the south. Anything comparable? The answer is no!

The hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator) is familiar with the Niagara Parks Commission parks. They are not even shown on this map. That is one thing that I hope will be corrected soon. Every park, Mr. Speaker, that this administration contributes dollars to should appear on this map. If they have to make a bigger map they should make a bigger map to get all the parks on, because the Niagara Parks Commission parks do not even appear on this.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite do not appreciate it. The parks are coming into the metropolitan area, Mr. Speaker.

Exhibit No. 6, the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, Mr. Speaker. I say every hon. member across the way should get a copy of this package. The Metropolitan Toronto Region Conservation Authority has developed wonderful parks for the people of the metropolitan area of this city. People who live all during the week on cement and sidewalks and cinders have the opportunity within a few minutes drive to go to these parks. They certainly are great, Mr. Speaker.

There are 31 conservation authorities in the province of Ontario, 50 per cent of whose money is from this government. There are 53 park areas. Mr. Speaker, this map also misses another great area. We have the municipal parks' assistance programme. Somebody was talking about the number of statutes that we have for parks.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province are not interested in statutes. They are interested in green grass and water and they do not care what statute they come under as long as they get the finest system of parks. There are 22 parks that get municipal assistance grants that are not even shown on the map. They are going to be on the map next year. I

suggest to the hon. member for York South I will do him a favour. I have a portable cooler and a portable barbecue and next summer when he will probably have a lot of leisure on his hands, because you never can tell, I will lend him my cooler and I will lend him my barbecue and he can do what a great number of the citizens of this city do. He can drive up and down the roads of this province—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, I will tell the hon. member if he only gave me the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, because I am going to have to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The best in the world, Mr. Speaker, and I have got to wind up. That was the "Roads to Recreation".

Here is another map, the highways map of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the people across the way—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well as long as I am keeping the hon. members' interest up that is something.

Mr. Speaker, you can take a pin, blindfolded, stick it into this map; and take another pin and stick it in, blindfolded, and Mr. Speaker, no matter what you do you can get from point one to point two on a first-class highway all the way. And, Mr. Speaker, you know why the present hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) is going to make such a good chairman of this committee that is going to study the transportation problems of this area?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, what is the hon. Minister's reason?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Do you know why? Because there are already so many first-class highways across the province of Ontario, we had to find something more to keep him busy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Do not downgrade this province. These highways have been built this year, last year and the years before. Take our neighbours to the south, New York State—18 million people—and we who have 420,000 square miles; they have 18 million

people and their highways cannot be compared with ours and if anybody challenges this let him get up and tell me otherwise.

Let the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. R. C. Edwards) prove it. The New York Thruway—you have to pay several bucks to get on it. The 500-mile expressway we are completing this next year is going to be free and so good that the hon. member from Cornwall is going to be able to have his breakfast at home and lunch with his colleagues here.

An hon. member: This year.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: This year—that is, in the spring. Mr. Speaker, you will be able to do the same thing from Windsor—the greatest road. That is just one; that is only 500 miles. We have built one 1,300 miles long, the Trans-Canada. I wish I had the time to review the bridges in Ontario because we have bridges—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South laid great stress on the fact that the words "human betterment" were not used in the Throne Speech. The people of this province can recognize a fact when they see it, even if it is not mentioned. The distinguished hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) sent a letter at the beginning of the year to me, setting out the ten-year period of the provincial welfare services, and all I am going to do is just read the headings. He brought in almost all of it within his time, a distinguished leader of that great department.

Old age assistance; medical assistance; municipal homes for the aged; private homes for the aged; nursing home care; elderly persons' housing; child welfare; blind persons' allowances; disabled persons' allowances; mothers and dependant children's allowances; children's welfare assistance; homemakers and nurses services.

And this year, Mr. Speaker, other additions: homes for retarded children and a housing programme developed by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

Human betterment, Mr. Speaker; where else on this continent will you have a programme of human betterment to compare with this? But you know, I was interested in the plan of the party of the Opposition; they are great ones for making headlines. The one I have here is "Liberals Plan \$275 a Month Pension for Every Couple"—that is

January 10, 1962, and I read it with a great deal of interest. That is the hon. members' colleagues down in Ottawa; they are just as promising as the Opposition here but they have the same faults. The leader of that group said "that all the details of the scheme had not yet been worked out." Mr. Speaker, that is the leader of a party that gave a \$6 increase; and they talk about human betterment.

I am going to make a prediction. I do not predict very often but I am going to make a prediction that we will not have too long to wait to see. You know, I have come to the conclusion the hon. leader of the official Opposition does not really mean all the things he says about the government. And as proof of that I predict that they are going to vote with the government to defeat the NDP attack on this government. That is what I predict, they are going to vote with the government—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But then the other interesting thing is that the NDP group after ripping the official Opposition up and down, is going to vote with the Opposition.

Mr. Bryden: We are not going to vote with them, we are going to vote against you.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is an interesting combination, Mr. Speaker. I tell you the hon. member for York Centre said that it was a unique amendment to an amendment; I agree.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a unique amendment to an amendment and the people of Ontario are going to be witnesses in the next few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I promise you, to a very interesting display. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister of this province on the anniversary of his succeeding to the leadership of this great Conservative Party, wrote a letter to his supporters within the party. But, Mr. Speaker, he could very easily have written—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am in his administration. Mr. Speaker, this letter could have been written to every citizen of this province. I will only read parts of it, interesting parts.

It is a good letter, one of the best I have ever read. Just bear with me. I will not keep you in suspense.

In expressing the dynamic creed by which we have lived [this party] and which remains the heart and centre of our policy. Briefly stated it is this—

and Mr. Speaker, I remind you of the programme of the Throne Speech; the letter goes on to say:

More people, more industry, more jobs, more wages, more opportunity, and from these, more productivity and revenue to do the job. Only the narrowest partisan—and I am sorry to advise the hon. Prime Minister that there are some very narrow-minded partisans sitting opposite.

Only the narrowest partisan would deny that the Ontario of 1962 offers the clearest proof that this was no mere paper creed. Under the leadership of our party through the years it took on flesh and blood. The people of Ontario made it their own. Through their efforts it has brought us to the strong and virile position our province occupies today. Because of this strength we are able to face the future without fear.

And here it is worth noting—

That in 1943 when we embarked upon this course of unparalleled development we met nothing but derision, scorn and even legislative censure from our visionless political opponents. They have not changed. In the forties they preached gloom, in the 60s, they preached doom, "unrevised and unrepentant." We of course—

and he is speaking for the party he leads. and the government he leads—

We of course take a very different view of things. Today, with the massive strength of our province with its almost unlimited productive capacity and the skills of our people brought together in a great new united effort, we are, I am confident, fully capable of meeting the problems, overcoming the obstacles and grasping the opportunities of a changing world.

And then he concludes:

With these thoughts in mind we shall during the coming session of the Legislature, be putting forward our own bold and well advanced plans for Ontario's next stage of economic development, social adjustment and cultural growth. It is on the strength of that programme and not just our past achievements that we expect to be judged. I am firmly convinced that

these plans carefully designed to keep our economy moving forward will meet with the wholehearted approval of our people.

Sincerely yours

John Roberts, Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Harris moved, seconded by Mr. Morningstar,

That a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

May it please your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Wintermeyer moved, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words:

But this House:

1. Regrets that the government has failed to enunciate a positive programme of tax adjustments and incentives for industry that will enable industry to meet the challenges being posed by the common market and The United States Trade Expansion Act.

2. Regrets that the government has failed to strengthen job security for Ontario's working people by:

(a) establishing a minimum wage for men of \$1.25 per hour;

(b) promoting the collective bargaining process; and

(c) protecting, in legislation, the vested interests in their jobs of workers engaged in a legal strike.

3. Regrets that the government has neglected to strengthen the competitive position of Ontario industry by failing to encourage management-labour co-operation through management-labour councils.

4. Regrets the chaos inflicted on Ontario farmers in the marketing of their products as a consequence of the government's lack of clear-cut, long-range farm policies and the failure of the government to check vertical integration and the threat it poses to the continued existence of the family farm.

5. Regrets the failure of the government to introduce a comprehensive pre-paid, service plan of medical care insurance,

without a means test, for all the people of Ontario.

6. Regrets the failure of the government to make available, through fair and equitable financing, equality of educational opportunity for all pupils in Ontario's tax-supported school system.

Mr. MacDonald moved, seconded by Mr. Thomas, that the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following:

Furthermore this House regrets that Her Majesty's official Opposition:

1. Has offered no clear-cut alternative to the government's inadequate programme of economic development, contenting itself with proposing a patchwork of measures instead of a comprehensive programme of economic and social planning through which the government, in co-operation with industry, labour, agriculture, consumers, municipalities and other major groups, will take all steps necessary to establish and achieve carefully considered targets of economic growth, rational allocation of resources among public and private purposes and fair distribution of wealth among all our people, and which alone will provide the basis for genuine labour-management co-operation in place of the form of company unionism proposed by the official Opposition.

2. Has, in relation to the vital issue of medical care insurance, contented itself with repeating the vague generalities that the Liberal Party has been repeating for more than 40 years, instead of advancing as an alternative to government policy specific proposals for a universal, comprehensive, publicly administered Medicare plan and for the financing of such a plan.

And this House further regrets that:

1. The government has disclosed no intention of bringing forward legislation to establish a government-operated automobile insurance plan that will cover all owners and drivers and will automatically provide compensation for accident victims and their dependants, as well as public liability insurance.

2. The government's housing programme continues to be grossly inadequate in relation to the needs of the people, particularly of senior citizens and low-income families.

3. The government still has not brought forward legislation for the redistribution of provincial constituencies, notwithstanding the assurance given by the Prime Minister to this House on April 18, 1962.

We will first vote on the amendment to the amendment moved by Mr. MacDonald.

All those in favour of the amendment to the amendment, will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

The amendment to the amendment was negatived on division as follows:

YEAS	NAYS
Bryden	Auld
Davison	Belanger
Gisborn	Boyer
MacDonald	Brunelle
Thomas	Bukator
-5.	Carruthers
	Cass
	Cathcart
	Cecile
	Connell
	Cowling
	Davis
	Downer
	Dymond
	Edwards (Perth)
	Edwards
	(Wentworth)
	Gaunt
	Gould
	Harris
	Haskett
	Hoffman
	Janes
	Johnston (Carleton)
	Lawrence
	Letherby
	Lewis
	Macaulay
	Mackenzie
	MacNaughton
	Manley
	Morin
	Morningstar
	Morrow
	McNeil
	Newman
	Nixon
	Oliver
	Reilly
	Robarts
	Roberts
	Rollins
	Root
	Rowntree
	Sandercock
	Simonett

YEAS

NAYS

Singer
Spence
Spooners
Stewart
Sutton
Thompson
Trotter
Troy
Wardrope
Whicher
White
Whitney
Wintermeyer
Worton
Yaremko
-60.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost. We will now vote on the amendment to the motion, moved by Mr. Wintermeyer.

All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

The amendment to the motion was negatived on division, as follows:

YEAS	NAYS
Belanger	Auld
Bryden	Boyer
Bukator	Brunelle
Davison	Carruthers
Edwards	Cass
(Wentworth)	Cathcart
Gaunt	Cecile
Gisborn	Connell
Gould	Cowling
MacDonald	Davis
Manley	Downer
Newman	Dymond
Nixon	Edwards (Perth)
Oliver	Harris
Singer	Haskett
Spence	Hoffman
Thomas	Janes
Thompson	Johnston (Carleton)
Trotter	Lawrence
Troy	Letherby
Whicher	Lewis
Wintermeyer	Macaulay
Worton	Mackenzie
-22.	MacNaughton
	Morin
	Morningstar
	Morrow
	McNeil
	Reilly
	Robarts
	Roberts

YEAS

NAYS

Rollins
Root
Rowntree
Sandercock
Simonett
Spoonier
Stewart
Sutton
Wardrope
White
Whitney
Yaremko
—43.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

We will now vote on the motion by Mr. Harris.

As many as are in favour of the motion by Mr. Harris will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

The motion was carried on the following division:

YEAS

NAYS

Auld
Boyer
Brunelle
Carruthers
Cass
Cathcart
Cecile
Connell
Cowling
Davis
Downer
Dymond
Edwards (Perth)
Harris
Haskett
Hoffman
Jones
Johnston (Carleton)
Lawrence
Letherby
Lewis
Macaulay
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
Morin
Morningstar
Morrow
McNeil
Reilly
Robarts
Roberts
Rollins
Root
Rowntree

Belanger
Bryden
Bukator
Davison
Edwards
(Wentworth)
Gaunt
Gisborn
Gould
MacDonald
Manley
Newman
Nixon
Oliver
Singer
Spence
Thomas
Thompson
Trotter
Troy
Whicher
Wintermeyer
Worton
—22.

YEAS

NAYS

Sandercock
Simonett
Spoonier
Stewart
Sutton
Wardrope
White
Whitney
Yaremko
—43.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Clerk of the House: Resolved that a humble Address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

TO THE HONOURABLE J. KEILLER MACKAY,
D.S.O., V.D., Q.C., D.C.L., LL.D., LIEUTENANT-
GOVERNOR OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

WE, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious Speech Your Honour has addressed to us.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading, upon motions:

Bill No. 1, An Act to amend The Dependents' Relief Act.

Bill No. 2, An Act to authorize the guarantee by the province, of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario.

Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Ontario St. Lawrence Development Commission Act.

Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Investigation of Titles Act.

Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Custody of Documents Act.

Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Partnership Registration Act.

Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Indian Welfare Services Act.

Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowances Act.

Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

Bill No. 15, An Act intituled The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63.

Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Parks Assistance Act.

Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act.

Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

Bill No. 27, An Act respecting the interpretation of an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of Ontario with respect to the collection of income tax.

Bill No. 25, An Act to provide for the inspection of meat for human consumption.

Bill No. 10, An Act to provide for the rehabilitation and development of agricultural lands in rural areas in Ontario.

Bill No. 31, An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

Bill No. Pr1, An Act respecting the city of Oshawa.

Bill No. Pr4, An Act respecting the village of Bath.

Bill No. Pr6, An Act respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

Bill No. Pr7, An Act respecting the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

Bill No. Pr8, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Bill No. Pr9, An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting The Chatham Community Young Men's Christian Association.

Bill No. Pr36, An Act to incorporate the University of Windsor.

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Could I just say a word?

I realize it is late, on the other hand this bill is quite an historical one in many respects, particularly as far as the area in Windsor is concerned. If I could just have a few minutes I would like to explain to hon. members what has been done here.

This bill to which we are giving third reading now and which will receive Royal Assent in a few moments is An Act to incorporate the University of Windsor and brings to fruition the efforts of a great many people in the Windsor area to provide a basis for a new institution of a non-denominational nature and to provide for further expansion of our university system in the province. Under this bill effective on July 1, 1963, Assumption University of Windsor and Essex College will

join forces in what will be known as the new University of Windsor.

Assumption University and the long traditions associated with that name will be preserved within the new university as it will retain its graduate faculty of theology. The corporation of Essex College which presently exists will be dissolved and its properties will be vested in the University of Windsor. Canterbury College, which is an Anglican Arts College, and Holy Redeemer College, which is the national seminary of the Redemptist Fathers, and other colleges which may wish to do so, will be able to affiliate with the new university in due course.

I would just mention that the original Act establishing Assumption University was passed in 1858 and in 1953 an Act was passed amending that original Act, establishing Assumption University of Windsor. In 1956 Essex College affiliated with the university and assumed responsibility for courses in natural science, and so on.

In 1956, Mr. Speaker, and I think this is really the interesting point, the enrolment was in the neighbourhood of 400 students. The present enrolment is 1,575 and we estimate by 1970, under the new arrangement, this university will be able to accommodate some 4,000 students. That will mean that from 1956 until 1970, a period of some 14 years, the enrolment in this university will have risen from 400 to 4,000. Incidentally, we started to pay grants as a government in 1956 when Essex College was established. Since that time we have paid to the university a total of \$10,425,000. Of this \$2.225 million has been for maintenance, and \$8.20 million of it has been for capital construction.

This is all part, of course, of the growth that we anticipate. It will be discussed in this House, I assume, in due course. We presently have 35,000 undergraduates in our universities and we expect by 1970 to have about 95,000, which is roughly the ratio in which the student body will increase in this university.

While I have the opportunity I would like to pay tribute to the Rev. E. C. LeBel. Father LeBel is vice-chancellor and president of Assumption University—and his colleagues among the Basilian Fathers for the work that they have done in the negotiations which have been necessary to bring together various parties to create this new university. They have done a very wonderful job indeed.

This order has operated Assumption since 1858, I believe that is when it was first formed, and their traditions and their roots go very deep in this university. I am happy

to pay tribute to Father LeBel and his colleagues because without their efforts, Mr. Speaker, we would not be creating what will become one of the great universities of our province, even greater than it is today.

I would pay tribute also to Mr. John White-side who is chairman of the board of directors of Essex College. He too has done a great deal in the negotiations leading to its formation. We have a new board of governors there under the chairmanship of John Stewart. These gentlemen have agreed to serve and have already done a great deal of work prior to the passage of this bill, before they became a legal entity. I would pay tribute to them and the work they have done and I would wish this new university well.

It will be a great asset to the city of Windsor. I know how worried the hon. members in this House from Windsor are about affairs in that community. This will certainly do a great deal over the years for the whole area of Windsor and southwestern Ontario.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, if I may be given a chance to reply to the hon. Prime Minister.

We certainly appreciate the very kind words that he has said in regard to the University of Windsor which will be incorporating on July 1, 1963. We in the city of Windsor are very proud of the work that has been done by the Basilian Fathers and also during the past six years since Assumption University has been in operation. Truly we want to say to this government that we do indeed appreciate the co-operation that the government has given to Assumption University in the past few years.

May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we consider Assumption University today, which will be the University of Windsor in July, an industry to the city of Windsor. Indeed, sir, we are grateful for the co-operation the government has given to us. Thank you very much.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister. Being a graduate of the university back in 1933 and having only 16 students in the graduating class, I can readily foresee a very bright future for not only the community but also for that university.

From a class of 16 to today's class of 100 is a great big step. From the enrolment of 400 today to the potential, the possible, enrolment of 4,000 within the next eight years

likewise will speak very highly for the university. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Before declaring the motion carried I too would like to express my appreciation, being a resident of Essex County and knowing also that I introduced into this House the original bill creating Assumption University many years ago. I am very happy at this time to see this great university expand in service and benefit to the people of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will now leave the House and wait upon His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed several bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Assistant Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

An Act respecting the city of Oshawa.

An Act respecting the village of Bath.

An Act respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

An Act respecting The Presbyterian Church in Canada.

An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

An Act respecting the city of Belleville.

An Act respecting The Chatham Community Young Men's Christian Association.

An Act to incorporate the University of Windsor.

An Act to amend The Dependents' Relief Act.

An Act to authorize the guarantee by the province of loans made to promote the economic development of Ontario.

An Act to amend The Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act.

An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

An Act to amend The Investigation of Titles Act.

An Act to amend The Custody of Documents Act.

An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

An Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act.

An Act to provide for the rehabilitation and development of agricultural lands in rural areas in Ontario.

An Act to amend The Indian Welfare Services Act.

An Act to amend The Mothers' and Dependent Children's Allowances Act.

An Act to amend The General Welfare Assistance Act.

The Charitable Institutions Act, 1962-63.

An Act to amend The Parks Assistance Act.

An Act to amend The Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act.

An Act to provide for the inspection of meat for human consumption.

An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-62.

An Act respecting the interpretation of an agreement between the government of

Canada and the government of Ontario with respect to the collection of income taxes.

An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

To these Acts the Royal Assent was announced by the assistant clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Assistant Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that when this House adjourns its present day sitting thereof it do stand adjourned until a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.30 o'clock a.m., until the date to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Reading and receiving petitions	525
County Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	525
General Sessions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	526
Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	526
Public Officers' Fees Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	526
Voters' Lists Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	526
Division Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	526
Junior Farmer Establishment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	526
Representation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Robarts, first reading	526
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	527

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery students from Forest Hill junior high school, Toronto.

I beg to inform the House that the clerk has received from the commissioners of estate bills, their report in the following cases: Bill No. Pr3, An Act respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust; Bill No. Pr11, An Act respecting the Esther Taylor Wood Trust and the John Taylor Evans Memorial Trust.

Clerk of the House: The report reads:

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MACKAY
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. KELLY

Osgoode Hall,
Toronto 1
January 17, 1963

RODERICK LEWIS ESQ., Q.C.,
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
TORONTO, ONTARIO.

DEAR SIR:

*Re Private Bill Pr3 1962-63
An Act Respecting the George
Taylor Richardson Trust*

The undersigned as commissioners of estate bills as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act RSO 1960, chapter 208, section 57, having had the above noted bill referred to us as such commissioners, now beg to report thereon.

The affidavit of William McAdam Nickle filed with your commissioners deposes that:

George Taylor Richardson died on or about the 9th day of February, 1916. Probate of his last will and testament was granted by the surrogate court of the county of Frontenac on the 25th day of July, 1917 to James Armstrong Richardson of the city of Kingston.

Paragraph six of the last will and testament of George Taylor Richardson reads as follows:

to set aside to be administered by himself or to pay to W. F. Nickle for administration fifteen hundred dollars annually for twenty years. The principal of this fund and all interest accruing to be used by my executor or by W. F. Nickle for the education or advancement of the lawful children of the married men at the time of imbarcation at Quebec, comprising E Company of the Second Battalion, First Brigade of the First Canadian Expeditionary Force, who may die, be killed or be permanently injured while the company is on active service, in the event of said married men having enlisted from and being at the time of enlistment citizens of the city of Kingston or of the counties of Frontenac or Hastings.

On March 29th, 1932 the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario on the petition of William Folger Nickle did assent to an Act Respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust granting that in addition to the powers of the said trustee conferred upon him by virtue of the said will, that it would be lawful for the said trustee, or his successor, to use the funds of the said trust and the income therefrom, as in his discretion may seem wise, to relieve the distress of those who may have been members of said E Company at any time while the said George Taylor Richardson was a captain thereof, the members of their families, or their dependents, giving priority from time to time, however, to the claims of those who may be in distress as a result of the war services of the members of the said E Company; a photostatic copy of the said Act being hereto annexed and marked as exhibit 'B' of this affidavit;

James A. Richardson died on the 26th day of June, 1939 in the city of Winnipeg, province of Manitoba and I have made a search in the surrogate court office for the county of Frontenac and there is no record of his estate ever being resealed or otherwise dealt with through that office;

On the death of my father, the late William Folger Nickle who died on the 15th day of November, 1957, myself and John Athcarne Partridge were nominated as executors of his estate in his last will and testament and became thereby the present trustees of The George Taylor Richardson Trust;

I have caused a search to be made at the office of the surrogate court for the county of Frontenac and the accounts were never passed in the estate of George Taylor Richardson and the only records that I have been able to locate in connection with this trust are records commencing on the 1st of January, 1944, photostatic copies of which are hereto annexed and marked as exhibit 'C' to this my affidavit;

All the other assets of the George Taylor Richardson estate have been duly dealt with according to the terms of the will and the only remaining asset in my hands are the funds of this trust, certain grants have been made from this trust pursuant to the terms of the 1932 Act Respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust the last of which was made on the twenty-third day of October, 1961, to one E. F. G. Smith;

Since October of 1961 I have diligently made searches for persons who may have been members of E Company of the Second Battalion, First Brigade of the First Canadian Expeditionary Force by inquiring at both local branches of the Canadian Legion and inquiring from a number of old soldiers here in Kingston. I have duly been informed by Frank Smith of 58 Chestnut Street in the city of Kingston that he is the last surviving member of E Company, Second Battalion, First Brigade of the First Canadian Expeditionary Force;

On August the fourth, eleventh, eighteenth, twenty-fifth, and September first and eighth of the year 1962 I did cause to be published in the Kingston Whig-Standard notice of the application to repeal The Act Respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust copy of said notice being annexed hereto and marked as exhibit 'D' to this my affidavit; On August eleventh, eighteenth, twenty-fifth and September first, eighth and fifteenth of the year 1962 I did cause the same notice to be published in The Ontario Gazette;

As a result of these notices no one has come forward requesting financial assistance from the

Trust nor have I heard of anyone who qualifies within paragraph six under the will of George Taylor Richardson or under the 1932 Act Respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust;

I have therefore been unable to locate anyone who qualifies under paragraph six of the George Taylor Richardson will nor of anyone who is presently or likely to be living in circumstances which would entitle them to qualify as a beneficiary under the 1932 George Taylor Richardson Trust Act and I am most anxious therefore to wind up the balance of this estate and to dispose of the funds in a manner which would result in their use being put to the benefit of needy persons.

It is further deposed in the said affidavit that certain payments have been made pursuant to the terms of the said trust up and until the year 1960.

The books of account maintained by the late W. F. Nickle indicate that as of January 1, 1944, certain assets of the said trust were in his hands. The photostat copies of the ledger accounts of the said W. F. Nickle deceased, from and including the year 1944 until his death and the continuation of such accounts down to the present time, unsupported by vouchers and otherwise unverified, contained entries of amounts received and disbursed during the said period.

Otherwise than indicated by the said ledger accounts nothing has been submitted to us to indicate how much of the funds provided for by clause 6 of the last will and testament of George Taylor Richardson have come into the hands of any person who at any time acted as trustees of the said funds. It is not the function of your commissioners to audit the accounts of the trustees and we have not attempted to do so.

The purpose of the bill as set out in its preamble is to enable the trustees to expend for charitable purposes to advance the interests or relieve the distress of persons residing in the city of Kingston in the county of Frontenac, the funds which the petitioners are unable to expend for purposes authorized by the will of George Taylor Richardson or by chapter 113, Statutes of Ontario 1932, 22 Geo. V.

We desire to draw your attention to the fact that section 2 of the bill is not necessary to accomplish the objects for which the bill is proposed.

Provided that the Legislature considers that the additional objects proposed for the disposition of the capital and income of the money of the trust are suitable substitutions for those named in the will of George Taylor Richardson and in the amending Act 1932, chapter 113, we are of the opinion that the provisions of section 1 of the bill are proper for carrying into effect its purposes and that it is reasonable that the said bill should pass into law.

The bill duly signed by the commissioners and a copy of the petition for the same are accordingly returned herewith.

Yours very truly,

F. G. MacKay

ARTHUR KELLY

Commissioners of Estate Bills.

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MacKAY

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. KELLY

Osgoode Hall,
Toronto 1
January 31, 1963

RODERICK LEWIS ESQ., Q.C.,
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
TORONTO, ONTARIO.

DEAR SIR:

*Re Private Bill Pr11 1962-63
An Act Respecting the Esther
Taylor Wood Trust and the
John Taylor Eans Memorial
Trust*

The undersigned as commissioners of estate bills as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act, RSO 1960, chapter 208, section 57, having had the above

noted bill referred to us as such commissioners now beg to report thereon.

We have examined the petition and the draft bill; there has also been submitted to us

(a) a certified copy of a resolution of the council of the township of Chinguacousy dated 18th January, 1963 reading as follows:—

WHEREAS Herbert James Walker Taylor is petitioner and applicant for a private bill to the Legislature of Ontario to terminate the provisions of two trust deeds registered as instruments No. 23281 and 23318 for the township of Chinguacousy in the registry office for the registry division of the county of Peel;

AND WHEREAS the municipal corporation of the township of Chinguacousy would have difficulty in policing and maintaining the said lands in view of the remote location;

AND WHEREAS the terms of the said trust have been considered by the township of Chinguacousy as it appears that they have an interest therein,

BE IT RESOLVED that the municipal corporation of the township of Chinguacousy hereby confirms that they are not prepared to accept title to the lands described in the aforementioned conveyances subject to the trust therein set forth. The municipal council of the township of Chinguacousy therefore consents to the private bill referred to in the said petition.

(b) a duly executed quit claim deed dated 19th December, 1962 of the said lands and premises in favour of the petitioner made by Harry Frazer to whom the lands and premises were contingently conveyed in the event that changing circumstances should render the continuance of the trusts impracticable and the corporation of the township of Chinguacousy should thereupon decline to accept the said lands and premises;

(c) Evidence in the form of a letter dated January 9th, 1963 from Messrs. Richardson & Graham, Solicitors, addressed to the petitioner's solicitors, that Harry Frazer had received independent legal advice before signing the quit claim deed;

(d) Evidence that neither Ruth Evans, James F. Evans and Mabel Mae Taylor as trustees of the John Taylor Evans Memorial Trust nor Peter Bessey Smith and Mabel Mae Taylor as trustees of the Esther Taylor Wood Trust have accepted the said trusts and that the public has not made any use of the said lands.

As it is impracticable to carry out the intention of the settlor it is reasonable in the light of the resolution and the quit claim deed that the real property described in the said trust deeds should be revested in the settlor, freed and discharged from all and every trust in either of the said trust deeds set out.

We recommend that the preamble to the said bill be varied by deleting all the words therein following "that" in the 27th line thereof and substituting therefor the following:

The aforementioned trustees have not accepted the trusts respectively attached to the lands and premises conveyed to them; the corporation of the township of Chinguacousy has refused to accept a conveyance of the said lands and premises; Harry Frazer has renounced in favour of the petitioner any interest he may now or hereafter have in the said lands; that it is impracticable to achieve by the said deeds of trust the purposes of the said trust and the petitioner has decided to achieve the purposes of the said trustees otherwise;

AND WHEREAS the petitioner has prayed for special legislation declaring the said trust deeds void and the lands and premises therein described to be and to have been at all times since the execution of the said trust deeds vested in the petitioner free of the said trusts and absolving the trustees from any duties, responsibilities or liabilities imposed upon them by the said trust deeds;

AND WHEREAS it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petitioner.

The form of the enacting sections is not proper for carrying into effect the purpose for which the

passage of the bill is sought; we recommend that clauses (1) and (2) be varied and as varied read as follows:

(1) (i) The John Taylor Evans Memorial Trust deed dated 11th day of November, 1954 is hereby set aside and declared to be void for all intents and purposes and the lands and premises therein described are declared to be and to have been at all times since the 11th day of November, 1954 vested in the said Herbert James Walker Taylor free from any of the trusts set out in the said trust deed.

(ii) The trustees of the said John Taylor Evans Memorial Trust are hereby discharged of and from all duties, responsibilities and liabilities to which they may have become subject by virtue of the said trust deed.

(2) (i) The Esther Taylor Wood Trust deed dated the 12th day of November, 1954 is hereby set aside and declared to be void for all intents and purposes and the lands and premises therein described are declared to be and to have been at all times since the 12th day of November, 1954 vested in Herbert James Walker Taylor free from any of the trusts set out in the said trust deed.

(ii) The trustees of the Esther Taylor Wood Trust are hereby discharged of and from all duties, responsibilities and liabilities to which they may have become subject by virtue of the said trust deed.

With the additions and amendments set out in this report we are of the opinion that the provisions of the bill are proper for carrying into effect its purposes and that it is reasonable that the said bill should pass into law.

The bill duly signed by the commissioners and the copy of the petition for the same are accordingly returned herewith accompanied by a certified copy of the resolution of the council of the township of Chinguacousy adopted on 18th January, 1963 and an executed copy of the quit claim deed dated 19th December, 1962 made by Harry Frazer in favour of the petitioner and the original of the letter of January 9th, 1962 addressed by Messrs. Henderson & Graham to the petitioner's solicitors.

Yours very truly,

F. G. MACKAY

ARTHUR KELLY

Commissioners of Estate Bills.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the corporation of the city of Niagara Falls praying that an Act may pass establishing an urban service area within the city, dissolving the wards, and establishing the "Board of Education of the city of Niagara Falls".

Of the corporation of the township of Toronto praying that an Act may pass authorizing the postponement of local improvement charges on land while it is used for farming.

Of the corporation of the united counties of Northumberland and Durham praying that an Act may pass authorizing a debenture issue for construction and equipment of an addition to the Cobourg District Collegiate Institute West.

Of the corporation of the county of Carleton praying that an Act may pass authorizing debentures for county road construction.

Of the corporation of the town of Grimsby praying that an Act may pass authorizing a debenture issue to pay a floating debt.

Of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws for erection of street lights; and for other purposes; also, the petition of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass increasing the number of members of the board of trustees of the Ottawa Civic Hospital from 11 to 14.

Of the corporation of the town of Wallaceburg praying that an Act may pass authorizing a fixed assessment for Wally Enterprises Limited.

Of the corporation of the county of Lincoln praying that an Act may pass validating the 1962 valuations made by the Assessment Commission; also, the petition of the St. Catharines General Hospital praying that an Act may pass authorizing its board of governors to prescribe the term of office and manner of appointment of its members and extending its powers of investment.

Of the corporation of the town of Mimico praying that an Act may pass enlarging the municipal council.

Of the corporations of the towns of Burlington and Oakville praying that an Act may pass increasing the number of votes of both towns' representatives on the council of the county of Halton.

Of the corporation of the township of York praying that an Act may pass authorizing the enlargement of the council; also, the petition of the corporation of the township of York praying that an Act may pass authorizing gifts or grants to persons in recognition of scholastic achievements; and for other purposes.

For an Act to reconstitute the Belleville General Hospital and to provide for its administration by a board of governors, etc.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, that bill together with the one I am now about to ask leave to introduce provides for the changing of the commencement of the fall session of the county court and the court of general sessions in Middlesex county so that there may be courtroom accommodation for county courts, general sessions and supreme courts.

THE GENERAL SESSIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The General Sessions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, the intent of that bill is to provide for appeals from the surrogate judge in cases where now no appeal exists.

THE PUBLIC OFFICERS' FEES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Officers' Fees Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, that is an Act to provide for further and better remuneration for bailiffs and other officials in the courts of Ontario.

THE VOTERS' LISTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Voters' Lists Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, that Act is to provide for the reduction in the number of copies of municipal voters' lists, which have to be printed each year, from 175 to 75.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, that bill provides for the extension of the jurisdiction in the division courts in the case of consolidation of orders for payment to \$400, to match the increased jurisdiction and to provide for the enlargement of time from five to 10 days during which jury notice may be served in the division courts.

THE JUNIOR FARMER ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Junior Farmer Establishment Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I might say that the intent of these amendments is to increase the amount of the loan and to extend the value of the security from the 65 per cent appraised value to 80 per cent, and provisions are made for provincial guarantee under the Act, on bank loans to junior farmers.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): What about the age limit?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The same as before—35 years. I will make a full explanation of it on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills:

THE REPRESENTATION ACT

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Representation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this bill, when it has second reading will be referred to the committee on privileges and elections, along with the report of the commission which sat on redistribution. There have been some questions raised as to the names of some of these ridings and there are some changes which can be made in committee if that is necessary. The riding boundaries can be examined there.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether the boundaries are basically the same as in the announcement which he made prior to Christmas time?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, they are precisely the same.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Precisely!

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question of the hon. Prime Minister.

1. Has the government received a report from Mr. Justice Roach concerning his commission of inquiry?

2. If so, when will the report be made public?

3. If not, can the hon. Prime Minister say when a report may be expected?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have received no report from Mr. Justice Roach. I do not know when I will receive it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question then?

There were news reports to the effect that portions of the report dealing with the OPP and The Department of the Attorney-General were in the hands of The Department of the Attorney-General. Do I conclude from what the hon. Prime Minister has said that this is inaccurate?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is inaccurate.

I read those news reports too. Nothing has been received from Mr. Justice Roach at all. I understand that he is presently writing the report. Of course, when it is complete it will come in here and I will table it in the House.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I thought it might be appropriate to draw to the attention of the House the absence from his seat of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Belisle) and remark that this might have some connection with the announcements that we read in the paper today about an appointment that he is reported to have received. I thought all hon. members of the House would want to commend those responsible for making such an appointment, for having selected such a logical person to receive such an appointment.

I thought too that the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby), who was here earlier in the day, perhaps might feel a little offended because I noted, Mr. Speaker, that he was the only hon. member of this House in recent months who spoke with any favour at all about the people who have any responsibility for making these appointments.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would just like to comment that perhaps some of the hon. members who have been back a few days have noticed in the last day or so certain

rumblings underneath this building, and there has been a certain amount of vibration. We keep the buildings humming pretty regularly 12 months of the year, Mr. Speaker, but this is underneath the building and it comes from the new University Avenue subway.

I want to reassure the hon. members that this very historic old building is not going to be shaken down. There is some testing going on and the TTC have not completed buckling down the tracks and making various adjustments and doing some insulating. I am assured that this vibration will cease and that there will be no noise whatsoever in the buildings. As a matter of fact, to further reassure the hon. members, I can tell them that we have an agreement with Metropolitan Toronto and with the Toronto Transit Commission to ensure that the subway running under the buildings will not disturb the hon. members as they discharge their duties in this Chamber.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I was really worried about disturbing the hon. members over there. They all look so nice and sleepy and somnolent I did not want them disturbed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, things are right back to normal, Mr. Speaker.

I am not going to call any of the orders on the order paper today.

The order of business for the next few days will be as follows: tomorrow there will be the introduction of more legislation, we will go to second readings on the order paper and there are three bills to be dealt with in committee. On Thursday we will sit at two o'clock, when the budget will be presented. On Friday we will continue with the estimates of one of the departments, I will tell the House which one later.

We may look forward to night sessions on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and I will try to limit it to those nights so that the hon. members can plan their activities on the other three nights. We will not go to committees, in other words we will sit on Wednesdays until such time as the committee work becomes heavy enough to necessitate the setting aside a full day for committee work, if that time in fact arrives.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.40 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Reading and receiving petitions	531
Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	532
Township of York, bill respecting, Mr. MacDonald, first reading	532
Township of York, No. 2, bill respecting, Mr. MacDonald, first reading	532
Trent University, bill to incorporate, Mr. Brown, first reading	532
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Morrow, first reading	532
Ottawa Civic Hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Morrow, first reading	532
United counties of Northumberland and Durham, bill respecting, Mr. Carruthers, first reading	532
Town of Grimsby, bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, first reading	532
City of Port Arthur, bill respecting, Mr. Chapple, first reading	533
Township of Toronto, No. 2, bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, first reading	533
Town of Hearst, bill respecting, Mr. Brunelle, first reading	533
Town of Mimico, bill respecting, Mr. Lewis, first reading	533
Town of Wallaceburg, bill respecting, Mr. Parry, first reading	533
County of Carleton, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading	533
Township area No. 2 of the township of Erin, bill respecting, Mr. Root, first reading	533
Township of Eramosa school area, bill respecting, Mr. Root, first reading	533
Guelph General Hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Worton, first reading	533
The Elliott, bill to incorporate, Mr. Worton, first reading	533
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mr. R. C. Edwards, first reading	533
Institute of Professional Librarians of Ontario, bill respecting, Mr. Sutton, first reading ..	533
County of Halton, bill respecting, Mr. Sutton, first reading	533
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, Mr. Bukator, first reading	533
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	533
Agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the province of Ontario respecting public harbours, bill to approve, Mr. Roberts, first reading	535
County Judges Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	535
Disposition of bodies and parts thereof of deceased persons for therapeutic and other purposes, bill to provide for, Mr. Dymond, second reading	535
Telephone Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	536
Community Centres Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	536
Warble Fly Control Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	536
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, reported	536
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, reported	536
Public Libraries Act, bill to amend, reported	538
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	538

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1963

The House met at 3.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery students from the Lawrence Heights junior high school, Toronto; and in the west gallery members of the Falada Club, Toronto.

I beg to inform the House that I have received notification of a vacancy in the Membership of the House by reason of the resignation of Rheal Belisle, member for the electoral district of Nickel Belt.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the city of London praying that an Act may pass empowering it to grant to any local board the right to fence and use portions of highways abutting on lands used and occupied for the purposes of such board.

Of the corporation of McMaster University praying that an Act may pass extending its powers and increasing the membership of its board of governors and the number of its vice-presidents.

Of the corporation of the town of Burlington praying that an Act may pass authorizing the imposition of certain sewer rates; and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. H. Morrow from the standing committee on standing orders presents the committee's second report and moves its adoption.

The committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Of the city of Guelph, praying that an Act may pass to make new arrangements for the control and management of the Guelph general hospital.

Of the corporation of the city of Guelph praying that an Act may pass re-incorporating the Guelph Home of the Friendless under

the name "The Elliott," re-arranging its management and enlarging its powers.

Of the public school board of the township of Eramosa to annul certain trusts.

For the incorporation of Trent University.

Of the corporation of the city of Toronto praying that an Act may pass providing for open meetings of the board of directors of the Canadian National Exhibition Association; and for related purposes.

Of the public school board of the township School Area No. 2 of the township of Erin praying that an Act may pass annulling trusts affecting certain of its lands.

Of the corporation of the town of Hearst praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to pass a by-law fixing the assessment of the property of Levesque Plywood Limited.

Of the corporation of the city of Port Arthur praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to convey all the lands lying east of the CNR right-of-way and east and south of the McIntyre River in fee simple, free of encumbrances.

Of the Institute of Professional Librarians praying that an Act may pass re-organizing the institute and its powers.

Of the corporation of the city of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass authorizing the variation and extension of certain provisions of its agreement with the T. Eaton Realty Company.

Of the corporation of the city of Niagara Falls praying that an Act may pass establishing an urban service area within the city, dissolving the wards, and establishing the "Board of Education of the city of Niagara Falls".

Of the corporation of the township of Toronto praying that an Act may pass authorizing the postponement of local improvement charges on land while it is used for farming.

Of the corporation of the United Counties of Northumberland and Durham praying that an Act may pass authorizing a debenture issue for construction and equipment of an addition to the Cobourg District Collegiate Institute West.

Of the corporation of the county of Carleton praying that an Act may pass authorizing debentures for county road construction.

Of the corporation of the town of Grimsby praying that an Act may pass authorizing a debenture issue to pay a floating debt.

Of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing by-laws for erection of street lights; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass increasing the number of members of the board of trustees of the Ottawa Civic Hospital from 11 to 14.

Of the corporation of the town of Wallaceburg praying that an Act may pass authorizing a fixed assessment for Wally Enterprises Limited.

Of the corporation of the town of Mimico praying that an Act may pass enlarging the municipal council.

Of the corporations of the town of Burlington and Oakville praying that an Act may pass increasing the number of votes of both town's representatives on the council of the county of Halton.

Of the corporation of the township of York praying that an Act may pass authorizing the enlargement of the council.

Of the corporation of the township of York praying that an Act may pass authorizing gifts or grants to persons in recognition of scholastic achievements; and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof it shall stand adjourned until two of the clock tomorrow afternoon and that rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended as far as it applies to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Daley be substituted for Mr. Davis on the standing committee on private bills.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE REGISTRY ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, this bill contains the first group of a series of amendments designed to modernize the Act. A complete revision of the Act will be accomplished in this way over a period of years.

TOWNSHIP OF YORK

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of York.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF YORK, No. 2

Mr. MacDonald moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of York, No. 2.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TRENT UNIVERSITY

Mr. K. Brown (Peterborough) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate Trent University.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

OTTAWA CIVIC HOSPITAL

Mr. Morrow moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Ottawa Civic Hospital.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

NORTHUMBERLAND AND DURHAM

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the United Counties of Northumberland and Durham.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF GRIMSBY

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Grimsby.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF PORT ARTHUR

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Port Arthur.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO, NO. 2

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Toronto, No. 2.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF HEARST

Mr. R. Brunelle (Cochrane North) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Hearst.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF MIMICO

Mr. W. B. Lewis (York-Humber) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Mimico.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF WALLACEBURG

Mr. G. W. Parry (Kent West) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Wallaceburg.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF CARLETON

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) in the absence of Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the county of Carleton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF ERIN

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting township area No. 2 of the township of Erin.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ERAMOSA SCHOOL

Mr. Root moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Eramosa School Area.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GUELPH GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Guelph General Hospital.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ELLIOTT

Mr. Worton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate The Elliott.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS

Mr. R. E. Sutton (York-Scarborough) in the absence of Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Institute of Professional Librarians of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF HALTON

Mr. Sutton, in the absence of Mr. Lawrence, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the county of Halton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following:

The public accounts of the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1962.

The report of the provincial auditor, Ontario, 1961-62.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which is directed to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). Notice has been sent to him.

The first question is: when positions in the civil service of Ontario become vacant or

when new positions are created, what is the policy of the government in publicizing these employment opportunities?

The second question—inadvertently there was a word left out: if there is a policy, how is it carried into practice, so that people desiring employment in the service of the government may be kept informed of opportunities for jobs?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first question I may say that recruitment is the responsibility of the civil service commission under The Public Service Act. This Act has been in effect since last August, but the commission has established a policy for filling vacancies since November of 1961, which is in accordance with the present situation.

The civil service commission is responsible for recruitment in the Metropolitan Toronto area and has delegated recruitment outside of this area to the deputy minister of each department with certain requirements.

When a position becomes vacant, the department advises the civil service commission of the vacancy and persons are referred to the department from an eligible list. If there is no eligible list, the position is advertised in all the Toronto papers, professional and technical journals, and outside papers as required in order to attract qualified applicants.

Outside Metropolitan Toronto, under the directive issued by the civil service commission, if no qualified applicants are available on an eligible list, it is required that the position be publicized locally to obtain qualified applicants.

In answer to the second part of the question, I am pleased to say that the civil service commission follows its own policies and that applicants are given equal opportunity to compete for positions. The policy of the government is to support the commission in this work.

Mr. Troy: I thank the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: how do they know that these jobs are vacant or new jobs are created, that is the problem? Who makes up this eligible list?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say in answer to the hon. member's supplementary question that many persons make applications and a great many of those applications are always on file with the commission.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question to ask of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), a copy of which he has already received.

Because of the great amount of snow and stormy weather in Ontario and particularly in Bruce county during the past several weeks, many of the schools had to close for several days. While appreciating the fact that the regulations of The Department of Education do not allow the payment of grants while schools are closed, will the hon. Minister review the situation and the regulations with the idea of changing them so that the school boards concerned will not be penalized through a situation over which they have no control?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for notice of the question, and because it perhaps affects other ridings besides his own, the answer may be somewhat more lengthy than ordinarily would be the case.

In 1954, when section 5 was added to The Department of Education Act so that the Minister of Education could and I quote from the Act: "add to the actual aggregate attendance of a school the number of days attendance lost by pupils", for certain specific reasons it was intended that this subsection (c) would apply only when the school plant itself was inoperative. As the wording of this subsection clearly expresses the intent, it has been so administered. There is, therefore, no authority to accept applications which are based on transportation difficulties. From the inception of this programme of granting additional days for grant purposes, it has been the policy to accept applications under section 5(c) only when the school plant itself is inoperative and also only when evidence is submitted that the school plant was inoperative because of some unavoidable emergency.

A few years ago many school boards requested additional days for grant purposes because of pupil absences at the time of the epidemic of Asiatic flu. At that time boards were assured that a study would be made to determine if any of them were being unduly penalized. A study of the reports of attendance for the calendar year submitted to the department revealed that there was no appreciable difference between the attendance efficiency of those schools where pupils were absent at the time of the Asiatic flu epidemic and those schools which were not so affected.

Other studies made periodically, when

school boards have raised this question of loss of grants because of transportation difficulties, have revealed no appreciable loss. School authorities can expect that each year the average daily attendance will be affected to some degree by epidemics of contagious diseases or transportation difficulties.

The policy regarding school grants is under continuous review, and the effect of this winter's severe weather on school grants based upon attendance will receive study, to determine whether present practice is to be maintained or whether some change in grant policy is advisable.

Mr. Whicher: If the hon. Minister would allow me to make a comment, I would say that I do not think that is fair at all. The people there have no control over the weather, and some schools have been closed for several days.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): May I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question? Is it still the practice of the department to make grants on occasions when holidays are granted by visiting dignitaries, including the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is not the policy of the department, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, further to that question, in 1955 when the late Dr. Dunlop opened a school down in Pickering township he announced at that time there would be no alteration in the grants. That was in 1954.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is 1963.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, might I ask one further supplementary question of the hon. Minister? Do I understand that no legislative changes are proposed to take care of this situation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought the answer was fairly clear. I think what I stated was that the policy will be reviewed when the reports are available from the various boards that have been affected.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Minister advise whether he expects that to take place during the current session?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to have it done during the current session because the reports will not be available from the boards until some time this fall.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

PUBLIC HARBOURS

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves second reading of Bill No. 17, An Act to approve an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of the province of Ontario respecting public harbours.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General) moves second reading of Bill No. 29, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, that is the bill which deals with equating allowances for surrogate court fees?

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): That is right, Mr. Speaker, and it makes it the same for all judges on the county and surrogate benches throughout Ontario, except the chief judge and the senior judge of the county of York.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General could advise us whether this bill will go to the committee on legal bills.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I have no objection to it going to the committee on legal bills, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Well, we can discuss it there.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

DISPOSITION OF BODIES

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill No. 28, An Act to provide for the disposition of bodies and parts thereof of deceased persons for therapeutic and other purposes.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The purpose of this bill is all summed up in the title. It is to provide legal machinery whereby it will be possible for one who chooses, to bequeath his whole body or parts thereof for medical research purposes or therapeutic purposes. We have had requests from people, complaints from people, that there was no formal or legal machinery making this possible, and, following the principle of The Human Tissues Act in Britain, we have devised this bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): May I ask the hon. Minister how the bodies used up till now have been made available?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In an informal sort of way. It has been taken for granted if one puts in their will that they want their body used for scientific purposes that was done. Also under The Anatomy Act, any inspector of anatomy in the province of Ontario has the authority to refer bodies to the places equipped to receive them.

An hon. member: Liberal headquarters.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Too much deadwood there now.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TELEPHONE ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Telephone Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE COMMUNITY CENTRES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Community Centres Act.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Agriculture could explain to us why community centres tie in with agriculture. Would it not be more logical at the time when there has been a lot of talk about amending the whole control of statutory set-up over municipalities, to put community centres in the department which deals with municipalities? Why should this thing which goes back into the dark ages be continued, and why should the community centres remain as a part of The Department of Agriculture?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter which could be taken under advisement.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): A question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. There is a limit in the amount of grants submitted to these arenas or community centres—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would point out to the member that I gave ample time for rising before passing this. I do not want to be too

strict but I feel that the question of the member would be better dealt with in committee stage. It is a detail rather than the principle.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: It is just a question of wanting to keep everything orderly. I gave ample time, the motion was carried, and I believe it would be better taken up in committee.

THE WARBLE FLY CONTROL ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Warble Fly Control Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: First order, House in committee. Mr. K. Brown in the chair.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 21 reported.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister in connection with section 1 whether or not the facilities that are going to be used beginning in the middle of the school year would have to remain vacant up until the time they would be brought into use when these children were allowed to enter the school at this later date.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, this will be up to the local boards, but it is suggested that the facilities will not remain vacant in that they will probably be doing this on a unit basis and they will be moving one unit from one place to another. It is possible that there may be some vacancy during the latter part of next fall if the boards decide to go for this particular provision, but once the system is in operation there should be no vacancy in the school system.

Mr. Nixon: Further in that section: the students who have accomplished a half year of attendance and instruction, how is their

promotion going to be handled? Would they be considered especially bright students or how would that work out?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I said, Mr. Chairman, in many instances it is done on a unit basis. The determination of this will be left up to the individual teacher, principal and inspector. Children may enter this class some time, say, in February, and if they have done well they will go on in the fall into another grade. If they have perhaps not done as well as others, they will continue either in kindergarten or Grade 1, perhaps until Christmas. They will be advanced on a unit basis under the recommendation of the principal, teacher and inspector.

This is presently being done without this legislation in various schools in the province.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, a question of the hon. Minister. Is this the beginning of a two semester school year now? Is that the idea of this?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, I would not say this is the beginning of a two semester system.

Mr. Newman: Well, has the department plans of extending this to other years?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the department is not considering this at the moment.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us what consultation, if any, has taken place with those boards that run kindergartens? I received certain inquiries from the North York board of education which was quite surprised that this was introduced without any suggestion being made to them at all as to whether or not they thought this would be a good idea, or a practical idea, or an idea that could be carried out without substantial expense to the ratepayers.

The township of North York, as the hon. Minister well knows, runs the second largest board of education in the province of Ontario and certainly the feeling of some of the trustees there was that the introduction of a section such as this one placed a very serious burden upon this board. They felt that they should have been consulted in advance before a radical change such as was introduced.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the department does not regard it as a radical change. If the hon. member will notice the wording of the section, it is a permissive section. Boards are being given roughly one year to consider this and it is up to the discretion

of the local boards whether or not they adopt it. So North York, I think, will have ample opportunity for consideration. Knowing the calibre of board they have, I am sure they will be able to solve this to their satisfaction.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2.

Mr. E. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, on that section: if I understand a casting vote correctly, a casting vote is a second vote endowed in the chairman of a meeting. Now, how can the chairman cast a casting vote, if I might use that combination, unless he himself has voted first? Is it not sufficient, in other words, if there is a tie, that the chairman then votes? I do not want to have to draw pictures, but the chairman does not normally vote. If his first vote will break the tie, well, what does he need a casting vote for?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think if the hon. member were familiar with the activities of some of the school boards in the more rural areas of the province he would realize that the chairman in many instances does vote. This provision now enables him to cast a deciding vote in the case of a tie. But we have also made it possible that it shall be done by lot, in cases where the two gentlemen who are tied happen to be personal friends of his and make it most difficult for him to make a decision.

Mr. Sopha: The last Wednesday in December, as a matter of fact, when I was chairman at the annual meeting at the township school area board of Dill, Cleland, Secord and Burwash—now that is a fearsome name—I acted as chairman and had to do precisely what this section contemplates. I had a vote but I had not voted and it ended up in a tie. So, without any contest with the Gordian knot, I then voted.

I will not say here who I voted for, but I broke the tie and one of them was elected. But when I voted I did not need a casting vote. My query is, what does this mean? Why would the chairman need a casting vote? Why do you not say if he has not voted, then let him vote?

I can see now—and I am sorry I got into this—that what I did that last Wednesday in December was illegal, and that person was never really elected. I hope nobody tells him that he was not elected, but what I did in electing him was illegal. But I did not need a casting vote to do it.

I suspect the draftsman in The Department of Education who wrote this has never been

to public meetings, and I do not mean any strong criticism of him. But the chairman of any meeting, whether it is a school board meeting or whether it is a meeting of the women's missionary society of the church, does not usually vote until a tie is arrived at and then he votes. Now if he votes to break the tie, and the problem can only arise if at the end of the voting there is a tie, all he needs to do is vote, he does not need the casting vote.

The casting vote is appropriate at municipal councils where there is an even number and the mayor normally votes—does he not—has voted and they are arranged in equal sides; then he strikes his casting vote. But you do not need it in this one.

Sections 2 to 15, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 22 reported.

THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 23, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 23 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendment and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business we have this afternoon. Tomorrow we will proceed with the budget; on Friday morning the estimates of The Department of Travel and Publicity.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.00 of the clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 7, 1963

Budget Address, Mr. Allan	541
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Wintermeyer, agreed to	558
Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-61, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, agreed to	558
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	558
Appendix I, Provincial Grants to Universities, 1963-64	559

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1963

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have here two messages from the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. Mackay) signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1964, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, February 7, 1963.

And the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor transmits supplementary estimates of certain additional sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1963, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly, Toronto, February 7, 1963.

Orders of the day.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee of ways and means.

BUDGET ADDRESS

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth occasion I have had the honour of making the traditional motion that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of ways and means. It is of interest, I think, to point out that this is the earliest date the budget has been presented since the fiscal year was changed in 1935.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that Colonel Price might have been here today, and he had hoped so yesterday. I was intending just to make a very slight comparison with the last budget which he presented in March, 1926, when his total in that year for ordinary

expenditure was \$50.9 million. I assure you that the budget which I shall present today will be much larger than the one which was presented by Colonel Price. I am very sorry that he was not able to be here.

It gives me great pleasure and satisfaction to inform the House that we are in a much stronger financial position than I thought would have been possible when I brought down my budget of a year ago. Economic growth has provided us with increased revenue which, when combined with prudent management of our finances, has enabled us to carry out a broad extension of services and still end the current fiscal year with a smaller increase in net debt than occurred in the fiscal year 1961-62.

The strength of our financial position is particularly gratifying for it permits us to proceed in the coming fiscal year with a greatly expanded programme—a programme that is shaped not only to meet the growing requirements for education, highways, health and welfare but to provide added support for the furtherance of measures designed to foster the orderly expansion and development of all sectors of our economy.

The government has long considered the promotion of economic growth and development to be one of its major responsibilities. Throughout the years we have continually sought to formulate policies and marshal our resources for the purpose of fostering growth and achieving higher living standards for our people. To this end, we have built up our stock of physical capital assets, having added since the end of World War II almost \$2.1 billion of assets in the form of highways, hospitals, schools, parks, rural power transmission lines and other general works and improvements.

Equally fundamental to our development over this period has been our investment, of more than \$3.8 billion in education, health and welfare services. I would like to emphasize that figure—our investment of \$3.8 billion in education, health and welfare services. We have increased our aid to municipalities many times in order to assist them in carrying out their programmes so vital and necessary for the continuance of economic growth.

In recognition of the importance of our natural resource industries, we have extended our programmes for the conservation and development of our natural resources. Increasing emphasis has been placed on the development of northern Ontario, particularly by providing transportation and communication facilities. We have provided technical training facilities so that our people are better equipped for the new industrial technology. Perhaps a key to our future success in the promotion of economic growth has been the development of programmes through which we can stimulate the vital secondary manufacturing sector of our economy.

In view of these policies that we have been following, it is especially gratifying to report that Ontario's gross provincial product rose last year by eight per cent to nearly \$16.2 billion. Even after eliminating price changes, the increase in 1962 was nearly seven per cent, the largest increase in any year since the capital investment boom of 1955-56.

Personal incomes were up by more than eight per cent, and there were more people employed than in any previous year of our history. Over the course of the year 45,000 new jobs opened up with the result that the labour market entered the new year in much better balance than has been the case for some time. In the last four months of the year, the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployed averaged less than four per cent of the labour force, compared with about six per cent in Canada as a whole. Total unemployment was reduced over the year by some 25,000, the largest year-to-year drop at any time since the end of the war.

The higher level of economic activity in 1962 can be attributed in large measure to the renewed strength in the manufacturing sector. Manufacturing output set a new record, with the total value of factory shipments rising by 10 per cent. Generally speaking, the major source of strength lay in the durable manufacturing sector, with the motor vehicle, machinery, heavy electrical machinery and primary iron and steel industries leading the way. The volume of automobile production rose 31 per cent, followed by primary iron and steel with a 10 per cent increase.

The continuance of the economic expansion that we have been enjoying is one of our greatest challenges, and the government is taking vigorous action to meet this challenge. A buoyant economy will enable us to obtain the extra revenue needed to meet the ever-increasing demands for education, health,

welfare and other services for human betterment. In this rapidly changing world, we must be constantly developing new approaches and policies which will lead to orderly and dynamic growth, for only in this way can we achieve higher productivity, higher incomes and higher standards of living for our people.

Later, I shall outline to you some of the new programmes and extensions of programmes that we are submitting for your approval. Of special interest is our plan for assisting universities in meeting the impending explosive growth in enrolment. This budget contains many such far-reaching provisions which, I am sure the hon. members will agree, will make a major contribution to the further advancement of the economic and social well-being of this province.

In pursuing our objective of maintaining an adequate rate of economic growth, it is essential that we exercise the maximum of economy and the most diligent oversight of our expenditures. To this end, we have improved our internal budgeting procedure to permit an even more careful scrutiny of both existing and new programmes. This enables us to have a clearer picture of the costs involved in individual programmes and to make a more accurate assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of each programme. I have been extremely gratified by the manner in which the hon. Ministers and officials of the various departments of government have supported this innovation in our continuing efforts to obtain the highest possible value out of every dollar of expenditure.

In the field of taxation, a committee to make a full inquiry into the provincial and municipal tax system has been appointed. This committee has been requested to recommend means by which our tax structure can be made to exert the least possible drag on the people's willingness to work, save and contribute to development. We are determined to avoid any rate or form of taxation that would unduly impede the type of expansion and development our programmes are designed to achieve.

The outlook for the future is one of confidence and optimism. We are experiencing a resurgence of economic activity. Our financial position is strong. Our plans to provide the facilities and services required for the progressive development of the province are broadly based and soundly conceived. We are ready to proceed with vigour, foresight, and imagination, to make the most of our great opportunities for future progress.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that

our financial position permits us to present for your consideration and approval supplementary estimates totalling \$35,837,000.

This year, we are introducing a number of improvements in our grant instalments which will have a beneficial effect in assisting the financial operations of municipalities and school boards. In view of the local problem in financing current expenditures, especially in the earlier part of the calendar year, we propose to increase the number of instalments of certain provincial grants and to make advances earlier during the year. While these changes will not affect the level of grants payable with respect to the calendar year, the earlier payment of grants will reduce the necessity of local authorities to borrow for current purposes and in consequence effect a reduction in their interest charges. Furthermore, the more even flow of provincial payments throughout the year will assist the local authorities in arranging their finances more systematically.

The changes for 1963 apply to the general legislative grants to school boards, the payments by the province of the cost of education of non-resident pupils whose education is a provincial responsibility, and municipal road subsidies for maintenance and capital purposes. The general legislative grants will be paid in four instalments, while the payments under the other two programmes will be made in three instalments. Full details of these changes in the number and timing of instalments will be made available in a few days to all municipalities and school boards throughout the province.

Two advance payments will be made this month; the first, an advance on the 1963 general legislative grants equal to approximately 10 per cent of the 1962 net grant and, the second, an advance on the payments respecting the cost of education of non-resident pupils of approximately 45 per cent of the estimated cost for 1963. The supplementary estimates include \$20 million to provide for these advance payments. An advance payment on municipal road subsidies to be made in May of this year will not affect our expenditures in the current fiscal year.

We believe these changes will be very helpful to the municipalities and school boards. In the coming year, further studies will be given to all payments made by the province to municipal and school authorities with a view to making additional improvements that will assist them in their financing.

We are also making available out of the current fiscal year's revenue an additional \$10 million to construct and equip vocational

units for school boards. This will bring the province's total contribution this year to \$39 million for this purpose.

In addition, there are other special grants and payments as follows: \$3.4 million for special grants to public hospitals; a special contribution of \$1 million each to the teachers' superannuation fund and the public service superannuation fund; \$200,000 for the Ontario Mental Health Foundation; \$150,000 to the Ontario Heart Foundation and miscellaneous grants totalling \$87,000.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to present a summary—based on nine months' actual and three months' forecast—of the financial operations of the province in the current fiscal year.

Net ordinary expenditure, including \$35.8 million in supplementary estimates and \$39 million for sinking fund but excluding \$70 million for capital payments financed out of current revenue, is estimated at \$915.3 million. Net capital expenditure on physical assets is \$214.8 million, consisting of \$176.6 million for provincial highways and municipal roads, \$31.9 million for public works, \$4.5 million for conservation projects, \$1.1 million for mining and logging roads and \$0.7 million for rural power lines. Our combined net ordinary and capital expenditures in 1962-63 are estimated at \$1,130.1 million, an increase of \$152.6 million over the corresponding expenditures of \$977.5 million in 1961-62.

Of the \$152.6 million increase in net ordinary and capital expenditures in 1962-63, education accounts for \$92.1 million or over 60 per cent of the growth in expenditure. Other increases in expenditures include \$15.4 million for health, \$12.2 million for highways and roads, \$3.5 million for lands and forests, and \$3.6 million for public welfare.

Net ordinary revenue and net capital receipts for 1962-63 are estimated at \$987.7 million, of which \$2.4 million represents net capital receipts. This is an increase of \$160.3 million over the 1961-62 combined net ordinary revenue and net capital receipts.

The major proportion of the increase in our revenue results from the first full year of operation of the retail sales tax and the improvement in our share of the individual income tax field from approximately 14 per cent to 16 per cent of the federal government's gross rates of tax. Economic growth also made an important contribution to the marked improvement in our revenues. Principal sources of revenue are: corporations tax, \$182 million; personal income tax, \$151.8 million; retail sales tax, \$174 million; gasoline tax,

\$170 million; Liquor Control Board, \$90 million; motor vehicle licences, \$70.9 million; and succession duty, \$44 million.

Our interim surplus on ordinary account is estimated at \$30,000 after providing \$70 million for capital payments financed out of ordinary revenue and \$39 million for sinking fund. After taking into account our net capital expenditure of \$214.8 million and net capital receipts of \$2.4 million, our shortfall of revenue is therefore \$103.4 million.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): What happened to the word "deficit"?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Through prudent management we have been able to carry out a broad programme, provide \$35.8 million in supplementary estimates and still end the fiscal year with a shortfall of revenue which is \$20.2 million below that which I anticipated a year ago.

In the post-World War II era, this government has spent nearly \$2.1 billion on our highways and roads, hospitals, schools and other physical assets. This vast capital investment programme is a clear indication of our confidence in Ontario and our willingness to undertake the capital expenditures required to accommodate rapid economic growth. To sustain this growth in the future, we are maintaining a high level of capital construction.

The financing of our capital programme calls for a delicate balance. By financing a portion of our capital expenditures through borrowing, we have maintained our tax structure at a level conducive to economic growth and development. At the same time we have preserved our favourable credit position in the money market by financing a substantial portion of our capital expenditures out of current revenues. Thus while we have undertaken capital expenditures of nearly \$2.1 billion, our net capital debt has risen by only \$836.2 million since 1946. In terms of the purchasing power of the dollar in 1946, our net capital debt per capita has actually dropped from \$118 in 1946 to \$94 in 1963.

Net capital debt at March 31, 1963, is estimated at \$1.3 billion, an increase of \$107.3 million over the 1962 figure. This increase is remarkably small in view of our increased expenditures and, in particular, our near record \$214.6 million capital programme. This year we will have an increase in net capital debt considerably less than the \$116.4 million increase incurred from 1961 to 1962.

In assessing the increase from 1962 to 1963, the extra \$20 million to be provided this

month to advance the payment of grants to school boards must be considered. Without this expenditure, the increase in our net capital debt would have been only \$87.3 million, considerably less than the average increase over the last four years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word about revenue for 1963-64. Net ordinary expenditure for 1963-64, including \$41.5 million for sinking fund but excluding \$62 million for capital payments to be financed out of ordinary revenue, is forecast at \$967.1 million. After allowing for the \$2.5 million increment in the provision for sinking fund, the increase this year in departmental expenditures amounts to \$49.3 million.

Because this is a dynamic year in the development of education, the great proportion of the total increase in net ordinary expenditure has been allotted to our schools and universities. Through the introduction of improved administrative techniques, and the careful scrutiny of operations, we have been able to raise the level of many programmes and introduce several new measures without adding substantially to our costs.

Next year the net capital expenditure on physical assets will total \$238.8 million, an increase of \$24 million over the present fiscal year. Of this amount, \$192.5 million or over 80 per cent will be spent on provincial highways and municipal roads. Public buildings, mainly hospitals and schools, will require \$33 million. Another highlight of the capital programme is the provision of \$5 million for resource development.

Hon. members will be interested to learn that the aggregate of net ordinary expenditure and net capital disbursements is forecast at \$1,205.9 million—that is the amount of the budget being presented—an increase of \$75.8 million over the present fiscal year.

In 1963-64, major departmental programmes—net ordinary and capital expenditures on physical assets combined—with this year's expenditures appended in brackets, will be as follows: Education, \$387.5 million (\$353.8 million); Highways, \$275 million (\$255.5 million); Health, \$132.6 million (\$145.7 million); Public Welfare, \$61.8 million (\$58 million); Public Works, \$46.6 million (\$43.9 million); Municipal Affairs, \$44.7 million (\$42.2 million) and Lands and Forests, \$38.4 million (\$31.5 million).

For 1963-64, the aggregate of net ordinary revenue and net capital receipts is forecast at \$1,031.1 million, including \$1.6 million in net capital receipts. This represents an increase over the current fiscal year of \$43.3 million. A substantial part of this increase

reflects the improvement in our share of the individual income tax field from 16 per cent to 17 per cent of the federal gross rates of tax.

Major sources of revenue for 1963-64 are forecast as follows: corporations tax, \$190 million; retail sales tax, \$180 million; gasoline tax, \$176 million; income tax collection agreement, \$171.4 million; Liquor Control Board, \$94 million; motor vehicle licences, etc., \$75.9 million; and succession duty, \$42 million.

I am forecasting a surplus on ordinary account of \$378,000, after providing \$41.5 million for sinking fund and \$62 million for financing capital payments out of ordinary revenue. After allowing for net capital expenditure of \$238.8 million and net capital receipts of \$1.6 million, the shortfall of revenue on overall account is forecast at \$133.3 million for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, in turning to specific expenditure programmes, I should first like to discuss the social services of education, health and welfare. The vital importance with which we regard these services is clearly evident in the growth in our expenditures for these purposes. A decade ago, the combined net expenditures of The Departments of Education, Health and Public Welfare amounted to \$150.3 million. In the current fiscal year, they total \$557.5 million.

This is the growth in a period of 10 years. Ten years ago they amounted to \$150 million and in the current fiscal year they total \$557.5 million, including supplementary estimates of \$34.8 million, and in the coming fiscal year they will rise to \$581.9 million. A decade ago, they accounted for 35 per cent of the province's net ordinary and capital expenditures; today the proportion is close to one-half.

The province's expenditures on education represent a substantial investment on behalf of our young people, an investment that will bring invaluable returns in future years. The details of these outlays clearly indicate that we consider education to be a continuing process gradually developing as it proceeds from the early grades of elementary school through secondary school to university, technical institutes and other post-secondary education, on to rewarding employment in professions, business and industry. In view of rapidly increasing enrolment at all levels, this budget provides for substantial increases in assistance to those educational authorities which are responsible for all the various phases of educational service.

As a result of increasing school enrolment,

which has been growing at the rate of about 70,000 a year, as well as rising costs for instructional salaries and improvements in standards of education, our grants to elementary and secondary school boards in the coming fiscal year will total \$233.3 million. This is an increase of \$31.9 million over the 1962-63 level of assistance, exclusive of the payments to be made before the termination of the current fiscal year for the purpose of advancing the date at which these grants become available to school boards.

Included in the amount being provided for next year are the special grants payable under The Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grant Act. In 1962-63, the rate of assistance per pupil of average daily attendance was \$15 for elementary schools and \$5 for secondary schools, for a total expenditure of \$16.7 million. In the coming fiscal year the per pupil rates will be increased to \$20 for elementary and continuation schools, \$30 for secondary academic schools and \$40 for secondary vocational schools. This means that the total payments under the Act will rise to an estimated \$30.3 million.

A large expansion of vocational school accommodation is being carried out under the federal-provincial Technical and Vocational Training Agreement. Under this arrangement, which went into effect on April 1, 1961, the province is paying 100 per cent of approved capital expenditures up to April 1, 1963, for vocational school accommodation. The province is being reimbursed by the federal government for 75 per cent of these payments. By the end of 1962, no less than 217 building projects had been completed or were in the process of being completed. Under the agreement, the province will have paid to school boards by the end of the current fiscal year a total of approximately \$170 million.

We are proceeding with our programme of curriculum revision in the elementary and secondary schools. In September, 1962, over 85 per cent of the grade nine students were enrolled in reorganized programmes of study, and most of the new courses to be used in the reorganization of the secondary school programme have been distributed to the schools. The planning and organization of the procedure for the revision of courses in kindergarten and grades 1 to 6 will be completed in this fiscal year. Emphasis is being placed on consultation with all groups to be affected by changes which may be recommended. In 1963-64, committees will be established to examine fully the role of the school in our society, to determine its aims

and purposes in a rapidly changing world, and to recommend courses which will contribute to the achievement of its objectives. During the next year, research will proceed in many areas of elementary and secondary school education; our research and advisory groups will continue to assist local organizations working in the field of education.

Important additions and improvements are being made to our already extensive facilities for the training of teachers. A new Teachers' College was opened last year at Windsor, and a new bilingual Teachers' College will be constructed in Sudbury for the training of teachers for elementary schools where English and French are languages of instruction. Work will be commenced on the erection of an Ontario College of Education in London, for the preparation of secondary school teachers, and plans will be developed for the establishment of a similar institution in eastern Ontario. An addition to the College of Education at Toronto is also planned.

We have launched an aggressive programme to increase our technical training facilities at the post-secondary school level. The new wing of the Ryerson Institute of Technology will be opened in the fall of 1963, and in the coming fiscal year work will begin on a new building for the Eastern Ontario Institute of Technology at Ottawa. We are pursuing a vigorous policy of establishing provincial institutes of trades for the training of indentured apprentices and the retraining of the unemployed. Three such institutions are already in operation in Toronto and three more are planned for September, 1964, in London, Ottawa and Sault Ste. Marie.

In the next seven years we shall witness an astounding increase in university enrolment. This year combined graduate and undergraduate enrolment in Ontario universities is nearly 35,000; by 1970—eight years hence—enrolment is expected to exceed 95,000. To meet this rapidly increasing enrolment, the province and the universities are co-operating in an extensive programme. In the current fiscal year our maintenance, capital and special purpose grants to universities amount to \$45.6 million. In 1963-64 this total will be increased by more than 50 per cent, to approximately \$70 million—from \$45 million to \$70 million.

In all areas of the province, university facilities are being developed or expanded at a rate which would have been considered impossible a few years ago. We are particularly encouraged by the development of new universities. To help these institutions to progress, the province provides them with a

great deal of assistance for their building programmes. They are not only increasing our university capacity but they are also providing higher education in areas where this was previously not available. Our newest university, Trent University in Peterborough, will open its doors this September. Laurentian University in Sudbury and York University in Toronto are already established and making a valuable contribution to our educational system. We look forward to welcoming another new university in the near future, the proposed Brock University, which will serve the Niagara Peninsula. The other older universities will also receive increased provincial assistance with their maintenance, capital and special expenditures, for they, too, are undertaking massive expansion programmes. As announced in the Speech from the Throne, we will provide special grants, totalling \$3 million, to those universities offering graduate instruction to allow them to expand this important aspect of their activities.

There follows a list in the statement of the grants to the various universities which I will not read but which information is available to all hon. members. (See Appendix 1)

Our student aid programme enables many students to obtain higher education who would otherwise be unable to do so. In the current fiscal year some \$1.7 million will be awarded in scholarships and bursaries and \$2.4 million will be lent to deserving students. These programmes will be expanded in 1963-64, and a new programme of post-graduate scholarships designed to increase the supply of potential staff members for the universities will be instituted.

Enrolment in the province's schools for handicapped children has kept pace with the increases in other educational institutions. The completion, in the coming fiscal year, of a vocational building on the grounds of the Ontario School for the Deaf in Belleville will permit the record enrolment to benefit from a comprehensive programme of vocational training. The new Ontario School for the Deaf in Milton, due to open this year, will increase our facilities greatly and allow a reduction in the age of admission at both schools. The Ontario School for the Blind at Brantford also has a record enrolment, and an additional dormitory is being planned to accommodate the increasing numbers.

Often overlooked in evaluating our assistance to education is the province's contribution to the teachers' superannuation fund. In 1963-64 this payment will be increased to \$19.5 million.

Our forecast of total net expenditure for next year for The Department of Education is \$387.5 million, an increase of \$33.7 million over the 1962-63 expenditure. It is evident that education in this province is on the march and that the government is doing its utmost to meet the growing needs of our young people in this modern world of rapidly widening horizons. This challenging task will require the support and co-operation of all the people of Ontario if we are to achieve the essential aims of education in future years.

Mr. Speaker, the government's health services are a necessary part of the daily lives of the people of this province. The many aspects of preventive medicine in the public health field, the care and treatment of the mentally retarded and the mentally ill, as well as hospital insurance for nearly 97 per cent of our population, encompass a very large part of the daily needs of each individual person. As one problem is overcome, another arises; it is our aim to keep abreast of these new challenges. Because of the importance of our health services, the net expenditures of The Department of Health in the coming fiscal year will be \$132.6 million, of which \$55.9 million will be for the Ontario Hospital Services Commission.

One of our major programmes is the further extension and expansion of our public health services. An additional health unit was established last year in the North Bay area and, with the opening of the Grey county health unit this July, the number of health units in Ontario will be increased to 37. During the past year, the Northern Ontario Public Health Service began a programme of preventive health services to unorganized municipalities which cannot receive public health service through existing health units. A pilot service has been in operation since last August to determine the needs of such areas and how these needs may best be met. This programme will be expanded and it is hoped that additional centres may be opened for such service during the coming year. To assist areas in Ontario receiving little or no medical and dental care, the government has adopted a bursary plan for medical and dental students. Bursaries of \$1,000 per year are awarded to medical and dental students who agree to serve in those areas where the need is greatest.

We are keenly aware of our responsibilities in the field of public health and are ready to assist whenever the need arises. Our actions with respect to babies deformed as a result

of the drug thalidomide is a case in point. Our officials investigated as soon as the situation was revealed, and they will continue to maintain a close liaison with the physicians in charge of the infants so deformed in Ontario. These children will have full opportunity to receive the necessary surgical and rehabilitation care. The costs of such care not covered by our hospital insurance plan will be assumed by joint subsidy from the provincial and federal governments.

Great success has been achieved in preventing deaths from tuberculosis, the death rate having fallen to 2.2 per 100,000 population, or 137 deaths in 1961, the lowest in the history of the province. Since increasing numbers of patients are being given a good deal of their treatment outside of sanatorium, The Department of Health proposes to provide organized follow-up care. By such means, we hope to ultimately control possible return of infectivity.

Particular attention is being focused on our rehabilitation programme for patients in sanatoria and Ontario hospitals. This programme is being tied in closely with community resources and facilities, thus bringing knowledge and understanding, particularly of mental illness, to the public. Eight district offices are in operation and rehabilitation councils are being organized throughout the province. So far emphasis in our programme has been upon returning to gainful employment as many patients as possible. Social rehabilitation is all that is possible in many cases and our efforts in this direction are being expanded. Visual return on our investment here is not always evident, but it is nonetheless worthwhile and justifies any expenditure made. By it, patients are restored to some degree of activity in a normal environment as quickly as possible, and the transfer from the sheltered atmosphere of a hospital to the outside world made much less difficult.

We are expanding and improving our facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally ill. The new Ontario hospitals, mentioned last year for Goderich and Owen Sound, have now become a reality. Work will begin this year on the new psychiatric institute in Toronto. Large renovation programmes are being planned for the Ontario hospitals at 999 Queen Street West, Toronto, and at London. The establishment of a new unit to the mental hospital in Penetanguishene is in the planning stages. Three hospitals for the mentally ill are planned for northern Ontario so that the present hospital at North Bay may be used for children. These hospitals will be at Timmins, Sault Ste. Marie, and

Sudbury. At least one of these is expected to be a community psychiatric hospital, on the plan established in Ottawa where, by agreement with The Department of Health, the board of the Royal Ottawa Sanatorium has undertaken to utilize some of its surplus accommodation for the care of the mentally ill, on an in-patient as well as out-patient basis. Negotiations are now under way to provide a similar type of facility for Windsor. With the setting up of these local units, great progress will be made in our plan to encourage the development of community psychiatric services so that people seeking treatment and advice may do so in a familiar environment.

At the 1961 session of the Legislature, the Ontario Mental Health Foundation was established by provincial statute for the purpose of promoting research relating to the care and treatment of mental illness. The foundation has now been set up and its members are representative of universities, business, labour and voluntary agencies, with the chairman a distinguished justice of the Court of Appeal. The foundation will assume responsibility for screening all applications for assistance in the field of mental health research. Provision is now made for such projects under the federal-provincial health scheme, and \$200,000 has been included in our supplementary estimates for 1962-63 to assist the foundation in carrying out its programme in mental health research.

In the coming fiscal year, the province's estimated expenditure for mental health purposes will total \$58.9 million, an increase of \$4.9 million over that in the current fiscal year.

Our hospital care insurance plan, which has been in operation for four years, has continued to prove its value and service to the citizens of the province. Improvements have been made in the administrative procedures, and the plan has been extended to cover certain hospital services on an out-patient basis to persons who would otherwise require an in-patient admission. Despite the mounting rise in hospital costs, premiums were stabilized in 1961 and have continued to remain at \$2.10 monthly for a single person and \$4.20 monthly for the family unit. Included in the budget for 1963-1964 is an appropriation of \$40.8 million from the general revenue of the province to subsidize those costs of the plan not met by premium subscription. This will bring the government's total contribution in the three-year period to \$148 million.

The introduction of the plan gave impetus to an unprecedented expansion in hospital facilities and, during 1962, some 26 major

hospital construction projects were completed. These comprised one entirely new hospital, three replacements of old existing buildings, 20 additions to existing buildings and two residences for staff. It is expected that the peak of new development will be reached during 1963 and that some levelling off may subsequently take place.

As has been the practice in past budgets, we are including in the supplementary estimates an amount of \$3.4 million to assist public hospitals with the retirement of debt for other capital purposes. This amount includes a grant of \$75 per bed to all qualified public hospitals in the province.

Now a word about welfare. Ever mindful of its responsibilities to those who are unable to provide for themselves for various reasons, the government has constantly expanded and extended its public welfare services. In the current fiscal year, our expenditures for public welfare are estimated at \$58 million. For the coming fiscal year, you will be asked to approve an expenditure of \$61.8 million.

The past year saw substantial progress in the field of public welfare. Increases in maintenance allowances were made available to citizens who qualified for assistance under various programmes, the most notable being the increases from \$55 to \$65 monthly on behalf of recipients of old age assistance, blind and disabled persons' allowances. The adoptions of children in the care of the Children's Aid Societies were continued at a high level with over 5,000 under-privileged children being placed in permanent adoption homes with parents of their own. There was also a large increase in the population within homes for the aged as a result of the continuing programme of expansion to provide new modern accommodation. During the year, six new public homes for the aged were constructed and additions were made to seven existing homes. Charitable organizations were assisted in the erection of four new homes for the aged and an addition to an existing home. In all, 2,250 new beds were made available for elderly persons.

In the programmes for the coming year, efforts will be concentrated on increasing and improving the facilities for the institutional care of children. Under new legislation, private charitable organizations will receive greater assistance in operating and maintaining accommodation for the specialized group care and treatment of children who, for many reasons, are unable to benefit from a normal family relationship.

We are also entering a new field of endeavour in relation to mentally-retarded

children. A new Act has been designed to enable the province to share the costs of the residential accommodation of trainable retarded children who may attend the day-school classes conducted by the local associations for retarded children. In this way, a greater number of retarded children will be able to derive the benefits of the educational programme that has been developed to meet their needs. At the same time, they will be assisted in their development through the process of group care.

The province now has in effect a broad range of public welfare services. It is our continuing objective to ensure that these programmes are meeting the needs and requirements of the less fortunate members of our society. To this end, we are constantly engaged in studies and research which are leading to refinements and improvements in existing programmes and the development of new measures and approaches.

Mr. Speaker, the government has continually extended and improved its highway and road system to keep abreast of the province's expanding economy. Substantial additions and improvements to our transportation system have been required to facilitate the expansion of trade and commerce, to open up new areas for development, and to meet the demands imposed by the sharp increase in motor vehicle registrations, which have grown from 663,000 in 1945 to 2,171,000 in 1962. The magnitude of the programme in which we have been engaged is clearly indicated in the province's total expenditures on highways and roads, which have risen from \$22.9 million in 1945-46 to \$103 million in 1951-52 and to \$255.5 million in 1962-63; an increase from \$23 million in 1945 to \$255.5 million in 1962-63.

During this the fiscal year, the volume of highway and road construction continued at a high level. In all, 385 miles of paved highway and 76 structures were completed, including the paving of some 84 miles and the erection of five structures as part of the reconstruction programme to bring existing sections of the Trans-Canada Highway up to standard. On Highway 401, two new sections were opened, bringing the total mileage now in use to 404 miles, and work commenced on the widening of a section of the Toronto bypass and the construction of eight service areas between London and Belleville was likewise carried out. Widening operations were continued on the Queen Elizabeth Way with the result that the highway now has six lanes from Toronto's western limits to the Mississauga Road. Good progress has been

made in the Hamilton area on Highway 403, which will run from the Queen Elizabeth Way to Highway 401 near Woodstock. Highway 405 from the Queen Elizabeth Way to the new international bridge at Queenston is well advanced and is scheduled for completion in the autumn of 1963. On Ontario's second skyway, the \$20 million structure at Homer, steel work has been completed and the bridge will be opened later this year. Stage three of the Ottawa Queensway is also scheduled for opening later this year.

An extensive road programme, including reconstruction work on a number of sections of existing highways, was carried out in the northern areas of the province. Marked progress was made on the \$6 million Rainy Lake causeway, as well as on the remainder of this road link between Fort Frances and Atikokan, with over 46 miles of construction completed or in progress at the end of 1962. The year saw the completion of a new 44-mile secondary highway from Trans-Canada Highway 69 near Burwash to Killarney on Georgian Bay and a 61-mile extension of Highway 101 from Foleyet to Chapleau. Good progress was made on the Savant Lake road and by the fall of 1962 travel was possible over this road and connecting private roads between the mining area of Pickle Crow and the Trans-Canada Highway near Ignace. On the Spruce River road, from Port Arthur to Cheeseman Lake, a 54-mile section was opened last summer with construction under way on an additional 20 miles. This year a new type of road, namely, an industrial road, was added to Ontario's highway network; the first of these roads, from Manitouwadge to Caramat, a distance of 55 miles, was opened in October for public travel.

In the current fiscal year—1962-63—the province's total expenditures on highways and roads are estimated at \$255.5 million, consisting of \$78.9 million for maintenance and \$176.6 million for construction and other capital projects. Provincial road subsidies to municipalities and unincorporated townships in northern Ontario, which are included in the foregoing, total \$79.2 million, of which \$30.1 million is for maintenance and \$49.1 million for capital purposes. If we add to the government's expenditures the amounts spent by municipalities from their own sources of revenue, the combined provincial and municipal outlay for highways and roads totals approximately \$335 million this year, or about \$190 million more than the amount spent only eight years ago.

This budget provides for the further extension and improvement of our highway

and road system. It provides for additional work on Highway 403 in Hamilton and a start on the Brantford by-pass. The first six-mile section of this highway at the east end, from the Freeman's interchange westerly to Longwood Road, north of the Main Street interchange, is expected to be completed and open to traffic by the end of 1963. The reconstruction of Highway 401 through Metropolitan Toronto will be carried on and the construction of other parts of Highway 401 will be accelerated in order to have this major freeway from Windsor to the Quebec border completed by the end of 1963. Work will be continued as scheduled on the Trans-Canada Highway, the Ottawa Queensway, the new controlled access route to the Toronto International Airport, Highway 11 between Fort Frances and Atikokan, and Highway 101 from Chapleau to Wawa. New projects will be started on other King's Highways for the improvement of highway alignment and driving surface. A crash programme to eliminate limited load capacity bridges will be continued in addition to the regular programme of reconstruction of bridges now substandard as to width or structural specifications.

In the coming fiscal year, 1963-64, the appropriations for our highway and road programme total \$275 million, or \$19.5 million more than the interim estimate of expenditures for the current fiscal year. Of this amount, \$82.5 million will be for maintenance and \$192.5 million for capital purposes. Included in the foregoing are road subsidies to the municipalities and unincorporated townships in northern Ontario amounting to \$87.3 million, of which \$34 million will be for maintenance and \$53.3 million for capital programmes. This will provide for a combined provincial and municipal programme for the coming fiscal year of \$362.3 million, an increase of \$27.3 million over the combined total in 1962-63.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about industrial development and trade expansion.

Through The Department of Economics and Development, we have been engaged since April 1, 1962 in an energetic and many-sided programme to stimulate economic growth and development in Ontario. The plan, which was introduced as a 20-point Ontario development programme, headed by the establishment of the Ontario Economic Council, has been implemented in all its essentials. In the coming fiscal year, it is our intention to consolidate, expand and perfect these activities which, in conjunction with other programmes of the government, will

help to secure a brighter economic future for our people.

Foremost in the development programme is the Ontario Trade Crusade. Since September, 1962 the department has sponsored groups of Ontario businessmen on sales missions to Europe and the United States. To date, some 70 manufacturing companies across the province have taken part in this plan and have brought back to Ontario orders in the magnitude of millions of dollars. The success of these missions has been most gratifying and further missions are already scheduled for New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Mexico, as well as the United Kingdom and Europe.

We are also sponsoring a programme of mutual manufacturing agencies designed to bring together manufacturers of related but non-competitive products. This programme permits small and medium-sized manufacturers which have never sold in the export market to participate in Ontario's trade expansion programme. Several actual trading groups have been formed and some 500 Ontario manufacturers have indicated their interest. Initial orders of hundreds of thousands of dollars are coming into Ontario firms as a result of this specific programme.

The Ontario offices that we have established abroad are an integral part of our trade crusade programme. Competent people have been added to the staff in New York, Chicago and London, England, to help in the sale of Ontario products and to work for commercial opportunities which can benefit this province. Extensive renovations and enlargements are being carried out at Ontario House. The new provincial office in Dusseldorf, West Germany, has an effective operation going. The Milan, Italy, office also provides excellent contacts. These offices are making an important contribution in selling this province and its produce abroad.

Ontario's first Manufacturing Opportunities Show was held in Toronto last November and the result was a resounding success. Thousands of imported components were displayed and more than 4,000 potential Ontario suppliers attended. Several million dollars worth of new business was obtained for Ontario manufacturers, replacing imported components. The success of the Toronto show led to the preparation of plans for the holding of further shows at London, Cornwall and North Bay.

The Department of Economics and Development is actively dealing with over 200 foreign companies seeking licensing arrangements with Ontario companies to manufac-

ture their products. A number of manufacturing arrangements have already been finalized which are expected to generate 1,500 new jobs and \$15 million in new business. Contact has also been made with 800 foreign companies for the purpose of encouraging them to set up branch offices in Ontario. Since last April, 51 foreign companies and 43 Canadian firms have established in Ontario and will be utilizing over one million square feet of plant capacity, resulting in \$7 million worth of business to the construction industry alone.

To accelerate the Trade Crusade programme at the consumer level, a consumer service section has been established to act as liaison between the department and the women's organizations of the province. In December a meeting with the women's organizations was held in Toronto and later this month a special conference of women will be held.

Another measure designed to stimulate economic development and provide growing employment opportunities for our people is the establishment of an Ontario development agency. Legislation to this end has already been enacted to enable the province to provide financial, managerial, technical and other forms of assistance to those enterprises and communities located in Ontario which can qualify for such assistance and can demonstrate an ability to contribute significantly towards Ontario's economic growth. Under this programme the government will guarantee loans up to a total of \$100 million. This limit will be raised if such a measure proves to be necessary.

In addition to the further expansion and extension of the specific activities I have mentioned, the plans for the coming year include a number of new programmes. Several important conferences and study groups of manufacturers and labour will be undertaken to encourage standardization of parts used by manufacturers in Ontario. Under the sponsorship of The Departments of Economics and Development, Education, and Labour, a conference will be held in the spring on automation and social change.

Greater attention should be given to new products and new techniques in our economy. With this objective in mind, we will hold a products and techniques show to promote the new products and advanced techniques which have been developed and are available in Ontario.

The Department of Economics and Development will introduce a small-business management training programme in con-

junction with The Department of Education and with the assistance of the federal Department of Trade and Commerce. The objective of this programme will be to provide a series of courses which will cover all basic aspects of business operations. It is scheduled to begin September, 1963, and will be made available to owners or managers of small businesses throughout Ontario.

Legislation will be introduced to encourage the establishment of community development corporations. These corporations will raise funds and finance their operations on a regional and community basis to assist with local or regional industrial development. The community development corporations will be supported by the Ontario Development Agency in cases where the proposed regional or community projects can qualify for such assistance.

A word about natural resources, Mr. Speaker. In order to carry out our important responsibilities in the protection and development of the province's great agricultural, mineral and forest resources, you will be asked to approve ordinary and capital appropriations totalling \$60.5 million for the fiscal year 1963-64 for The Departments of Agriculture, Mines, and Lands and Forests. This involves an increase of \$8.7 million over the combined expenditure estimated for the current fiscal year.

In all of these areas, the past year has been one of substantial progress in the effective management and use of our resources. A number of extensions and improvements in our programmes relating to the natural resource field are planned for the coming year. In this way, we are actively assisting and supporting the valuable industries which are based upon these resources and which are of fundamental importance to our economy and the continued well-being of our people, particularly those living in rural areas or in the northern parts of the province.

In 1962 Ontario's agricultural production reached the highest level ever attained in our history. A preliminary estimate places the gross production at almost \$1.3 billion, or about three per cent above the previous high recorded in 1961. Output of most products held up and prices remained firm over the year.

In recognition of the continuing challenges of farming today, provision is being made for increased help and assistance to the farm community through The Department of Agriculture. While the activities of the department have been directed to the advancement of all facets of farm operation, the development of

modern techniques and increased mechanization have brought about a widening and acceleration of its programmes in the fields of research, marketing and farm business management.

The Ontario Agricultural Research Institute has proven to be of major importance in strengthening our research facilities. The institute co-ordinates and directs all research conducted by the schools and colleges of the department, as well as relating the work of the department with that being done by various industries related to agriculture and the research division of the federal Department of Agriculture. In this way we are better equipped to take advantage of the improved methods, advanced techniques and new opportunities available to us through research.

During the past year a fact-finding committee was appointed to make a study of the problem of vertical integration. One of the suggestions advanced by the committee at the conclusion of its first series of hearings and discussions was the formation of an Ontario food council, to be composed of representatives of producers, processors and consumers. The organization of the council is to be proceeded with this year. Its objectives will be twofold; first to advise the government on general programmes of concern to agriculture, the food industry and the consumer; and secondly, to provide a common meeting place enabling the groups represented to realize a greater understanding of each other's problems.

Legislation has been passed at this session to facilitate in Ontario the application of The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act passed by the federal government. A special branch of the department has been set up to apply desirable provisions of the legislation within the province. Programmes under consideration for implementation include the establishment of community pastures, the expansion of Crown-managed forest lands in areas uneconomic for agriculture, the utilization of unproductive agricultural lands in southern Ontario for recreational purposes, and rural development studies to determine land capability and new economic opportunities.

During the present session, legislation has also been passed to provide for the inspection and control of meat intended for human consumption and of the plants where such animals are slaughtered. The Ontario Act contemplates that the system now used under The Canada Meat Inspection Act will be applied in Ontario and an agreement will be

entered into between the governments of Ontario and Canada for this purpose.

The House has also been advised of the government's intention to reinstate The Junior Farmer Establishment Loans Act. The scope and effectiveness of the legislation will be greatly increased and consideration will also be given to other credit problems associated with the farm.

To carry out the extended programme of The Department of Agriculture, we are providing for the coming fiscal year a total appropriation of \$18.9 million. This is \$1.6 million more than the expenditure estimated for the current fiscal year.

The mining industry continues to be one of the key factors in Ontario's economy, surpassed only by agriculture in dollar importance among the natural resource industries. While the attention of the mining community has been drawn recently to a number of developments outside the province, we have been able to maintain substantial interest and activity in Ontario mining areas. During the past year, two new mines commenced production and substantial development took place at many mining centres in the province, particularly in the Kirkland Lake, Timmins, and Manitowadge areas. Exploration and development work is proceeding at several other points throughout the province.

Through its various programmes, the government is playing an important role in encouraging and facilitating new mining explorations and development. We are determined to ensure that the great mining potential of this province is developed to the best advantage.

Our plans for the coming fiscal year include a further enlargement of the staff of the geological branch to speed up the geological mapping of the province and improve the services which this branch is providing for the Ontario mining industry. The increase in staff will enable us to have 20 geological units in the field compared with 17 in 1962 and 15 in 1963. The federal-provincial aeromagnetic survey is being continued and it is expected that in 1963 an additional 35,000 square miles will be covered, bringing the total so far to 165,000 square miles.

Through the Ontario Research Foundation we are undertaking two research projects of importance to the mining industry. The first is a project to perfect a jet smelting process for iron ore in which natural gas will be used as the fuel. This project opens up exciting prospects for Ontario's iron industry. The replacement of imported coal with natural gas would have a beneficial effect on

our foreign exchange position. The other project is concerned with the development of improved methods of ore dressing.

Our mining roads and roads to resources programmes are of great importance to the development of northern Ontario and its vast resources. Since 1951, we have built, or have under construction, 1,050 miles of roads, either alone or in co-operation with the federal government. Sixty-one mining access roads have been constructed, three roads to resources have been completed and three are in various stages of construction.

For the coming fiscal year, the total net current and capital expenditures of The Department of Mines are forecast at \$3.3 million, an increase of \$0.2 million over the expenditures of the current fiscal year.

In this budget we are providing for the continuation and expansion of the wide range of activities carried out by The Department of Lands and Forests. Of these, the management, protection and regeneration of our forest resources are among the most important. These forestry services are fundamental to the well-being of Ontario's forest-based industries, which in turn are an important factor in our ability to earn foreign exchange.

Approximately 44.2 million seedlings were provided from provincial nurseries during 1962-63. These are planted on Crown land and on private land. This is exclusive of trees planted on Crown lands in co-operation with timber companies and several hundred thousand trees planted for the department by tender. Further experimental use of helicopters for aerial seeding was carried out. This, along with aerial spraying, provides two alternative uses for helicopters under contract to the department for forest protection purposes.

In recent years, substantial strides have been made in the effectiveness of our forest protection services through increased staff, additional facilities, the use of modern equipment, improved training programmes and emphasis on public education and support of our programmes. In 1962, our junior forest ranger programme provided instruction and employed the services of 680 boys in 54 camps throughout northern Ontario, and new and improved training programmes for departmental personnel were introduced.

This is ample evidence of the success and value of our efforts. While the number of forest fires extinguished this year was 15 per cent above normal, the area burned was only 15 per cent of the average annual burn and was the third lowest on record.

The past year was marked by a substantial

addition to the road mileage which has been provided under our forest access road programme. This programme is approved under a federal-provincial agreement providing for the equal sharing by Canada and Ontario of the costs and is divided between The Department of Highways and The Department of Lands and Forests for construction purposes. During the year The Department of Highways has constructed 22.5 miles of class 1 access roads. The Department of Lands and Forests has constructed 17 miles of access roads, the cost of which will be recovered within five years from increased value of stumpage. It also has constructed or improved to a higher standard 94 miles of roads required for stand improvement, planting and timber extraction.

In the coming fiscal year new research programmes will be undertaken to ensure efficiency and improve our varied services, and an expanded reforestation programme is planned. Under our forest access roads programme it is proposed that The Department of Highways will construct 12 miles of class 1 access road and finish surfacing the 1962 construction. The Department of Lands and Forests proposes to construct 44 miles on a recoverable basis and 39 miles required for stand improvement.

For the coming fiscal year you will be asked to provide \$38.4 million to meet the total ordinary and capital expenditures of The Department of Lands and Forests, including \$8.3 million for forest protection, \$8.4 million for timber management and reforestation, \$7.6 million for fish and wildlife, \$7.7 million for parks development and lands and \$6.4 million for conservation authorities.

A word about provincial parks:

In recent years the demand of our people and of visitors from neighbouring jurisdictions for increased camping and recreational opportunities such as those provided in provincial parks has been surprisingly heavy. We are therefore making comprehensive plans to expand and improve our parkland and park facilities. Our parks programme is an important aspect of our efforts to encourage both summer and winter vacationing in Ontario which in turn provides a very real stimulus to business throughout Ontario and to tourist operators and allied concerns in particular.

During 1962, five new provincial parks came into use adding almost 12,000 acres of parkland for the enjoyment of our people and bringing the total acreage actually in use as provincial parks to over 3.5 million acres.

The new parks were Ojibway (6,130 acres) near Sioux Lookout, White Lake (almost 4,000 acres) near White River, Restoule (1,417 acres) west of Powassan, The Chutes (235 acres) near Massey, and Pakwash (71 acres) south of Red Lake.

Use of the 81 provincial parks in operation in 1962 showed a spectacular increase over the previous year. The number of visitors rose 26 per cent to 7.8 million and the number of campers increased 23 per cent to over a million. Attendance at park museums, use of nature trails and attendance at lectures showed a corresponding increase to about half a million people.

Efforts are being made to provide for greater use of provincial parks in winter through the provision of winter sports facilities. Kakabeka Falls Provincial Park has been exceptionally successful as a winter sports area and Darlington Provincial Park near Oshawa and The Pinery near Grand Bend are now being kept open for winter use. A new year-round park is being established in the Killarney area with a proposed extent of approximately 4,000 square miles. In areas where seasonal unemployment is a problem, we are undertaking programmes of development and maintenance during the winter months.

In addition to our provincial parks system the province has responsibility for over a million acres of park reserves and several wilderness areas and has commenced establishment of a representative number of nature reserves across the province typical of each climatic region. Through the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission and the Niagara Parks Commission, the province has been instrumental in developing and maintaining two of the finest parks systems available to tourists anywhere on this continent.

This year we are beginning a 20-year shoreline and parks acquisition programme at an estimated cost of \$200 million. Increasing population and industrialization in Ontario make it imperative for us to commence this programme immediately if we are to meet future requirements for parks and recreational facilities. Briefly, this programme involves the acquisition of Great Lakes shoreline and other lands to provide for parks, recreational facilities, reforestation of idle lands, public hunting and fishing and orderly commercial developments with multiple-use management being stressed. A new branch of The Department of Lands and Forests will be set up to study the needs and plan the development of acquired lands.

This year we are also undertaking a survey of the marine resources of the province

in conjunction with the federal government. The survey will include safe harbour, break-water and dock facilities, marking of wilderness anchorages, channel markings, shore parks and launching ramp facilities. The results of this programme will be of great value to our tourist industry and should attract more pleasure craft to Ontario.

The appropriation for parks development including the shoreline and parks acquisition programme and the survey of marine resources will amount to \$8.3 million in 1963-64 compared with an estimated expenditure on parks of \$4 million this year.

The activities of the Ontario Water Resources Commission continued at an accelerated pace during the 1962-63 fiscal year. This was made possible by the fine co-operation of the municipalities and industry, particularly in respect to disposal of sewage and other wastes. Much was accomplished in the development of water supplies and in the abatement of water pollution.

The commission is endeavouring to assist municipalities by providing water supply and sewage works. It does this by technical guidance to the municipalities and industry, and by arranging for financing, engineering, construction and operation of these works. As the province grows these works are of increasing importance. Even the very small municipalities are desirous of securing public water works and sewage works. These programmes have been of special significance to these communities.

Since the commission began operations in 1957, it has been involved in water and sewage construction projects with 170 municipalities and these works have an estimated cost of more than \$100 million. Over 140 projects constructed by the commission are now in operation. The remainder are in various stages of development and construction. More projects are being added to the list continually. These projects, payment for which is made over a long period of time, are enabling municipalities to take advantage of these essential utilities, thereby providing better living conditions.

The commission recognized at its inception the importance of abating water pollution, a condition which is of world-wide significance today. Accordingly, the programmes undertaken have been directed to the installation of waste treatment facilities and the control of pollution wherever it may occur. This involves municipalities and industry of all kinds. The progress made in this direction so far is most gratifying. Municipalities and industry have co-operated with the com-

mission, and the large construction programme attests to the advances made. The commission is not only interested in the construction of these works, but also in conducting surveys to seek out sources of pollution and also to ensure that the treatment works are operated in an efficient manner. The water resources of the province are a great natural asset, and it is essential that these be preserved for the beneficial use of the people of the province.

The commission is aided in its programme by modern laboratory facilities. This laboratory is now making about 140,000 analyses a year in an effort to assist in these surveys and to seek more efficient and more economical methods for water treatment and waste disposal. The different branches of the commission act jointly in assisting municipalities and industry to solve these many pressing problems. The commission has a staff of highly trained officials, and with the facilities provided to them they are able to make marked contributions to the advancement of water and sewage works.

Expenditures in 1962-63 to support the many services rendered by the Ontario Water Resources Commission are estimated at \$2.3 million for operating expenses and \$14 million for capital purposes. In the coming fiscal year, we are providing \$2.7 million for operating expenses and \$17 million for capital purposes.

A word about housing.

Last year the government, through The Department of Economics and Development, formulated and put into effect a completely new approach to the overall problem of ameliorating the housing needs of low-income families across the province. Known as the "12-Point Programme," it is of an exploratory nature, aimed at determining whether a broader and more flexible programme of governmental assistance in housing is desirable.

One of the points was put into effect immediately. I refer to the "rent certificate plan" whereby privately owned dwelling units are leased and re-allocated on a rent-to-income basis to families who would qualify for normal public housing. During the experimental stage the rent certificate plan has been applied in Metropolitan Toronto only. In the nine months ending December 31, 1962 a total of 114 units had been leased by the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, and further units are being taken over each week. If, as it appears to do, this method provides a valuable supplement to federal-provincial public housing, consideration will

be given to extending it to other centres during the next fiscal year.

Another facet of the new programme is the provision of grants to municipalities and other organizations willing to construct and operate low-rental projects on a non-profit basis. In the city of Toronto a grant of \$500,000 will be provided to assist with the Moss Park low-rental project. This grant is being made with the proviso that it be used for the sole purpose of reducing rentals of those families in the project who, because of their financial circumstances, are most in need of such assistance.

All aspects of the new programme are being fully explored and changes in various parts of the programme or additions to it will be made as they appear necessary. Those parts of the programme which prove their worth will be implemented to the fullest possible extent.

During the past year the normal public housing programme has been pursued with diligence. A total of 767 units of rental housing were under construction during the year and the servicing of 722 land assembly lots for sale to potential homeowners was underway. Within the next few months major projects here in Toronto and across Ontario will leave the drawing-board stage and begin to take shape.

In all we expect to have under development a minimum of 29 rental housing and land assembly projects during the fiscal year 1963-1964. Some of these, for example the \$22 million Thistletown project in Etobicoke and the \$4,652,000 Borden Farm development on the outskirts of Ottawa, will take a number of years to complete. Planning and negotiations toward the development of further projects will continue apace throughout the province so that a steady supply of decent, safe and sanitary accommodation will be made available to lower-income families across Ontario.

The total appropriation for our housing programme in the fiscal year 1963-64 will be \$5.6 million, of which \$4.3 million will be capital expenditure under the dominion-provincial partnership agreement.

No one can fail to be impressed by the staggering amount of financial assistance which is given by the province each year to Ontario's municipalities, school boards and other local authorities. During the current fiscal year, our assistance to local authorities totals \$469 million including \$34.4 million in supplementary estimates. In other words, the province is turning over for local purposes

about 47 per cent of its net ordinary revenue, as compared with 19 per cent in 1942-43.

In the coming fiscal year, our municipal aid will rise to \$486 million. This vast sum is equivalent to 90 per cent of all the revenue we expect to derive from the retail sales tax and from corporation and personal income taxes. Nor does this reflect the substantial assistance rendered through provincial agencies such as the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation and the Ontario Water Resources Commission.

Obviously this huge amount of municipal aid is of tremendous benefit to Ontario's municipalities. It enables them to provide for tremendous expansion and improvement in municipal services throughout Ontario and, at the same time, to keep local tax rates at manageable levels.

Our legislative grants to elementary and secondary school boards have been increased 26-fold since 1943-44. They are estimated at \$219.9 million in the current fiscal year including supplementary estimates at \$18.5 million, and are forecast at \$233.3 million in the coming fiscal year. These amounts include the special per pupil grants payable under The Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grant Act, amounting to \$16.7 million in 1962-63 and \$30.3 million in 1963-64. We are also planning a substantial increase in our assistance to higher education. Grants to universities are expected to amount to approximately \$70 million in the fiscal year 1963-64.

Our subsidies for the maintenance and construction of roads in municipalities and unincorporated townships in northern Ontario have been expanded 11-fold from \$7 million in 1945-46 to \$79.2 million in the current fiscal year. It is planned to increase these subsidies by a further \$8.1 million to \$87.3 million for the coming fiscal year. In addition to the substantial increase in municipal road subsidies, the province has assumed responsibility for many miles of roads formerly under municipal jurisdiction and has constructed many access roads, by-passes and costly road interchanges directly benefiting urban municipalities.

The benefits accruing to our municipalities from a variety of provincial grants programmes in the health and welfare fields are also very important. Under the Ontario Hospital Care Insurance Plan, the province has assumed the cost of hospital deficits previously paid by the municipalities as well as the cost of hospitalization for all provincial welfare cases. Municipalities also receive compensation in a general way under The

Municipal Unconditional Grants Act for their costs in connection with hospital indigency cases. We are also providing substantial payments in connection with hospitals.

In addition to the aid provided in the fundamentally important fields of education, roads, health and welfare, our municipal assistance programme includes a number of other grants and payments arising out of special municipal circumstances and needs. Among the most important of these are the unconditional grants programme and municipal winter works programme. Payments under The Unconditional Municipal Grants Act are expected to rise to \$26.9 million in 1963-64. An appropriation of \$2.8 million will be required in the coming fiscal year for the municipal winter works programme and you will also be asked to provide funds for a number of other municipal aid programmes, including \$6.4 million for conservation, drainage aid and flood control and \$5.8 million for payments to mining municipalities.

I am confident the hon. members will agree that it would be impossible for the province to carry out its responsibilities without the revenue that is being derived from the retail sales tax.

In the fiscal year 1960-61, our net ordinary expenditure for education amounted to \$226.5 million. In the coming fiscal year of 1963-64, we estimate our net ordinary expenditure on education to be \$387.5 million. Therefore, in that three-year period our expenditures in respect of education alone have increased by \$161 million.

In the coming fiscal year of 1963-64 we estimate the collections under The Retail Sales Tax Act to be \$180 million. After allowing the sum sufficient to stabilize hospital insurance premiums, it is clear that the rest of this revenue is less than the increase in the province's expenditure on education in just three years. It is even more clear that the trend in our expenditures on education will continue and so emphasize the need of the retail sales tax and the use being made of the revenues from it. Indeed, I suggest that we should refer to this tax as an educational tax rather than a retail sales tax.

In the individual income tax field we have not, as have certain other provinces, imposed a rate of taxation in excess of the federal withdrawal from the field. Under the new federal-provincial fiscal arrangements that came into effect last April 1, our share of the individual income tax field has been increased from approximately 14 per cent of federal gross rates of tax to 16 per cent in 1962 and

by one additional point in each of the four succeeding years up to 20 per cent in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that there will be no new taxes this year. On the other hand, substantial relief will be provided for dependents under amendments which will be proposed to The Succession Duty Act. Legislation will be introduced to provide tax incentives under The Corporations Tax Act. It is also proposed to amend this latter Act to provide a new basis on which logging taxes payable under The Logging Tax Act will be allowed as tax credits. Minor adjustments to The Retail Sales Tax Act, mainly of an administrative nature, will be introduced.

Amendments will be submitted to The Succession Duty Act to provide a clear exemption of \$60,000 in the case of widows and of \$10,000 for each dependent child.

Legislation will be introduced to permit an alternative date for valuation of listed securities, instead of confining such valuation to the date of death.

It is proposed to insert a notch provision in this Act to ensure that, where property valued in excess of the exemption limits passes to persons in the collateral line or to strangers, the benefit received after payment of the tax will not be less than the amount of the exemption plus one-half of the excess.

The exemption in respect of property passing to strangers will be raised from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Legislation to be presented concerning The Corporations Tax Act will primarily consist of four tax incentive measures.

Two of these arise because of our desire to co-operate by providing in our legislation for changes that have recently been made in The Income Tax Act of Canada affecting the definition of taxable income of corporations. The first of these is an allowance as an expense deduction from income of 150 per cent, instead of 100 per cent, of the increased expenditure on scientific research made by a corporation, while the second is an extension of the deduction allowed for the drilling, exploration, prospecting and development expenses of corporations engaged in the production, refining or marketing of petroleum or natural gas or in mining or in exploring for minerals.

In addition, the legislation will provide for two further incentives. These are designed to stimulate companies engaged in manufacturing in Ontario through the granting of tax credits. These tax credits will be related firstly to increased employment and secondly to increased production facilities.

Certain adjustments to the rules and regulations under The Retail Sales Tax Act will be made so that the remuneration allowed to most vendors with monthly tax collections of less than \$500 will be increased.

As an additional aid to vendors and to facilitate small transactions, legislation will be introduced to raise the exemption from tax so that vendors will be relieved of collecting tax on single transactions of less than 21 cents instead of 17 cents as at present. This change comes into effect now.

It is also proposed to extend certain exemptions in order to remove small anomalies concerning purchases for agricultural and educational purposes.

The rate of tax on logging income will be increased to 10 per cent from nine per cent, but under The Corporations Tax Act the companies concerned will be granted a tax credit equal to one-third of the new 10 per cent logging tax.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to place before you an account of our financial affairs for the current fiscal year and to present a comprehensive and unified programme to meet the requirements of our province and our people in the coming fiscal year. During the past year the buoyancy of the economy has enabled us to carry out a greatly expanded programme and still maintain a strong financial position. This bright conclusion to the fiscal year 1962-63 is due in large part to prudent management and the foresight shown in past budgets in undertaking measures designed to foster economic growth and expansion. While we can take great satisfaction from past achievements, the plan I have outlined for the coming fiscal year demonstrates that we are determined to adapt and improve our policies and programmes, and to undertake new measures, as required by changing conditions and circumstances.

Education continues to present us with our greatest challenge. The demand for new educational facilities which we are experiencing is indicative of the enormous growth we can expect in enrolment within the next few years, particularly at institutions of higher learning. We are required not only to provide for greatly increased enrolment but to adapt our educational system to meet the new needs of our highly specialized and industrialized society. In proposing sharply increased expenditures for education we are taking aggressive action in fulfilling our responsibility to the young people of this province. These expenditures will not only assist in providing the necessary facilities to accommodate our

growing school population but will pay rich dividends in the future in terms of a well-educated population and a highly skilled labour force.

Many of the expenditure programmes proposed in this budget will exert a number of positive effects upon our economy. Our expenditures to promote trade and industrial development will not only stimulate employment and make better use of our present productive capacity, but will have a continuing benefit by encouraging the expansion of existing industries and the establishment of new ones. Our highways and roads programme will meet the demands imposed by increased motor vehicle registrations and improve the efficiency of Ontario's existing transportation system; it will also open up new areas of the province, providing new opportunities, particularly in northern Ontario. The vast sums of money which this budget proposes for municipal and school purposes will provide very substantial benefits for local ratepayers and at the same time will assist in the provision of the facilities required for future growth at the local level.

In formulating our plans for the coming year, we have been deeply conscious of the continuing need for economy. We must exercise the greatest possible vigilance over our controllable expenditures if we are to preserve our capacity to make the most of our opportunities. By careful planning, we have been able to provide for a record-breaking expenditure and at the same time to introduce a number of tax reductions and tax incentive measures.

In fact, this budget is a comprehensive plan, designed with painstaking care, to ensure that the needs and requirements of our people will be met in 1963-64. At the same time, it is a plan to strengthen the foundations upon which future economic growth and higher living standards will be based. I am sure the hon. members will agree that it

provides a vigorous and dynamic plan of action by which we can participate to the fullest extent of our ability in the challenging task of providing a better way of life for our people.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): May we revert to introduction of bills?

Mr. Speaker: I would ask permission of the House to revert to introduction of bills.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-61

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, that concludes the order of business for today. Tomorrow morning we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Travel and Publicity. I can assure the hon. members that this is the last sitting of the House where we will have a short session. Hereafter, we will go to 6 o'clock in the afternoon and night sessions will be the order of the day.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Before putting the motion, I would wait a moment or two in order to allow the distribution of the books. For any of the members not present in their places, their copies will be put into their desks.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.20 of the clock, p.m.

APPENDIX 1

PROVINCIAL GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES,
FISCAL YEAR 1963-1964

	<i>Maintenance Grants</i>	<i>Capital and Special Grants</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>(\$000's)</i>	<i>(\$000's)</i>	<i>(\$000's)</i>
University of Toronto	13,050	6,507	19,557
for Ontario College of Education	1,736	—	1,736
University of Western Ontario	2,300	3,500	5,800
Queen's University	2,100	3,000	5,100
McMaster University	1,950	3,500	5,450
Carleton University	1,200	3,000	4,200
University of Waterloo	1,350	3,000	4,350
University of Windsor (including Essex College)	1,300	3,700	5,000
University of Ottawa for instruction in Medicine and the Sciences	1,100	1,300	2,400
York University	900	5,400	6,300
Laurentian University of Sudbury	425	1,750	2,175
Lakehead College of Arts, Science and Technology	210	300	510
Trent University	175	300	475
Ontario College of Art	250	—	250
Osgoode Hall Law School	150	—	150
Ontario Graduate Fellowships	—	1,500	1,500
Extended Graduate Programme	—	3,000	3,000
Special Fund available to Universities for Temporary Accommodation	—	2,000	2,000
Special Grants for Archaeological Research	10	—	10
TOTAL	<u>28,206</u>	<u>41,757</u>	<u>69,963</u>



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Friday, February 8, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Friday, February 8, 1963

Estimates, Department of Travel and Publicity, Mr. Cathcart	563
Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	589
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	589

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1963

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery students from Woodbridge Public School, Woodbridge.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Before the orders of the day I have a question directed to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay). I do not know if the hon. Minister is prepared to answer it today.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): I do not have the answer at the moment but perhaps it would be as well if the hon. member put it in *Hansard* and I will get it for him.

Mr. Troy: I thank the hon. Minister and I shall do that. I wonder if the hon. Minister is yet prepared to answer that question on Spruce Park, which was presented last November?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I am sorry; the answer no doubt is ready but I don't have it here. I will look it up. Would the hon. member put the question that he had in mind for today?

Mr. Troy: Yes. The question is: Is the Ontario Northland Railway Commission conducting, or has it conducted, research into the feasibility of constructing a spur line from the present terminal at North Bay to a port on Georgian Bay?

Coupled with this is another question: If the answer is in the affirmative, will the report of this survey be presented to the Legislature at this session?

The third question is: What is the cost per mile of the new spur line that is being built to service the Adams Mine?

And fourth, is the hon. Minister prepared yet to announce to this House that the commission of the Ontario Northland Railway has been reorganized and if the reorganization has been completed, would he name the personnel, including the name of the permanent chairman?

House in committee of supply; Mr. H. M. Allen in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF
TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2201:

Hon. B. L. Cathcart (Minister of Travel and Publicity): Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to express my personal regret, and I am sure that of the House, that it is necessary—while we have a lot of regard for our chairman—that our good friend the appointed chairman is presently under the weather and cannot be with us. My report is that he is doing very well and we can look forward to his return very shortly. And I should say that the appointed chairman is the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney), so that we have that in *Hansard*.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago last December it was my privilege as the responsible Minister to present the estimates of The Department of Travel and Publicity to this House, and at that time I expressed my appreciation to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) for making an early presentation possible. I would like to say again that this is a pleasure, and it means a great deal to our department to have the privilege of presenting the estimates at this early date because of our need for early planning and the assurance that it does give to our many tourist organizations that we are very much in business and ready to go.

Mr. Chairman, before talking in particular about the estimates, I would like to take this moment to pay tribute to our present Speaker, and some of his predecessors, and also to our very charming guides in their red jackets for encouraging and arranging for the pupils of our schools to attend the sittings of this

House. I am sure their visits leave an impression on their minds of the importance of taking a greater interest in public affairs and that we can expect as a result an increase, in the days to come, in the percentage of voters in our elections.

As a matter of fact, when I took my seat this morning, I looked up in the gallery and we have with us a school teacher from East Kent, Mrs. Craven and her son Howard. She has set an example for many of our schools inasmuch as over quite some years she has made an effort to bring 50 to 100 pupils down to make a tour of these buildings, to sit in the House, and hear just what is going on. So I pay tribute to Mrs. Craven.

Last year I stated in my speech that 1962 would be an even better year than 1961, and I am indeed happy to say that my forecast was correct. I would just like to cite briefly, in support of Ontario's tourist programme, what has happened and what was commenced in 1962 that has had an effect on the programme.

First, our tourist operators and allied service industries enjoyed an overall increase of 8 per cent in income from tourist spending.

Second, 5,285,568 cars entered Ontario on travellers' vehicle permits. This was an increase of 4.7 per cent over the previous year and represented 73.9 per cent of the total cars entering Canada.

Third, there were 224 new tourist establishments with 2,008 units of accommodation built in 1962, and additions were made to 358 establishments in the amount of 1,884 units of accommodation.

Fourth, 418,524 inquiries from tourists were serviced through our office here in Toronto, which is an increase of 30,158 over 1961.

Fifth, we carried out three community surveys. These were conducted at Wiarton, Morrisburg and Wallaceburg, to measure the value of the tourist industry to municipalities and to serve them as a guide to better planning.

Sixth, there were 41 historical plaques erected, bringing the total to 309 over the past 6 years.

Seventh, under the new policy of the Liquor Control Board, some six agency stores were established in north and northwestern Ontario, four summer stores in various parts of the province, and I understand there are more being given study and consideration at this moment.

Eighth, there has been a sharp increase in winter activities with at least some \$2 million being invested in all types of facilities such

as chair lifts, T-bars, poma-lifts, toboggan slides, rope tows, and of course, accommodation facilities. Also, an increasing number of communities are holding three-day winter carnivals which feature all types of winter activities. In fact, just last weekend I had the pleasure and the privilege of opening two such carnivals, one at Minden and one at Orillia and there are others that will be carrying out similar programmes at Barrie, Penetang and elsewhere during the rest of this winter.

We in the department are doing everything we can to encourage these activities in order to expand the tourist season to 12-months rather than the old two months period. We placed advertisements in newspapers and on radio throughout southwestern Ontario, which are not only heard in southwestern Ontario but of course are heard in the different States along our borders. We started these in January and we will continue them until the end of the winter season.

Ninth, The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act has been passed which will promote further economic development and guarantee loans not otherwise available through normal channels or the federal Industrial Development Bank.

Tenth, we have about 300 miles of access roads which have been built up through the north which will open up new areas to the vacationing public.

Eleventh, we have eight new service centres along Highway 401 all under construction, some of them almost completed and certainly they will be ready by spring. In each one of these service centres there will be an area set aside—and I should say built by the oil companies themselves—for the use of regional tourist councils as information bureaux.

Twelfth, the new reception centre at Windsor is nearing completion and will be in operation this spring. At the same time, centres such as those at Cornwall, Prescott, Sault Ste. Marie, and so on, which have been by-passed by new international bridges, are being replaced by The Department of Public Works.

I would just like to mention for a moment as well among these items, the great interest that is being taken in the promotion of our convention business throughout this province. I might be forgiven if I just point out what is happening in my own riding: a few short years ago there was little interest. Today we have, according to the report of the Sarnia Chamber of Commerce, over 800 units of accommodation available in the Greater Sarnia

area and additional ones are under construction at this moment. Last year Sarnia hosted some 2,000 delegates and this has created the right impression because I am now advised that they have confirmation of between 5,000 and 6,000 delegates slated for this year already, which I am told will leave, according to their own calculations, some two-thirds of a million dollars in the municipality.

I should add, of course, that our own capital city of Toronto last year enjoyed, according to their own records, well over a \$100 million industry. We are doing what we can to encourage and support the convention business and if I may I would just like to read into the record a letter which I signed personally and sent out to executives of industries and corporations. It was mailed last Monday, and already we have replies to a very large extent. With your permission I would like to read the letter which I signed and sent out, because it is attracting a great deal of interest on the part of these industrial executives; and I would like to give one or two quotes from some of the replies that I have received.

Dear Mr. -----

I do not need to point out to you that in the solution of many of the problems which it faces the government must rely on the active assistance and co-operation of leaders of the business and professional community like yourself.

For some years now, for example, we have suffered from a rather sizeable unfavourable balance of tourist dollars. We are a travelling people, we Canadians, and in the interests of better world understanding it is good that this is so. The problem, however, is that per capita we have been making a lot more visits to the United States and abroad than our fellow North Americans and our friends in Europe have been making to our country.

Recent research into the travel industry has clearly demonstrated that a large percentage of travel is influenced by family and business ties. The significant and fast-growing role of conventions and tourism is an obvious example. Yet we in Ontario and in Canada generally have not always perhaps been as active as our friends to the south in selling our towns and cities and our resort areas as desirable sites for business and professional get-togethers.

Among the recommendations that have recently reached us from the Ontario Economic Council's committee on the tourist industry, has been the suggestion that industrial, professional and commercial

organizations in this province might through their many liaisons in the United States and the United Kingdom and on the Continent, arrange more visits to Ontario by their foreign associates. Whether these be executive conferences, sales meetings, trade associations or professional conventions, Ontario has outstanding facilities. They are admirably geared to a small get-together at a hunting lodge, a conference in a resort hotel or a major convention in a large city.

Some of your associates outside Ontario may not have visited our province. Indeed the full range of what it has to offer in this line may not even be known to you. As a result, I am arranging for the full facilities of my department to be made available to you in exploring arrangements along this line.

Mr. F. A. Venn, director of the information branch, and his knowledgeable staff, are presently co-operating with the visitor and convention bureaus throughout the province and will increase their activities in this regard.

From such business-based tourism of course we gain not only a most welcome contribution to our balance of payments, but we do make new friends for the province in an influential segment of the world community and may well in addition interest new foreign investment.

But I am confident that you are already well ahead of me in seeing the potentialities. May we count on your help to make them work for all of us over the next few years. And if you have any specific recommendations for the development of this further aspect of Ontario's trade crusade, which could help expand the contribution of tourism, to our economic growth, they will certainly be most welcome. Tourism is already Ontario's third largest export industry and it can and does work for all of us.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of that letter only mailed last Monday, I have received a very large number of replies which indicates the interest on the part of these people. I would just like to quote a passage or two from one or two of the letters. Here is one received from a corporation, an industry here in Ontario:

Thank you very much for your letter of February 4th, 1963. You may be sure that the people in our small company are very aware of the importance of the tourist trade to our province. But your letter has emphasized this in a novel and compelling

manner and I am taking the liberty of circulating it among our executives and posting it on the bulletin board of the company.

Another quote:

Three weeks ago I was at a sales meeting in Cleveland. At this meeting district managers from the U.S., as well as personnel from our head office, were present and one evening they showed a film put out by your department on the Trent water system. This film had been borrowed from the Cleveland public library and I must say it was very well received by all present. I spent at least a half an hour afterwards answering questions asked by the various men present.

The Trent waterway film was one which was produced by The Department of Travel and Publicity and has been in circulation now for a couple of years.

Another short quote from another executive:

I am sure that we will do everything we can to attract them and to encourage their visits. We will do our best and I thank you for writing.

I look forward to great results from this letter, and this is certainly indicated by the responses to date.

Mr. Chairman, while Ontario's picture is indeed a rosy one, we are ever mindful, as I indicated last year, that the travel industry is more competitive today than ever before, since it is the largest single earner of foreign currency for many countries of this world. With this in mind, last spring I had the deputy Minister of the department attend the meeting of the International Union of Official Travel Organizations in Lausanne, Switzerland, to find out what other countries are doing and where they expect to obtain their major markets in the future. Possibly I should explain that the International Union of Official Travel Organizations is composed of most of the countries of the world and at their meetings they discuss all aspects of tourism, including the availability of markets and how best to reach them.

A most interesting fact coming out of this conference is that all countries look upon the United States as a primary source of tourist revenue which has barely been tapped and warrants being thoroughly exploited. Since this is also our major market, it is very obvious that we will have to be able to compete successfully with all of these countries which are channelling their budgets into this area. At the same time, the United States of America is making every effort to

attract foreign travellers and the various states of the union are increasing their budgets with the same objective in mind. Canada is looked upon as one of their prime markets.

As a further example, I might say that last year the state of Michigan established a senate committee for the sole purpose of studying all aspects of the tourist business and determining what they must do to attract more visitors. A special request came to me to have my deputy Minister attend one of their hearings. This he did and it was very obvious from his report that this committee placed the utmost importance upon the need to obtain more tourist dollars to enrich the economy of the state and that they looked upon Ontario not only as a prime market, but also as the major example in North America of a government that was giving recognition to the vital importance of this industry. As a result of these hearings the budget of the Michigan Tourist Council was increased by 25 per cent, and in addition greater attention than ever before is being paid to those services catering to the tourist industry, such as parks, restaurants and other facilities.

I only mention these things as an indication of the international competition which exists for the tourist dollar. The Department of Travel and Publicity, in co-operation with other departments of the government and associations such as the Tourist Resorts of Ontario, the Tourist Courts Association, Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters Association, the Ontario Hotel Association, etc. has assured Ontario the major share of the tourist revenue coming into Canada. However, we are not by any means resting on our laurels. We are continually reassessing our own methods by taking every opportunity to have a thorough look at our industry on a local, provincial, national and international basis to ensure that we remain the recognized leaders in this field.

It was for this reason that we decided it would be wise to adopt similar practices utilized by any successful business and have a complete organizational survey conducted by the organization and methods branch of The Treasury Department to confirm our own feelings that certain basic changes would achieve a greater efficiency and enable us to meet our aims and objectives more adequately.

As a result of this study, a certain amount of reorganization is being implemented in all branches, and in particular I would mention a travel research branch will be established in order that we may develop yardsticks for the measurement of the tourist market, its

effect on the economy, the trends within this market and the various factors which affect it. This branch will make possible the centralization of all information which can be used by management as an aid to making intelligent decisions in the areas of overall departmental administration and in the programming of individual functions. It will also permit us to obtain statistics never available before and confirm figures from other sources used in the past.

In addition, we encouraged the establishment of and appointed a tourist industry committee of the economic council to review this province's tourist industry as it is affected by current policies and the practices of all provincial departments, federal and municipal governments and private agencies in the field. This committee works very closely with our department, The Department of Economics and Development and with each of the other government departments such as Lands and Forests, Highways, Municipal Affairs, and so on, which are also very much concerned. I know its members would wish to join with me in expressing sincere appreciation to these departments for the ready and ever-increasing co-operation which we enjoy.

I would like at this time to elaborate to some extent on the work of the tourist industry committee and to express publicly my appreciation for the exceptionally fine work that is being done by its members under the chairmanship of Mr. W. H. Cranston, with whom I am sure most of the hon. members of the House are personally acquainted. He is the executive vice-president of the Shoe Corporation of Canada, a vice-president of the Ontario Regional Development Council and for the last number of years chairman of our Ontario Archaeological and Historic Sites Advisory Board. The personnel of this committee were not selected in relation to geography or for special interest considerations, but were drawn almost entirely from people not directly concerned with the tourist industry, but who were intensely interested as citizens in its welfare and development.

This tourist committee has held 12 public hearings in Toronto, London, Chatham, Grimsby, Napanee, Ottawa, Orillia, Kenora, the Lakehead, Cochrane, Timmins and Sudbury to which all public and private agencies engaged in tourism—municipal councils, boards of trade and individuals—were invited to express their opinion. Over 120 briefs and verbal submissions have been made. In addition to the above, sessions have been held with the Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters, the joint board of Ontario Travel Associa-

tions, the Ontario Hotel Association, the Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union, the Ski Area Operators Association and others.

It is interesting to note that a great many of these briefs concerned other departments of government which have been most co-operative and receptive to discussions with and recommendations from the committee.

The first recommendation stemming from the committee concerned the holding of a souvenir and handcraft competition and exhibition which we have undertaken in co-operation with The Department of Economics and Development. The competition is now in its final stages and the response has been overwhelming, with approximately 3,000 entries received to date. I am sure this project will provide increased employment in Ontario by encouraging and promoting the design, production and distribution of Ontario-made souvenirs and handcrafts and that we will be seeing these products in our stores and shops in ever-increasing numbers.

The entries will be on display at the Toronto Spring Gift show in the industrial building at the Canadian National Exhibition Park where designers, producers, wholesalers and retailers will have an opportunity to view the products and make on-the-spot contracts. Our own hon. Prime Minister, who announced this programme and has continued to give full encouragement and full support, will be joining with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) and me in hosting the preview of this Ontario souvenir and handcraft exhibition on Monday, February 18, 1963 and I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that you and all hon. members of this House will endeavour to be present and view this display. I can assure you that you will be amazed at the variety and quality of products which the people of Ontario are capable of producing in this field.

I should point out that a study shows that over these past years some \$45 million of souvenirs and handcrafts were imported for sale to our travelling public; \$45 million for Canada as a whole and some \$33 million worth of these articles for Ontario alone. There is no doubt that this is a market which we have been overlooking to some extent. One is pretty disturbed and concerned when you walk along looking for souvenirs to take back home with you as a conversation piece or tell your neighbours about your visit to a certain part of Ontario; you pick up the article and you find when you turn it over—although it may be a map of Ontario on a linen towel, or whatever it may be—you find that somebody had manufactured this in some other country, such as Japan, Germany or the

USA. And so these are the things that we should overcome. We will, I am sure; and we will find our Ontario souvenirs and hand-craft on our counters in greater numbers and available to the travelling public so that it will increase the number of jobs for our people. I think if we all get behind this and keep impressing on the people the importance of this work, great advantages will come to us.

Mr. Chairman, I would not want to overlook, and certainly I would be remiss if I did not make some reference to, the regional tourist councils which have been formed as a result of the programme of matching grants which we initiated two years ago. Thirty of the 31 regions are now organized and are actively promoting and developing their particular sections of this province of Ontario. Many of them are producing attractive brochures, providing information centres on a local basis and establishing attractions such as The Lumbermen's Village planned for the Upper Ottawa Valley; the Indian Village at Golden Lake; and Fort St. Pierre at Fort Frances which will be completed this spring.

The service centres being constructed along Highway 401, to which I referred before, will provide an additional opportunity for our regional tourist councils to join together in providing information services to the travelling public. As I said, some eight of these centres will be available and we hope they will be staffed through the regional tourist councils, so that they can provide information and assistance to the travelling public in their own regions in particular.

There is much more that I could say but I feel it is only necessary for me to emphasize that tourism is one of Ontario's largest industries; that it concerns many departments of this government, in fact the government as a whole, and that it is the concern, as well, of each and every citizen of this province. We are all in the business; we are all sales managers and shareholders. It is our one big export in which the customers come to us to buy; pay cash for their merchandise and yet leave their purchases behind for the next person to enjoy. That is why, as the Minister of Travel and Publicity, I am most anxious for the counsel of each and every hon. member of this House in relation not only to the development of the potential tourist attractions in his own riding but in programmes which will benefit the whole province.

This is not a business that is confined to any one side of this House, for it affects all of us. For example, the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) asked the other day

what might be done to make better use as a tourist attraction of the caves in Bruce county, which are some eight miles from Wiarton. He is also exploring at the moment a suggestion of the tourist industry committee for co-operation between the federal Indian Affairs branch, Lands and Forests and our own department in the possible creation of an Indian public park in the Cape Crocker reservation similar to that which I mentioned contemplated at Golden Lake in eastern Ontario.

The hon. member has every reason for this interest and concern since the preliminary results of a survey conducted by our department in the town of Wiarton this past year shows that, over a ten-week period during the summer, visitors to this town spend almost a half-million dollars and this figure does not include major purchases for such things as lumber, appliances, boats, etc. Also during this period 70 per cent of all spending within the town was accounted for by visitors, 60 per cent of whom were travelling with children and stayed longer than 11 days.

According to the estimate of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, \$550 million was spent in Canada by foreign visitors during 1962. I mentioned earlier some 73.9 per cent of that total of Canada's travel business came to Ontario. If this is the case, then Ontario's share is well in excess of \$350 million and when we add to that the money spent in Ontario by Canadian people, by visitors from our sister provinces, the many people who come up from New York State through Quebec and into Ontario, we have indeed an industry approaching one billion dollars and an industry which warrants everyone's complete support and co-operation at all levels.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, before we have the opportunity of making some general comments, I wonder if the hon. Minister would advise us as to whether or not an annual report has been published for the year ending March 31, 1962?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: No, the report has not been published for the year 1962.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a most frustrating experience for the hon. members of this Legislature who come here to try to do a job. It is about 11 months now since the fiscal year 1962 ended, and yet hon. members are being asked this afternoon to come here and intelligently discuss a department, and the department has not even had the courtesy—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Eleven months since 1962 ended? Let me get this straight, I just want to know.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Since the fiscal year, do not confuse—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Would the hon. member please keep quiet? It is bad enough to read what he says without having to listen to it.

I wanted to ask the hon. member for Wentworth whether he said 11 months since the end of 1962?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am sorry I did not get the comments of the hon. Minister. My question to the hon. Minister—and I will repeat it because I think it is very important—has an annual report been published for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1962? Now did the hon. Minister change the original comment or has it not been published yet?

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): We do not even get an answer now. March to February, 11 months.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I can only assume that it has not been published, and surely, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: May I reply? I just got a note here.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. Minister mean he did not know?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am advised that the 1962 report is being prepared and will be filed before this House rises.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out the absurdity of trying to come here and intelligently discuss a problem which is of vital concern to every citizen in the province of Ontario. I point out to you, sir, that the tourist industry, while in terms of expenditure as far as this government is concerned there is perhaps too much money spent in relation to the overall budget, nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, the tourist industry is a very important segment of this province. It is of vital importance to the development of our north country, it is of vital importance to a great number of people who depend upon the tourist industry for a living.

Now here is the department that is responsible for the development of this important segment of our province and a government which gives lip service to advising the hon. members of this House that they

are vitally concerned with it; and yet the hon. Minister brings his estimates to the Legislature today and we have not even had the opportunity to read the last annual report.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have complained about this in the House before. I say to you, sir, that it is a very important principle that I am debating and the principle is simply this: if hon. members of this House are going to be able to intelligently discuss the affairs of this province surely, sir, it is not unreasonable to suggest that we at least be given the facts on which to discuss them. If the government is not prepared to put these on our desks on time I can only conclude one of two things: they have been negligent in their duty, or they do not wish us to discuss the matter intelligently with all the facts in front of us.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister and the government must stand condemned for this. I think it is not fair, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members of this Legislature. It can only result, the only possible result which can come from this, is that we do a second-class job and we do not do the proper job for the people who sent us here in the first place.

I almost think—

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Would the hon. member allow the government to state this to him, that the annual report of The Department of Travel and Publicity is prepared on a calendar year basis. The calendar year ended some 34 or 35 days ago. It has been at the printers now and great expedition was used in getting it to the printers so it would be available. The hon. member has offered some very critical comments and I think it is only fair that the government have an opportunity of expressing its view on this matter.

This is an annual report and it is impossible to have this available to the House any sooner than this, February 8.

Mr. Singer: Why were the estimates on so early then?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I presume the hon. Minister is speaking for the government and I ask him in all sincerity if the hon. Minister is telling me that this is prepared on a calendar year and if this House is being asked to debate, as I understand we are, the estimates for the year ending March 31, 1964, if the government is giving to us for discussion the report of the year 1961? How can the hon. Minister in conscience advise this

House that we are being given a fair opportunity to intelligently discuss this problem?

We are concerned with it, Mr. Chairman. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the estimates of The Department of Travel and Publicity have been brought to this Legislature, for the past four years since I have come here, in a very drab manner. There really has not been in my opinion any sincere conviction behind the department in their efforts to take a serious look at this problem.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, this is part of the debate in relation to the estimates. This is perfectly correct, this is part of the estimates of the department. Now I have given the answer as to why this report cannot be ahead of this and I think the hon. member has to accept it.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): May I ask the hon. Minister, why is the report based on the calendar year?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: First of all, I would ask the deputy Minister if he could tell me if there was any legal obligation to prepare a report at all. The reports are prepared for public information.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: This is a technicality.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: No, this is not a technicality. The reports are prepared for public information, the hon. Minister comes into this House for the information of the other hon. members and it is to him that any question can be put.

An hon. member: What utter rot.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister now speaks about a legal position. Now I say to him that if this government does not feel that they have a moral and a proper responsibility to the hon. members of this House to present a report that is their business; let them stand up and say so. But let us get away from the farce of bringing out a report which is absolutely useless to us if we are going to intelligently discuss the problem.

I think it is a fair point. I think it is a valid point. I am sure that the hon. gentlemen opposite who are interjecting at this point would not think of being part of any organization where they went in a business-like manner to discuss the estimates for a future year and they were given a report that was a couple of years old concerning the operations of the business.

Mr. Singer: Including the Minister of all the departments.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: We are not experts and we do not on this side of the House profess to be experts on this matter, but I think this point is elementary. Surely, Mr. Chairman, if the department is doing the job that we are being told that it is doing this afternoon, it is reasonable to publish the facts and let the hon. members decide, let this Legislature decide, whether or not they are as they say they are. I am not suggesting that I am doubting anybody's word, I am merely saying that it leaves this side of the House with some doubts as to whether the situation is really as good as they tell us it is.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if the backbenchers over there are not interested in this, perhaps they can go out and play cards or something and those of us who are interested can proceed.

Maybe the most appropriate comment at this stage, Mr. Chairman, is the old Confucian saying that he who blows his top admits he has lost the argument. The hon. Minister proved it a moment ago, but he had lost the argument before he began on this.

However, I want to deal fairly with this point because this is something I think we should get settled. I sent out and had a check and it is correct, that the report is on the basis of a calendar year. We have the report for the year 1961, we are now awaiting the report for 1962.

Now I really have two comments to make here. The first one is that this is a big improvement over most of the departments over there, because if we are within a matter of weeks of getting a report for a calendar year that ended on December 31, 1962, this is a big improvement over the other departments. But that still does not remove the basic point, that if we are going to have a discussion of estimates in this department, and if the self-appointed spokesman for the government this morning is going to argue that there is no legal obligation to publish a report at all, it is just published for public information, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if it is going to be published for public information, it should be published when it is of some value and not an historical record that is going to be put in the archives. And surely it flows from that that we should have it before we discuss the estimates. And therefore the hon. Minister should not come into the House and say he is pleased and he is

gratified—and all of the other rosy outflow of words which he has developed so magnificently for the opening of these carnivals—to have his estimates brought on early. In fact they are brought on so early that we have not got the information to judge them as accurately and as validly as we might.

Now we have argued about this every year, year in and year out. We have discussed it in the select committee on government organization, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, just a kindly word of advice to the government, that this is something that should get settled. If the annual report is at the printers, I submit to you we should not have the estimates before the House this morning. Let them be brought in when we have all the information and then we will not have this needless kind of bickering which does not contribute either to the dignity of this House or the carrying on of the work.

While I would submit to the hon. Minister from Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) that it is rather difficult to pump life into this dead corpse on the other side, an intervention on his part every five minutes, pounding the desk when another dull point is being made by the hon. Minister, is not going to pump life into it. So just a kindly word of advice to him, that he is not adding very much either.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the only point I want to make with regard to the estimates this morning is really one that is not in the estimates—but I wonder why it is not. The function of this department is to promote the province of Ontario, to promote the government of Ontario. It is a public relations job, and I think I am correct that this department handles through one of its branches, the advertising which is done on behalf of the various departments of government. Am I correct?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: To some extent.

Mr. MacDonald: To some extent. Well, fine. We usually get into an argument as to which of the agencies is doing it and to what extent. That is not the point I want to make. I am not objecting to any government promoting the work that it is doing. I am not objecting to any government promoting the province of Ontario, which is the main function at which this hon. Minister spends most of his time. This is fine. But there is one interesting difference, or one interesting new area that has emerged, and it has emerged in such proliferation in the last year or two that I think it should be brought out into the open.

Apparently this government feels that each of its individual Ministers has a public image that is so frayed at the edges that the individual Minister must have some public relations job done on him. And it would be very interesting if somebody were to do a study throughout all of the departments as to the amount of public money that is being spent on people whose function is really to promote the Minister—to do public relations for the Minister.

Now we have reached a rather interesting state in the government when this amount of public money has to be spent just to refurbish the tarnished image of the various hon. Ministers in the Cabinet. And this in fact is the case. This—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Who is receiving this money for this particular purpose?

Mr. MacDonald: I am not going to single out any person, I am talking about all of the special assistants who have been appointed, PR people who have been appointed to Ministers; whether this hon. Minister has one or not—

He has not got one?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, I do not have one.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister says he has not. I am talking about the expenditure of money in this new area of image makers.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I do spend several days a week out—

Mr. MacDonald: Image makers, people whose prime responsibility while being paid from the public purse is to promote the image of the Minister who hires them. And the government, the province of Ontario, I submit, in this new picture is of secondary concern. If this is going to continue—if the government thinks the need is that great, and quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I would agree the need is great—I think the image has become so tarnished—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: May I say to the hon. member—

Mr. MacDonald: Whether or not it is a valid proposition for public moneys to be spent by a whole range of PR people who are building the Ministers concerned, I submit is something perhaps we should give some consideration to. It would be interesting for somebody to do a little bit of a study within the government as to how much money is being spent in this fashion.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is what I had the methods survey for.

Mr. MacDonald: And when it has been done, as a final bit of friendly advice to the government, I submit that next year it should be in the estimates of this department so we would have the facts before us.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Mr. Chairman, may I just say in reply to this one remark anyway: Sometimes for your information I am almost embarrassed because of the fact that I do a great deal of travelling, a great deal of contacting, a great deal of interviewing with associations, et cetera, and sometimes I feel as though I rather submerge the department because of my personal interest in the many factors that we have to deal with.

I would just like to say too, in regard to the report which we are concerned about, that of course pretty much the total statement is in the public accounts of the moneys that we expended last year.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, then, why was the money not on the annual report?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, because, as the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has said, this is important to get it out to the people. I have said, with all due respect, the report will be available before the House rises. It is being prepared and it will be filed. I am just pointing out that the information is all here—the spending of the money for last year—in public accounts. I am not trying to protect or to take anything away from your statements. Sure, it is nice to have the report, but as the hon. Minister has said the report is really for the benefit of the people of this province and we get it out to them.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. members opposite are here to ask questions, now go ahead and ask them.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): At the outset I would tell the hon. Minister that it is not my intention to be personally critical of him. However, Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility to ask questions, as the leader of the government has said. Mr. Chairman, I beg your indulgence to ask some specific questions at this time.

The hon. Minister has said that the total industrial or the total tourist trade activity in Ontario approximates a billion dollars. Now I understand from those who should know that 15 cents of each tourist dollar which is spent in Ontario, or any other jurisdiction,

basically comes back to the government by way of revenue. I estimate therefore that this department is responsible for a total of \$150 million by way of revenue to the province.

Mr. Chairman, I say without hesitation that this department has failed more dismally than any other department in offering the opportunity to develop economic activity in this province. In 1948, 45 per cent of all American tourists who travelled abroad came into Canada. At the present time, it is 22 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, you can talk from now to doomsday but the simple fact is that the hon. Minister obviously had great difficulty in finding a programme or policy to enunciate this morning. I can appreciate his difficulty. He referred to platitudes, he referred to sites here and there that are being built to attract tourism. But in terms of real fundamentals, Mr. Chairman, I ask you what is being done? He lauded the state of Michigan for setting up a Senate investigation but what type of investigation has ever been undertaken here except by one man—the deputy?

The public of Ontario knows very well that we have not had the leadership and the programming and the policy in respect to the tourist trade that we should have had for the past 20 years. The simple fact is we have lost the initiative. For lack of imagination, for a lack of business approach to this whole problem we have failed. And, Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I, that much of this province is dependent for its economic livelihood on the tourist trade.

The great northland, all the area north of this territory, is much dependent on tourism. Of all jurisdictions, of all countries, of all provinces, we should give primary consideration to this factor. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development rightly worries about imbalances of trade; but sir, I point out to you that we have an imbalance in Ontario today in respect to tourist trade. It is my understanding that more dollars leave Ontario than come into Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is correcting itself.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Is correcting itself? Of course, but it is a very unfortunate and a very pathetic commentary on this important aspect of economic activity. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that had we envisaged the potential of the tourist industry 20 years ago, what we could not have done!

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): The Liberals did not have any roads up there.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister talks about conventions.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Before the hon. leader of the Opposition labours that particular item, we did set up the tourist committee of unbiased people who were—

Mr. Wintermeyer: Let me give the hon. Minister some suggestions that have been made to me.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister said that we have convention activities. I challenge the hon. Minister to tell me what convention of 500 or more people can be attracted to tourist accommodation available in the province of Ontario at the present time? In the larger cities, of course.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: In my own city of Sarnia, they can take care of over 800.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I challenge the hon. Minister to name one tourist or summer resort in Ontario today which can accommodate a convention of 500 or more people. It has been suggested by many prominent business men, and I point this out to the hon. leader opposite, by many prominent business men of very high calibre and persons that he is dealing with, that one of the most effective things we could do in Ontario today is to take a part of Ontario, take a part of the Georgian Bay area, and develop it as a year-round tourist attraction and pump real money into it.

Twenty-five million dollars spent on a hotel and accommodation would, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you, bring Ontario back into the tourist industry.

But this platitudinous talk, this reference to advertising! Experts say that advertising in respect to tourist activity is the last thing that should be done. The first thing which is required is to formulate a plan and a programme and carry it out, and then advertise it. But we do not have a plan or a programme to enunciate.

We have the facilities, we have the natural resources, and they are second to none. But, Mr. Chairman, the chamber of commerce—Mr. Chairman, for the edification of the hon. Minister of Mines—is more critical than I am of the lack of leadership and determination in this particular field.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is untrue, I criticized—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I will not sit down, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, the very comments I am making are coming from prominent members of the chamber of commerce. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that what is required in Ontario at the present time is a governmental policy of consequence and decisiveness in respect to this particular industry.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Did the hon. leader of the Opposition ever have one?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman—

An hon. member: We will have, as soon as we get in. Right after the next election.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister said something that is very true, and obviously common sense supports him, that there is greater competition now for the tourist dollar than ever before. Travel to Europe is cheaper, more facile than it has ever been. We acknowledge that. But, Mr. Chairman, we are participants and residents of a province which is more dependent on the tourist industry than probably any other jurisdiction or any of the states in the United States except the extreme southern states. What opportunities we have had and we have lost!

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you this morning, and without bitterness and without personal acrimony of any sort, that this department has not given the direction and the programming and the policy that the people of Ontario had expected and do still expect for economic development in the tourist trade.

I said a little while ago that 15 per cent of every dollar that comes in here, Mr. Chairman, comes back to this government. Now, I understood that the Americans spent about \$300 million in Ontario at the present time, I think the hon. Minister mentioned that this morning. That would mean that \$45 million of that \$300 million comes to this government by way of revenue.

Now I would think that any business man who could count on a 15 per cent profit on operation would be prepared to pump real credit and the extension of credit into an

industry in order to promote it. If this industry could be developed to the extent that that \$300 million was increased by twofold to \$600 million, we would add \$90 million to our revenue. If the estimate of the hon. Minister is accurate, that \$1 billion is spent on the tourist trade in Ontario, then \$150 million of our total budget comes from tourist activities.

Mr. Chairman, if it is of that proportion, if one-sixth of our total revenue is accountable from the tourist industry, then I say to him we have to take a far more fundamental approach and attitude and determination in respect to this particular industry. I for one would suggest that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development assure that unlimited credit be offered to this industry to expand in a wholesale fashion because the type of reward that will come to the government will be unlike that which will come from any other economic activity or development.

I suggest to you again, as I said a little while ago, that in my humble opinion one of the most dramatic things which could be done would be for the government to promote in some part of Ontario an expansive, modern — year-round tourist — accommodation and facility that would attract people from all parts of the continent, that would attract people in all seasons and that would attract conventions of consequence.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Is the hon. leader of the Opposition kidding? Does he know what has been done in the north in new chair-lift ski-runs and new motels for the tourist trade?

Mr. Wintermeyer: I am not kidding.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Has the hon. leader been up north and seen the new establishments that have been added, making available 700 establishments with a total of more than 5,000 visitors?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I have been there.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Does the hon. Minister of Mines think he is the only man who has ever been up north?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I talked to the president of an insurance company, whom I am unwilling to identify, and he told me that they had a convention arranged for Ontario—it was supposed to be Ontario's turn—they had 1,000 people coming and they wanted to go some place other than a large metropolitan area. The convention went to Atlantic City because there was no place in

Ontario that is commonly identified as a tourist resort which could accommodate them.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Did the hon. member know that at the Lakehead alone, three or four establishments can handle 1,000 visitors at one time?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I am talking about—the criticism that comes opposite is to be expected.

I am not talking about Port Arthur or Toronto or Hamilton, I am talking about what is normally identified as the lake area of Ontario. If the hon. Minister of Mines does not have enough faith in this industry to do something to pump credit and extend credit and to do something about the development, then we on this side do.

Mr. Chairman, I simply conclude my preliminary remarks by saying this, and without acrimony, and I mean it without—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: It is not the truth and the hon. leader of the Opposition knows it. It's political propaganda.

Mr. Wintermeyer: It is the truth.

Mr. Chairman, the appeal that I am making is for this department to effect a policy in respect to this very important industry, an industry by his own acknowledgment that develops more revenue dollars for this province than any other comparable industry, an industry that by his own acknowledgment of known figures presumably accounts for one-sixth of the total revenue of the province. And, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that if it is of this significance then the mere references that we have had this morning are not sufficient.

I know the hon. Minister is a pleasant man, I know that he is a friendly man, but he has got to be a business leader as well to do something about the development of this industry, and this requires, sir, I suggest, a policy and a programme that is currently lacking in this government in respect to the tourist trade.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that in his remarks the hon. leader of the Opposition said it appeared that I had been searching for something to put into my speech. I did not have to search, the trouble was to keep it down to a reasonable time, but I would gather from what he had to say, with all due respect to him, that he too has been searching around trying to find one thing where he might be helpful to me and the promotion of this industry. I accept

what he has to say and certainly it will be given consideration.

I should point out, too, that many dollars are spent by other departments of government. Our job is to promote Ontario, not to build establishments. Lands and Forests—

Mr. Wintermeyer: Let us ask that question. Is that true? What is the hon. Minister's job?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: My job is to sell Ontario as a provincial tourist province.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Is it the hon. Minister's job to promote the tourist industry?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. Wintermeyer: And what is the hon. Minister's concept of promotion? Is it advertising only?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I have just got through with rather an extensive talk which outlines just some of the things that we are doing in co-operation with associations, municipal governments, and with other departments of governments. But I do not think it is our responsibility to go out and build a great facility to house 10,000 people.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Is the hon. Minister speaking for the government in this respect?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am speaking for my department.

Mr. Wintermeyer: And as a responsible Minister in charge of this department?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Do not put words in my mouth. I said it was not the responsibility of The Department of Travel and Publicity to go out and build housing facilities for 10,000 people at one moment.

Mr. Wintermeyer: What about 1,000?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: It is not our responsibility to build those things. Other departments of government have gone ahead. The government itself built Upper Canada Village and many other attractions that are helping to bring these people in. Our job is to tell the world at large that the province of Ontario is a tremendous tourist province and that we have everything within the boundaries of Ontario that all the other countries in the world have. We have these things and we hope that will encourage people to come and visit us and leave their dollars with us.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have one general comment and it comes in the main office or I can give it later—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: May I have a point of order? Could we just sort of refresh our minds as to what has been the practice in relation to the estimates in the past? It has been that the Minister makes a general statement and then a general statement is made by whomever the leader of the Opposition would select in his party and the same applies in the New Democratic Party. Then we move normally to the first vote and then each person is able to raise any points or make any speech they wish in relation to the specific vote. Now, could we go back to that procedure, because I think it has worked quite well.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, I think the hon. Minister is correct, but I would draw to his attention that he has intervened and tried to bail out the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister from Port Arthur (Mr. Wardrope) has been yakking over there so that we could hardly make any comments on this side, so I submit that he have a little discussion in his caucus, and after he has the rules impressed on his caucus then maybe we can get them enforced in the House.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Let us be fair about that, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Wentworth raised a point of order, Mr. Chairman, that is to say he stated an initial objection that was in relation to the absence of a report. That is the only reason I rose. I did not rise to bail anybody out. But perhaps we could get on with it this way. The first speech having been given perhaps now by the Opposition we could move to the New Democratic Party.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, sir, there are several items that we wish to discuss. I think the hon. Minister has made a valid point but I hope that we will not be unduly restricted once having passed the estimates. There are several matters here that we wish to discuss. I agree that we should have order and this is perfectly reasonable. But there are some of these matters that we are not sure which department really it comes under and this is the reason many of us have chosen the first vote. If we are out of order we are quite happy to have them put back, but if we do not raise them in the first vote and the time passes then our opportunity is gone. I suggest to the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: This is the point. We have not yet arrived at the first vote. The hon. leader of the Opposition has spoken generally in reply to what has been said by the hon. Minister. Now, as I understand it, is the moment for the general observations if they are desired, by the leader or whomever he selects of the New Democratic Party, after which then we go to vote 2201.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the acting leader of the government a question? May I ask him a question?

Mr. Chairman: We have had enough discussion on this.

Mr. Troy: Will that general question of the hon. Minister then come under the main office, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, could we not move on?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: If the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party has any general comments he should make them.

An hon. member: He made them.

Mr. Troy: In other years, Mr. Chairman, and to the then Minister of Travel and Publicity, the late lamented member for Kenora, Mr. Albert Wren, always brought up this point: that the estimates were not presented until the various tourist groups had an opportunity to appear before the committee. Is it the position now, that this tourist committee which you have, has taken the place of the members of the Legislature in hearing the briefs of the various associations? The leader of the government in those days made arrangements that these estimates were not to be presented until the various groups, like the hotel associations, the northern Ontario tourist people—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I think the hon. member was out of the House during the discussion a year ago, in particular. He is correct that the member for Kenora did make that statement in the House. I question whether I should make this statement in view of the fact that unfortunately he is not with us, but let me say that the tourist associations of the province of Ontario, that is the joint board, the tourist outfitters, et cetera, pointed out by resolution to me that they wanted us to proceed with our estimates regardless of any committee meeting. This was so that they would have

the assurance that this House had approved of the moneys that are in my estimates and they could proceed with their planning.

It was, as far as I know, never their wish—this was a misunderstanding—never their wish that we should withhold these estimates until after any committee meeting. They made that statement right at our committee meeting, with all due respect. And on top of that the tourist committee is not replacing the associations. I particularly repeated in my talk that the tourist committee interviewed those associations for their recommendations and so on. They are not replacing, they are simply bringing recommendations for all of us to deal with.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2201.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could perhaps tell me where I might discuss this matter. Last year in this House the hon. Minister of Economics and Development made some comments with respect to this particular committee, and I quote from page 208 of the hon. Minister's comments:

Reports were to be a new approach towards the revitalization of industry in this province and one cannot properly do it without accepting that the tourist industry is part of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this commission or council or whatever it is that has been set up is obviously making reports and making suggestions and recommendations which would, I hope, do just what the hon. Minister has suggested that it should do. Yet if we study the budget this morning there does not seem to be any considerable change in the estimates that are being brought forward which would indicate that very much is being done with respect to government expenditures to accomplish this purpose.

My question to the hon. Minister is, has this committee reported, and if they have reported have they not reported anything which would be reflected in the budget?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The tourist committee held these interviews, they received some 120 submissions. These are studied and screened in co-operation with the economic council under The Department of Economics and Development; they are screening them and picking out those resolutions which in their opinion should be given consideration by the government. These recommendations have not come to us yet and when they do arrive they will be given consideration.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would conclude from that that notwithstanding the fact that this committee was established in 1961, it will be the budget ending March 31, 1965, really, before anything will be reflected in the attitude of the government which would accomplish the purpose which apparently we intended when this committee was set up. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We have already started the souvenir programme. They have presented certain items which they feel are of great importance and we are dealing with them. But the total recommendation of the committee has not come to us or to The Department of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I would be happy when my estimates come forward to discuss this with the hon. member. The hon. member said that the committee was appointed in 1961. It was not, it was appointed under legislation passed in this House last spring and the appointment of the committee was not completed until the summer. They have held sittings ever since.

They have, I understand, submitted a first report. They are a continuing committee. They have submitted a first report to the economic council. The council is now studying these and I understand will make recommendations to the government very shortly. When this is done we will be in a position to discuss this with the House.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, if I might refer to the submission of the joint board of Ontario Travel Associations regarding the Ontario tourist industry to the committee on March 16, 1961, there were several suggestions there. I would hope this would be the place I might refer it to the hon. Minister respecting policy as a result of those recommendations.

On page 2 of the submission—and I would like to quote—they stated:

Tourist operators and more particularly the urban and semi-urban establishments are still subject to an antiquated regulation whereby the municipality or township can by by-law relicense these establishments. The Act also gives the local councils power to govern and regulate the operation of motel and tourist establishments. Although the initial reason for granting these powers to the municipalities and townships is not disputed, we feel that the cause has long been removed. Some local government bodies are now merely using these powers to add to their overall revenue. We feel

that the tourist industry fully pays its municipal obligations by municipal and business tax levy which in itself is not equitable when compared with other business enterprises requiring less taxable assessment but with equal or greater net income.

Now what I would like to know is whether or not there have been any negotiations with The Department of Municipal Affairs perhaps to correct this situation and perhaps remove any barrier which might be there to the development of this industry? Has the department taken this matter up and what progress has been made, or is it the feeling of The Department of Travel and Publicity that this should not be done?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: This is an item, one of the items, which the joint board have presented to the tourist committee, one of those items that I presume they will pass along, when they have considered it, to the economic council.

One of our great problems in the department was that economists were not available to us since they were not in sufficient numbers. But economists are available to this economic council. The tourist committee is using those resources, they are working as a subcommittee to the economic council. That is one that has been presented, I understand. They will give it study and pass it on to us.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that this is dealing with the subject. I point out to the hon. Minister though, that in my opinion this brief is asking the legislators to make a decision, not to pass it over to some committee to study. It appears that we are not prepared to make a decision at this time. My question I guess then is answered, that the department has not come to any conclusions with respect to this problem and that no negotiations have taken place with The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Another matter which I should like to discuss is with respect to the matter of workmen's compensation. It is my understanding that in the tourist industry there are inadequate provisions for workmen who work in this industry with respect to coverage by the workmen's compensation board. Has The Department of Travel and Publicity taken this matter up with, say, The Department of Labour, with the thought of making some changes to correct this problem?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Then, Mr. Chairman, are we not concerned with the problem? I am suggesting that this brief was submitted two years ago by people who are active in the industry. These are problems which are already brought to our attention, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that setting up new committees is not going to help unless we are prepared to attack the problems which have already been presented to us.

Surely these are matters which should be the concern of this department. They were submitted to this committee and this Legislature as problems, and if we are concerned with this industry, and it is my understanding from the remarks of the hon. Minister this afternoon that we are concerned with this industry in this department, then I suggest that perhaps we have not taken this matter as seriously as we could have. So that when we criticize on this side of the House, and say that we feel that not enough has been done, I suggest that when the hon. Minister comes to the House this morning and tells us that nothing has been done about a brief that has been presented two years ago, then the department has not perhaps done its duty.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I should correct the statement, because all of those briefs, all of the items in the briefs, are referred to the different departments for their report. As a matter of fact, I have talked with the workmen's compensation people, with The Department of Labour, personally, about resolving some of these problems. So I take back what I said in the first place.

But in view of the fact that a year ago we were setting up this tourist committee, so many of these problems arise—they arise at committees or in briefs—it has been a bit of a problem to resolve some of them on behalf of those operations. I do feel, and I hope you will agree with me, that through the resources of the tourist committee that has been set up, through the economic council, we should get factual reports which will assure the government deals with those things that we feel are worthy.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: If I might disagree with hon. Minister, in as friendly a way as possible—and I do want to do it in that manner—I disagree with him entirely. I suggest that this department and this hon. Minister is sloughing off his responsibilities to other people which rightfully belong in this Legislature and in his department.

Now surely if we are concerned with this

industry it is not enough to turn it over to a department and two years later still be waiting for a report on the situation. I think this is wrong. I think this is one of the reasons that on this side of the House we have said that we think this department is perhaps doing as poor a job as it is possible to do on that side of the government.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The hon. member ploughed a deep furrow that time. I hang my head in shame.

An hon. member: The hon. Minister should!

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Oh well, forget it! Ontario enjoys three-quarters of the total of Canada's travel business. I expect the hon. member to get up and harp and say things and I take it with a smile, but when I got some giggles off the front bench about something, why it becomes a little monotonous and tiresome.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I did have some difficulty in following the reasoning—

Mr. Singer: The Minister of all the departments does better than that.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: When the hon. member stoops to say what he just said, it is a little bit embarrassing.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, if I stooped, I am sorry. I think I am entitled to an opinion. I think as an elected representative in this Legislature I have a responsibility—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well then, talk as somebody in Parliament should.

Mr. Singer: Well, well, well!

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to do that, and I will ignore the last remarks to do it.

In this same submission there were some recommendations, and I think it has been raised in this Legislature before, with respect to tourist information and tourist signs along our highways. Would the hon. Minister advise me, is Fort Henry part of the responsibility of The Department of Travel and Publicity?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: No, it is not.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The reason I mentioned Fort Henry was simply because it was a government operated organization. But I have

talked to many people who feel, now we have reached the point in the development of our highways where we have super highways running from border to border, that it is having a profound effect on the operators of tourist establishments that were not affected previously when the highways went through the various towns and villages and it was possible for them to advertise.

I also note that the committee made recommendations along this line and I am wondering whether or not The Department of Travel and Publicity feels that any changes could be made in the signing of our roads which could help this problem.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: They have been made very largely, and as a matter of fact we today have a representative of The Department of Travel and Publicity, with the kind permission of the hon. Minister of Highways, (Mr. MacNaughton), on the signing committee of The Department of Highways. These matters are brought to their particular attention, and I think if I had the information in front of me the signing has been corrected to a large extent. I quite agree in the past it was creating problems because of the by-passes that were being built.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would supply me with the information as to the names—and the areas they represent—of those people that compose the Northern Great Lakes area council.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The council consists of representatives of the states of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Ontario. The Ontario representatives who have been appointed and do hold office are the Minister of Travel and Publicity; Mr. Fred Butler of Ottawa; Mr. Dalton Caswell of Sundridge; Mr. Arthur Wignall of Fort William; Mr. John Gibson, Toronto, of the Imperial Oil Company; and Mr. Carl Menore of Meaford.

Mr. Troy: What Great Lake does Mr. Butler represent?

Mr. MacDonald: What Great Lake does the Imperial Oil represent?

An hon. member: The Ottawa River.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Does the hon. member know Mr. Butler?

Mr. Troy: I know several Butlers.

Mr. Chapple: The hon. Minister mentioned areas south of the border. How many repre-

sentatives would there be of those different states? Would there be as many in those different states as there are in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Each state has the same number.

Mr. Chapple: And there were three states mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Yes, Minnesota, Michigan and Wisconsin; three states.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, on item 5, vote 2201: membership in grants to travel organizations, \$8,000. Yet in the public accounts for the year ending March, 1962, we have there a total of \$137,302.55; the Algoma Regional Tourist Council Association, \$5,000, and a host of others. Where do they come in this estimate?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The regional grants that were in this originally were transferred over to item 5 in vote 2206. This is the result of the reorganization I spoke about.

Mr. Thomas: Thank you.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, do the guides to which the hon. Minister made reference this morning, come under this vote or 2202?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: No, they come under 2205; tourist promotion and information.

Mr. Troy: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Does the hon. member want to talk about them?

Mr. Troy: Yes, sir.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the figures were given before this was carried and if they were I missed them. I wonder if the hon. Minister would repeat. I am wondering the number of tourists who came into Ontario this year as compared to, say, the last two or three years, say back to 1960. The hon. Minister made mention, I think, of three-fifths of all tourist travel is in Ontario. What is the total number as compared to previous years?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: In the overall programme, I think I pointed out in my talk, something of the neighbourhood of 4.7 per cent of an increase or some place in there, and we conclude that that would mean about 75,000 or 80,000 more people.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked the question, I wanted to—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am sorry, 800,000. I cannot multiply, I guess. It was approximately 4.7 per cent of an increase. I think I stated there were between five and six million cars crossing the border. You do understand that we do not have anything definite on the people who come into Ontario other than across the crossing border entries, so we gauge that on—I think we gauge it on the basis of five to six million cars coming in last year—three decimal five people per car, and we arrive at a figure of approximately 20 million. There was an increase last year on crossing border entries—and we get that, of course, from the federal bureau of statistics—of approximately 4.7 per cent.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: What I was trying to establish was whether or not the exchange rate was having an effect on the number of tourists. I was trying to establish whether or not we were slipping, as related to other countries who are competing for the tourist business.

You will recall, sir, that in 1960, the Prime Minister at that time in speaking on this problem had very strong views with respect to the effect of the Canadian dollar. Now, that situation has reversed, and the question is, has the pattern of tourist trade in Ontario changed with it or has the graph remained steady or what is the situation related back three years?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: When the exchange rate changed I immediately sent out, or my director of publicity sent out, a little phrase to add to all our advertising that was already with printers: "Come over and visit Ontario where you will receive eight cents on your dollar."

Certainly we were very happy—and we are still happy. While the exchange was against U.S. tourists, we were meeting up with a great many difficulties in people having to pay exchange on their U.S. money. The situation has reversed, we benefit greatly, plus the fact that I think there is a happier relationship between our visitors and our own people.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, theoretically what I am endeavouring to do is to assess our policy. Now, I realize that these estimates come from the government and if we wanted to change them upwards over here, we would have extreme difficulty in doing it. What I was trying to find out at this time was whether or not we had in fact been doing as good a job as we could have been doing in encouraging the tourist business

into this country in competition with other people who are competing very strongly for the tourist dollar.

I think the only way we could establish whether or not we were doing this successfully would be to determine whether or not the number of tourists coming into this province had actually increased. Now, if it was 4 per cent last year would the hon. Minister be able to tell me roughly what it was in 1961 and in 1960 so that we could have this information?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, a year ago, previous to a year ago, we were showing an increase each year. I recall—I have not got the figures in front of me—but I recall last year we were just about holding our own with the exchange against the U.S. dollar. I think that having had the benefit of this year with the exchange as it is now, by next year it would very forcibly show the advantages we are gaining as a result of paying the premium on the foreign dollar.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I may be a little dense—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am sorry!

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I will repeat it, I do not like to, it may be that I am a little bit dense on this, but I am trying to determine: does the hon. Minister say we have been holding our own and next year it is going to get better? What is the pattern? Surely we must know how many people—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am sorry, I did not say that. I said last year, a year ago, with the exchange against us, it was just a problem to hold our own; but previous to that we showed increases each year. You see the reason I say that: probably by next year we will learn more about the benefits we have gained from the exchange rate, because many of our people who come over here have made their plans in the spring, during the winter time, even before the exchange rate is announced. We have not got track of the difference between the regular people who are coming over and spending their vacations and those people who have been encouraged to come in because of the rate of exchange or for other reasons.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I realize that, Mr. Chairman, I realize we cannot tell who came in, but what I was trying to establish was—would the hon. Minister then give me the figures from his department of their estimates of tourists into Ontario for the years 1960, 1961 and 1962?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I have just been handed this note. In 1961: 17,671,209; 1962: 18,499,488; the increase in people for 1962: 828,279.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Do I understand that we do not have the 1960 figures here then?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I have not the 1960 figures, I can get them for the hon. member.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I would appreciate it, if the hon. Minister would make a note of it.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am so instructed.

Mr. L. Quilty (Renfrew South): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Wentworth was accused of not speaking as a responsible representative by the hon. Minister. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go along with some of the comments that the hon. member for Wentworth made, and to back up my statement I will read two paragraphs from a brief presented by the Eastern Ontario Development Association:

If the tourist business was like any other \$500 million-plus business with its chairman, board of directors, president, general manager, and other well placed executives and workers, it is doubtful that the growing tide of concern would be as acute. In due time, if there are not substantial improvements, this concern is almost certain to reach such proportions as to permanently damage the prospects of all those who were in a position to do something about it and did not. For it would be inexcusable and a colossal blunder to continue to ignore the waste, the cross-purposes, the badly placed personnel, the general lack of planning and co-ordination of effort that go to make this business the largest, most disorderly and badly managed business in our history.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I thank the hon. member very much. I already had a copy of that. Of course, once more, I know who wrote it—

Mr. Chapple: Who did?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, the hon. member did not want to tell me who made that statement when I asked for somebody to be named. But I do know this, that that resolution came after many of the people had left that particular meeting. This certain person arranged to have this resolution presented and it is really the thinking of one gentleman and one gentleman alone.

However, it is a good thing to have it on record, to straighten me out. It supports

what the hon. member for Wentworth said, so I will take back what I said.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2201 carried.

On vote 2202:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): If I may, Mr. Chairman, coming as I do from the sunshine parlour of Canada, it is not 10 below there today, Mr. Chairman, it is probably about 20 above. Does this department publicize or co-operate in the publicizing of national parks at the same time as they publicize the provincial parks? I specifically refer to the Point Pelee National Park, because it is probably the second most popular park in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: National Parks are listed in our camp sites brochure.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest then to the hon. Minister that he probably put a little more emphasis on this national park, because it is so close to a large centre of population and it does have a fairly important economic effect—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, is not that under vote 2205, tourist promotion? Could we not stick to the votes as they are before the House?

Mr. Newman: I will bring it up either later or now.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That is all right, stick to it under the proper one.

An hon. member: The hon. Minister is railroading it.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I am not railroading it, I am just trying to—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Minister give me some direction as to where I might discuss the matter of the grants which have been given to chartered regional development associations?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That comes under vote 2206, item 5, on page 119.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Thank you.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he could tell us about how the trillium symbol was developed? Was it developed by his department?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The present symbol which is now in use was not developed by our department, although we have used the trillium, Ontario flower, to a very large extent.

over the many years I have been in the department. But the symbol that is being used presently was by The Department of Economics and Development.

Mr. Singer: Can I take it then that no money was spent out of the hon. Minister's departmental estimates for the development of this symbol?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2202 carried.

On vote 2203:

Mr. P. Manley (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, in 2203 there is a sum of \$72,000 for the purchase of photographic supplies, motion pictures and equipment. I want to ask the hon. Minister from whom those supplies are bought and if they are manufactured in Canada, all of them?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: All are purchased in Ontario, we make it a point to do this.

Mr. Manley: They are all manufactured in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. Manley: From whom were those purchased?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I think the hon. member will find it in the public accounts, if he would take a look.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, surely the hon. Minister is in a position to advise us from whom he purchased \$70,000 worth of equipment?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Does the hon. member want to know from whom we are going to purchase next year's or last year's?

Mr. Manley: Naturally, we expect from whom he purchased last year.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The films we produce are called by tender. Ashley and Crippen processed the two films that were produced last year, and they are for TV showing and for service clubs, etc. Then we had a ten or 12 minute film produced by 20th Century Fox for theatre screening across the world. It goes all over the world.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, my question was only answered in part. I did ask the hon. Minister where he purchased his camera equipment. There must be other equipment which he purchases besides films shown across Canada.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The Toronto Camera Exchange, Hall's Photographic—not from one firm, but from a number. I can get the hon. member the list of the names of the firms from which we purchase.

Mr. Manley: But they are absolutely all made in Canada, are they? All this equipment?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. Manley: Were those cameras and equipment tendered for the same as the other items you mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am sorry I did not hear what you said.

Mr. Manley: Were those, the other equipment, cameras and what have you, were they asked for by public tender?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I do not think we bought cameras last year at all, we have had equipment—

Mr. Manley: The equipment, was it by tender? Was it purchased by tender?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I doubt if we bought equipment, but if so I doubt if we would call for tenders on it. They would simply purchase from the stores.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Just go to a store and buy it.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: They may want one little item of some kind that might cost \$10; I am sure we would not want to call a tender for it.

Mr. Manley: Well then, Mr. Chairman; I would like a breakdown of the \$72,000 as between equipment and the films that you ran, and if it is only an item or so we can assess.

Mr. Chairman: 2203, carried?

Hon. members: No, no!

Mr. Manley: The hon. Minister has not answered my question, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): This is a big issue.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: There is a listing in Public Accounts—

An hon. member: What page? Where can we find it?

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): It is in "odds and ends."

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Page U-8: Purchase of photographic supplies, motion pictures and equipment—\$59,899.17, and then the names of the firms are listed underneath: Ashley & Crippen, \$35,608.50, Fletcher Films Productions Ltd., \$3,534.86, 20th Century Fox Corporation Ltd., \$6,500. And then, of course, accounts under \$3,500, amounted to \$14,255.81.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister, did Ashley & Crippen tender for this—\$35,000?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Yes, they did; that is right.

Mr. Manley: How many films were there?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That was for two films. They produced two for \$35,000.

Mr. Manley: How many tenders were there submitted for this item?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We had half a dozen; about six.

Mr. Manley: Then, Mr. Chairman, accounts under \$3,500 amounted to \$14,255. I suppose this is the odd camera that someone in the back benches mentioned a moment ago—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. Manley: Just how were those purchases made?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I think I told you there were no cameras purchased last year, to my knowledge.

Mr. Manley: Well, what was the \$14,000 for?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I understand that this was for films, paper, all the ingredients that are used by the photography branch for developing and taking pictures. We run our own photographic gallery. The pictures that you see in our publications are taken by our own photographers and used in our brochures. In fact, we send them out to newspapers and magazines and so on for their use when they are publishing a story on Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get some more information on this tendering process. The hon. Minister stated that there were some six tenders received when the contract was awarded to Ashley & Crippen. Was this call for tenders a public call or was it an invitational call?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Invitation calls.

Mr. Singer: And how were the names of those who were invited selected?

An hon. member: All good Tories.

Another hon. member: Out of the 'yellow pages'.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am told that the names of the firms were selected on the basis of those firms that were capable of producing the particular films.

Mr. Singer: How could that determination possibly be made by the hon. Minister if he does not advertise publicly?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Because we have a director of photography, for instance, a specialist in this line, who travels with the film people in producing the film, who has been with the department since it was established and I, of course, rely on him.

An hon. member: That is the best you have done today.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister then does not believe that it is possible that his director might have missed someone?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: This is the way we did it anyway.

An hon. member: Right or wrong, that is it.

Mr. MacDonald: Now the façade is broken down.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That just slipped out.

Mr. MacDonald: The implication is that it will continue to be done this way.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question. Does the booth that the department has down at the Sportsman's Show come under this vote or under 2205?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Under 2205, tourist promotion.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2203 carried.

On vote 2204:

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, on 2204, the amount of advertising in the Public Accounts for the year ending March 1962, was \$418,772.30, and I find that four firms received a total of \$411,677.00 out of that amount of \$418,000.00. Now, surely there are more than four firms in the province of Ontario that would be capable of doing that kind of work. And how are the contracts awarded to them? On a commission basis, or by tender or what?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: They are not firms, they are agencies that handle it.

Mr. Thomas: Well, agencies, how are they—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, there is a suggestion by some of my hon. friends across the way that we use too many agencies now; we should cut down.

An hon. member: Oh, no—the wrong agencies.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I wonder if I could read this statement because this came up in the House before and I hope I am a little prepared to give you an answer:

All publications of the department are ordered—

Mr. Thomas: Reading the wrong one?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, maybe I was going to disclose some new information for you.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that would be a precedent.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: There is a little story, I will tell you about that afterwards, but I do not want to—

An hon. member: To the Tories, of course.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Oh, it could be told in the House.

Advertising—all our advertising is placed through one or another of the four agencies serving this department. Each agency is responsible for servicing a specific part of our programme and this is the way it is set up:

The James Lovick & Company responsible for U.S. magazines; McConnell-Eastman responsible for U.S. dailies; Hayhurst & Co. responsible for U.S. radio; Stanfield, Hill and Johnston Ltd., for our Canadian programme of paper advertising, etc. We do not place our advertisements directly with the media since they will not accept anything which does not come through a recognized agency. The agency charge to the advertising media—not to us—is 15 per cent which is the internationally accepted figure. The use of agencies allows us to have the services of artists, layout men and other advertising skills of a specialized nature and thus means that we do not have to have staff of that kind to provide those particular services.

I hope that does explain exactly the procedure that is followed with reference to the advertising.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2204 carried.

On vote 2205:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there is just one brief comment I would like to make here, I was going to make it earlier but the hon. Minister, the spokesman for the government, said it should come under the appropriate department.

The hon. Minister made a delineation between the responsibility of his department, namely, in promoting Ontario and the responsibilities that might lie with somebody else in building facilities that might attract tourists. I just want to draw attention to the fact that this is a distinction that he did not make in his introductory remarks. My attention was caught by the fact that he said that in the past year \$2 million was spent on tows and lifts, T-bars, and then he threw in—this is what astounded me—“accommodation”. Now, I will confess right here that I am no expert in this field, but it strikes me that \$2 million for this kind of a development, including accommodation, is not peanuts, it is something less than peanuts.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That \$2 million that I mentioned—may I answer this?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I was referring to private operators who have extended their winter activities or built new ones, and have spent approximately some \$2 million to provide additional facilities for their own operations, such as ski tows, tobogganing, slopes, and what-have-you. It was not an expenditure of the government for this purpose, and I included accommodation facilities because, of course, they go along with it.

Mr. MacDonald: This is the point I would like the hon. Minister to speak to now. What does he mean by accommodation? New facilities in terms of rooms?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that \$2 million in an industry that is a billion dollar industry, as the new capital outlay this year for not only bars and tows and accommodation, is something less than peanuts. I must say I was intrigued—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The \$2 million applied to those facilities and probably I should have said plus facilities to accommodate these people.

Mr. MacDonald: Plus another figure?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Another figure.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, it is awfully difficult to discuss the estimates of this department when the hon. Minister every five minutes withdraws what he said a little bit before. Now he says that the \$2 million figure was not what he gave to us.

Mr. Cowling: That is good strategy.

Mr. MacDonald: It is good strategy, but it certainly shows that you do not know where you are standing today, tomorrow or the next day. I have made that point.

I want to go on now and deal with it in relation to what the hon. leader of the Opposition said, Mr. Chairman. I must say I am intrigued by this calculation that we have a billion dollar business and one-sixth of it, roughly 15 per cent, comes back into the provincial Treasury.

This sounds like a guess, but it may be right, I do not know. If one considers liquor taxes, gasoline taxes, and everything else, it may be right. I am a little bit skeptical that \$150 million of our revenue comes from the tourist industry. However, let me for the moment accept the figure and I come back to tie the two of them together.

I do not know what I am tying together, because the hon. Minister has given us only half the picture and retracted the second half. I do not know how much money was spent on accommodation and apparently he does not know. It would be interesting to find out how much was spent on new equipment, plus new accommodation. If we had that figure then we could assess how much the government is really doing. The great problem is that the hon. Minister is not really certain.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, on 2205, now I did hear the hon. Minister—I had to go out for a telephone call—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Of course, that would not make him too happy—he would prefer that they go the other way, so that—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the petulance of the hon. Minister is not contributing anything, perhaps we could listen to the hon. member for Stormont.

An hon. member: Shame!

Mr. MacDonald: I just pointed out where he gave his misinformation and now he gets petulant. What does the hon. member mean, shame?

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, I was called out of the House when the hon. Minister was

making his report before we got into the various votes, but as I came in I heard him say something about the centres across the province. The question I want to put to him now is—and I raised it a year ago—when is the new reception centre going to be ready in Cornwall? Is it going to be ready for the beginning of the tourist season this year? Will the hon. Minister make some remark? As I was out, I would like to have it clarified?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I understand it will be ready this spring. Public Works have the design and they are ready to proceed just as soon as the weather will permit.

Mr. Manley: Public Works are going to build it?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, on 2205, I want to suggest to the hon. Minister, if he is going to have any publicity or an information centre at the Sportman's Show this year that they really put on something that is indicative of this programme of his. Compared to the booths that are there from the states south of the border and other provinces, his in comparison is nothing at all. I suggest we can sell the tourist areas of Ontario if we have the proper setup there at the Sportsman's Show.

You also mentioned about the guides; I agree they are very charming young ladies and quite an asset to this government, but I would suggest that you show a little kindness to them in the summer time because of the uniforms that they have to wear. I think it is ridiculous those heavy red coats; there should be something that still can be decorous and nevertheless be comfortable.

There is another thing, too. Continuing what my hon. leader has said about development, because I know at the convention of the anglers and hunters, in North Bay, a point was brought out by Mr. Pete McGillen, an outdoor writer of one of the metropolitan papers here. He brought out the point that we at Nipissing—which is an ideal tourist paradise—have 35 or more motels along our beautiful lakeshore. But, as my hon. leader has pointed out, there is not any banquet hall on the lakeshore that would accommodate a large convention. I suggest too that with the economic council you do—I do not care where you put it, but certainly I would like to see it up in the Nipissing area—that you assist private enterprise to put up accommodation like that.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question in regards to tourist promotion. What is the hon. Minister doing in other countries overseas in regards to promoting the tourist industry in Canada, to offset the number of tourists going out of the country?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We have been placing personnel over in Chicago and New York in the facilities of the federal government offices there. We have always used Ontario House, too, as our office to promote travel and to reply to inquiries and keep them supplied with our literature. We also propose to place staff in the new federal government information office which was opened last year in London, England. I think at the moment that is about as far as we will go.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I might ask the Minister another question. Do these publications that are sent out in the United States go to the London House, are they used in Europe in other languages or are there other publications that are being published or prepared from the department of the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We do have some publications printed in French that we use here, but we do not send them over there.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, a question I would like to ask the hon. Minister is about Crystal Beach in that great riding of Niagara Falls—the hon. member for Welland's (Mr. Morningstar's) riding borders on my particular area. The village of Crystal Beach is not too prominently advertised in the literature of that area. As a matter of fact, there was a time they did get more publicity in the brochures and maps. I was approached by the council whose members were wondering if they could get an appointment with the hon. Minister to discuss the matter. I think that for five or six people to come here on a special excursion and cost the village that much money would be added expense and this does not make sense.

I wonder if when the hon. Minister makes up his brochures, he would place Crystal Beach on the map again. They entertain many hundreds of thousands of tourists, as he knows, and for some unknown reason the name is left off.

Now I would hate to think that in the last four years he decided to take it off because there happened to be a member there from the Opposition. This would not happen, I am sure, with the hon. Minister who runs that department. What would make me happy is

to see him reinstate it just a little larger to show I have some influence on him.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The matter will be taken care of, I assure the hon. member.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: This is the place I was told I might ask a question with respect to this grant that is made to chartered regional development associations. On what basis is this grant available? My understanding was that it was available to these associations on a dollar-for-dollar basis. In other words they must spend an equal amount of their own money in tourist promotion. Is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The arrangement is this: in the first instance the grant was paid based on the expenditures of those associations within the region that had been set up. The second year, in order to obtain the dollar-for-dollar grant up to \$5,000, it is necessary for them to raise money and we pay the equivalent dollar for dollar from then on. The first year was simply based on the expenditures of the preceding year in order to get them under way and that brought all of the existing associations that resided within the boundaries of the region into the picture. But from there in it is based on moneys that they raise.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: What method is used to determine if they have spent the money? Is a report submitted annually?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: An audited report.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get your attention for quite a while now and apparently you pay no attention to this end of the House. Mr. Chairman, I can understand it might be a bit difficult to see the few members who are back here.

Coming as I do from the great municipality of Windsor and as the hon. Minister mentioned three-quarters of the tourist trade that does come into Canada comes into the province of Ontario, may I state that one-third of all of it that does come into Ontario comes in through the port of Windsor. That means that tourists coming into Windsor spend approximately \$125 million in Ontario.

Now, Windsor, as you may know, is ideally located as a tourist centre. Looking on the map you can see that its location sort of points an arrow into the heartland of America. There are approximately 50 million tourists that live within five hours' drive of the province of Ontario going through the gateway of Windsor, so that the first impressions that a tourist gets of Canada and of Ontario would

be those that he would receive once he arrives in the city.

Now, the drive along the Detroit River is one that is probably unequalled anywhere in the free world. Here you have a drive of approximately twelve miles where you can see the larger buildings of the city of Detroit and the sight is such that we get thousands of Detroiters coming across daily, and I would say probably maybe ten times that amount on Sundays.

Here is the place where The Department of Travel and Publicity could sell a little. The local community has been attempting to sell it and they have gone to the extent of setting up the Windsor Foundation. Probably few areas in Ontario have gone to the extent that my own community of Windsor has in an attempt to sell or to entice, to attract tourists to the province of Ontario.

It is only two weeks ago, and the date is Thursday, January 24, that the hon. Prime Minister personally saw the enthusiasm, the vigour, and the never-say-die spirit of the community. He not only witnessed the determination of the people to present a united front, to a rebirth of a new spirit in the community, but also the extent to which management, industry, new Canadian, old Canadian, layman, professional, blue collar and white collar, college professor, kindergarten teacher, service club and individual went out to sell the community.

The organization that I referred to, the Windsor Foundation, raised funds to erect what is considered one of the largest signs in Canada atop one of the larger buildings in the downtown area. This sign faces Detroit. This sign does not sell Windsor only; it also sells Ontario and Canada, not to Canadians but to our friends across the border. The letters are so large that they are readily visible from the centre of downtown Detroit. This announces that Canada is only five minutes away.

The hon. Prime Minister did the area a great service by being present at this Windsor Foundation dinner, and then officially pulled the switch that lit up this symbol of international goodwill. We in the community were most disappointed that after expressing himself so ably and being most complimentary of the Windsor Foundation, the hon. Prime Minister did not even suggest that the province would assist in a sizeable grant to help defray the cost or some of the cost of this, the community's, attempt at tourist promotion.

Surely this Department of Travel and Publicity should make some grant available. In fact, I would say that the department

should take over the complete cost of this project and erect similar signs at other border areas in the province where large centres of population exist.

Millions of U.S. tourists visit Detroit. The Detroit riverfront area has one of the largest complexes of convention facilities in the world. These convention delegates or tourists should be attracted not only to visit our shores but also to spend their vacations in Canada. Very seldom, if ever, do I find any information from this province available at the numerous conventions that take place in the city of Detroit.

Little attempt is being made to sell Ontario. The local tourist information bureau should be instructed to cover, or should I say to distribute and entice our good friends to the north not only to visit Windsor, which is the largest Canadian city south of the U.S., but also other parts of this province.

I would strongly recommend to the hon. Minister that he inform his local office, the tourist office back in the city, to cover the conventions in Detroit, not occasionally but at all times. You would be surprised the number of tourists that would come into our community were they informed that Canada is only five minutes away.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I have one plea to the hon. Minister that relates to the city of Toronto and the surrounding area, and that is in relation to publicity for the performing arts.

Toronto has been and should continue to be the centre for Canada of the performing arts, and I feel that at the moment we could emphasize this more than we are presently doing in our tourist promotion literature. Here in Toronto we are the centre for the TV industry of Canada; we have a very vigorous and growing motion picture production industry, and as well—and the point I want to emphasize here—a very great industry, a theatre industry. By that I mean live stage productions.

Here in Toronto at the moment there are a number of theatres which consistently show a deficit every year. I have not got the facts and figures in front of me, but I believe that there is not a stage theatre in Toronto that shows a profit.

The Royal Alexandra Theatre is rapidly reaching a point where it may well be turned into a parking lot. The O'Keefe Centre has not shown a profit since it was built, and there are other theatre groups in Toronto that are really facing a financial crisis. I am not here advocating direct government aid to

these groups or to these theatres, but I do believe that we could emphasize them in our tourist publicity, and especially in the Buffalo area—especially in the American area bordering Lake Erie and Lake Ontario.

The availability of theatres here in Toronto and how this can be a theatre centre for this area of North America, should be emphasized in tourist publicity. And I think that the department could help and assist more than it has been doing by helping to organize or give some assistance, in any event, for train trips and bus tours, and in that line of activity.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I just add a comment to what the hon. member has said? I think this is extremely important. I do not want to take a great deal of the time of the House. I would underline completely what he has said and support it, but just take exception to his comment that he does not favour the idea of the government contributing directly to these organizations.

As a matter of fact, now that the Ontario government has begun to announce that it is going to establish a council of arts, I would welcome some time soon what the government envisages as being the function of this council of arts—other than as a gimmick at election time. In any council of arts, where they have been in operation—and not just an election promise for the benefit of the hon. Minister from St. Andrew (Mr. Grossman)—I think you will find that one of the things they do is to assess the worthiness of various organizations in this field and to make contributions to them.

However, I want to go back to generally supporting what the hon. member has said, apart from this one point.

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I would like to disabuse my hon. friend's political mind about the election gimmick concerning that announcement in the Speech from the Throne. A bill will be introduced establishing an Ontario Council for the Arts, it will be established before this session ends, and it can be debated here, but I assure him it was no election gimmick.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2206.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I have a problem pertaining to the city of Niagara Falls. I presented a bill here the other day—I do not know under what particular vote and what category this comes, but it is pertaining to the tourist industry.

You will find that the city of Niagara Falls with a larger assessment than \$25 million was

contributing to the chamber of commerce for tourist promotion some \$10,000 a year. Stamford township which has a population much larger than the city of Niagara Falls, was also contributing \$10,000. Now the Act, as I understand it, and I am appealing directly to the hon. Prime Minister on behalf of those people, allows the township and the city to each contribute \$10,000. Now they have become one city of 55,500 people and they find themselves stuck with this portion of the statute stating that they can only contribute \$10,000. In other words, their budget was cut in half. This is according to the statute.

Now then, you can make a contribution of \$5,000 to areas that promote the tourist industry, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman. You give them this \$5,000 providing they spend an additional \$5,000. You have not given it to a municipality which in their particular case has taken in Port Colborne, which again is my hon. friend's (Mr. Morningstar's) area in Welland. They have come to you, you recall, asking for this grant—and a portion of, I believe, Lincoln County also. To get men who are prominent in business to sit together from three counties to persuade you to give them \$5,000 for a promotion of that type, does not make sense. These men are too busy, have not got an opportunity to sit down and discuss how the \$5,000 would be spent in such a large area, under the circumstances, because their budget may be cut some \$10,000.

I would appeal to the hon. Minister, that this \$5,000 grant be given to that city to assist them with their budget. They are doing an excellent job of promotion and I would like to see you bend a little backwards, because I understand in other parts of the province you have done just that.

I put that on the record simply because I will come back to you again and again and for many more years with this same argument for many more thousands.

An hon. member: We will not have to go back to them. We will look after it.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: It is on a trial basis, it was only initiated a year ago. This is the second year that we are making the grants and after all we had to start some place. These matters will be considered as the years—

Mr. Bukator: If you can assure me of the \$5,000 now I will carry this no further at this time.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, when we are listening to the weather forecast on television

and on radio, we hear time and again that cold air from Canada will be coming down here and we will have a cold wave. I believe that statement frightens many tourists away from Canada. I would like to know if the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity can do anything about it?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We are working on that one.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, it does not appear that we will complete the estimates of this department today and therefore I move that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Troy: We are on 2205, are we not?

Several hon. members: No!

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: 2205 was called.

An hon. member: 2206.

Mr. Chairman: We completed 2205.

An hon. member: No, we are on 2206.

Another hon. member: I do not care where you are, let us start over again.

Another hon. member: We have been discussing 2205 for the last half hour.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 2205 carry?

Several hon. members: No.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, it has never been the intent, nor has effort ever been made on this side of the House, to prevent

the hon. members from speaking on all these very interesting points, so we will revert to 2205 and whatever hon. members have to say we will sit here and listen to it.

Clerk of the House: 2204, then, was the last one carried.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, 2204 was the last one carried.

Shall the motion to report carry?

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may we revert to routine proceedings. The hon. Provincial Secretary has a report he wishes to table.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

The report relating to the Registration of Births, Marriages and Deaths in the Province of Ontario for the year ending 31st December, 1962.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will proceed with the estimates of the hon. Provincial Secretary. I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.15 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Monday, February 11, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963

CONTENTS

Monday, February 11, 1963

Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading.....	593
Grand River Conservation Act, 1938, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	593
Provincial Parks Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	593
Statement re Kapuskasing "bush strike", Mr. Rowntree	593
Statement re Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act, Mr. Robarts	598
Estimates, Department of the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Yaremko	602
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	623

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1963

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery students from St. Michael's Choir School, Toronto; and also under the Speaker's gallery a group who are attending the convention of rural municipalities.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, following the usual practice of some short comment at this time on the nature of the bill, I would say there are a number of sections—some of them are merely improving the language of the sections—for clarification.

In section 3, however, the amendments make it clear that one municipality may request a meeting to consider the enlargement of a conservation area over which the conservation authority has jurisdiction. Previously two were required.

Under section 4, at present, an authority may make regulations prohibiting or regulating the dumping of fill in areas below the high-water mark of lakes, rivers, etc. The amendment authorizes regulations to prohibit or regulate the dumping of fill in areas in which the conservation of land may be affected.

In section 5, the amendment provides that the regulation regarding internal management

of authorities requires the approval of a Minister rather than the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

In regard to section 6, the amendment removes the reference of a chief officer and substitutes the chairman or vice-chairman of the authority.

THE GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION ACT, 1938

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Grand River Conservation Act, 1938.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, this amendment brings tenants of commission lands in line with tenants of Crown lands in respect of municipal taxation.

THE PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, the amendment in this bill brings the authority of the person in charge of a provincial park—and it is either the district forester or the superintendent—with respect to portages, into line with his present authority with respect to park roads and trails.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a statement which I wish to make.

In view of the serious and unfortunate incident reported in the Kapuskasing area this morning I feel it is my duty to inform the hon. members of the Legislature of the background and events in this matter.

Toward the end of last summer the collective agreements between three locals of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union and 12 pulp and paper companies, covering the basic

operations of these companies, expired. Following direct negotiations between the various companies and the union, and the failure of these negotiations to bring about new collective agreements, Mr. R. B. Bradley, a conciliation officer in The Ontario Department of Labour, was appointed under The Labour Relations Act to meet with the parties in an attempt to arrive at new collective agreements. Since the two sides do not follow the practice of bargaining jointly, it was necessary for the conciliation officer to bend every effort in the direction of establishing a pattern of negotiation and settlement which would be acceptable to everybody concerned.

After numerous discussions with the three union locals and the 12 companies, it was determined to attempt settlement of the Abitibi Power and Paper Company's four logging operations through the appointment of a conciliation board. It was indicated to The Department of Labour by the industry that settlement of the Abitibi situation would form a pattern for settlement of disputes in the other 11 companies.

On September 15, the Abitibi company and the union were requested to nominate their respective members to the conciliation board. By September 28, The Department of Labour was advised that Mr. Drummond Wren would represent the union, and Mr. George Ferguson would represent the company. They subsequently advised The Department of Labour that they had agreed on Judge Walter Little as the chairman of the conciliation board.

Members of the conciliation board themselves fixed November 24 and 25 as the earliest dates upon which they could commence their work. This was unfortunate because The Department of Labour had expected that conciliation proceedings in the entire industry might be concluded by the end of the year. The conciliation board met on November 24 and 25 and then, after a week's adjournment, the parties met again and a settlement for the Abitibi operation was made.

Meanwhile, under sponsorship of The Department of Labour, talks were continuing between the union and the management of the 11 remaining logging operations. I again point out that The Department of Labour expected that the Abitibi settlement would set the pattern for the rest of the industry.

When some of the other companies saw the Abitibi settlement they decided they could not meet it because of certain differences in their economics and general operations. Therefore, the department undertook to work

out, at the conciliation level, appropriate settlement with as many of the remaining 11 companies and union locals as possible.

Mr. Bradley set up a series of meetings early in January and to date settlements have been reached with the following: Ontario Paper Company, St. Lawrence Corporation, Great Lakes Paper Company and the Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company Limited.

A conciliation board has been established in the dispute between the union and the Marathon Corporation at Marathon, Ontario, and holds its first meeting this Saturday, February 16. A conciliation board has been set up to deal with the dispute at the Dryden Paper Company, Dryden, Ontario. On Wednesday of this week a Department of Labour conciliation officer will meet with union and management representatives of the K.V.D. Company at Espanola.

During the early part of January, Mr. Bradley met with officials of union and management of the Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company at Kapuskasing and the Kimberly-Clark Corporation at Long Lac. These discussions became deadlocked, and Mr. Bradley was on the point of recommending that the disputes be referred to conciliation boards. Before he could make this recommendation, on Monday, January 14 the union went on strike in the bush operation of these two companies at Kapuskasing and Long Lac. This strike involves some 1,600 men.

The Department of Labour has not ceased in its efforts to end these strikes and bring about collective agreements. After two meetings and several contacts with union and management, The Department of Labour induced both parties to accept Professor Bora Laskin of the University of Toronto law school as mediator.

Professor Laskin's initial task was to work out a procedural basis for the settlement talks. He scheduled a meeting with union and company representatives for February 9 and 10. On February 8, however, a picket line was placed around the Kapuskasing mill of the Spruce Falls company by striking bushworkers.

The company refused to sit down with the union until the picket line was removed, but Professor Laskin persuaded the company to attend the meeting. At this session, union officials agreed to try to remove the picket line and had this been accomplished, it is likely that progress would have been made. This was not done, and thus the mediation effort was suspended.

A third party in this picture is the settlers who do not belong to the union and who cut wood as independent contractors. During the past three weeks they have continued to cut wood but the strike has prevented them from delivering it to the company and receiving payment for it. This, understandably, has been a very great hardship for them.

Mr. Speaker, to complete the record, and in answer to a question which was directed to me by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), may I read the question and indicate the answer at the same time?

The question from the hon. member is:

With reference to labour-management dispute in Kapuskasing, the union applied for conciliation services in September. Why did The Department of Labour delay granting such conciliation services until January 8 and thereby permit the building-up of such an explosive situation?

Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member for York South, I would say that the hon. member has been misinformed. There was no delay in granting conciliation services by the department. There was a general understanding that the Abitibi Power and Paper Company Limited and Locals 2537, 2693 and 2995 of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union would proceed first to conciliation.

A conciliation officer met with representatives of that company and the union early in September of 1962 and when a settlement was not reached a board of conciliation was established. This board was chaired, as I have said earlier, by Judge Walter Little from Parry Sound, Ontario. The earliest date that this board could meet was November 24 and 25.

A settlement was effected by this board of conciliation, and thereupon the conciliation officer arranged dates for meetings with the other employers, to endeavour to negotiate settlements. The date fixed for the Spruce Falls and Kimberly-Clark negotiations was January 8, 1963. Before the officer could report on the negotiations, a strike was declared at Spruce Falls and Kimberly-Clark at Long Lac.

Had there been no strike, it is reasonable to expect that these negotiations would now be well advanced, if not concluded. Since that strike, negotiations have been continued and agreement effected with four other companies without the intervention of a strike.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a supplementary question arising out of the answer

to the question which I submitted to the hon. Minister?

The hon. Minister stated that the pattern that was going to be worked out in the agreement with Abitibi would apply across the board; at least this was the hope and this was the expectation. My question to the hon. Minister is this: To what extent was there a commitment by The Department of Labour to those unions in the Kapuskasing area, in effect a commitment by the company through The Department of Labour, that this would apply? To what extent was there a commitment? That is my question.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The commitment on the point the hon. member raised was a tacit understanding with The Department of Labour representatives, the unions concerned, and the companies concerned.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask another question then? The hon. Minister has said there was a tacit understanding that the companies in Kapuskasing area would accept the pattern agreed to in Abitibi. Now we find that they decided not to accept it, and that, therefore, there was a four-month delay in conciliation services during that period while they were waiting for the Abitibi decision is the point I was making in my question.

My second question to the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, is this: Is it not correct that the union warned The Department of Labour that the companies in the Kapuskasing area were not likely to accept the Abitibi pattern?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There were discussions on that point I am informed by the department, but the union itself went along with the principle of the tacit understanding and agreed that the conciliation board, with Mr. Drummond Wren and Mr. George Ferguson and Judge Little, should proceed.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I do not know to what extent you are going to permit some discussion now, but this is an exceedingly important matter. And I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have no desire to inflame an otherwise dangerous situation. But I think all of the facts should be before the House.

The facts are that the unions in this area were assured by The Department of Labour that the Abitibi settlement would apply there, that it was a tacit understanding. The facts are that the union warned that the companies in the Kapuskasing area would not likely accept the Abitibi settlement. This is for a reason that I will not go into now because

it would take unnecessary time. The situation we have now is that the companies did not accept the Abitibi settlement. Therefore The Department of Labour was found in the embarrassing situation that they had in effect given a commitment on behalf of the company and the company did not live up to it. Now, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that here are the makings of a situation in an area where direct action is part of the pattern of life. I do not want to assess any blame at the moment, but I do not think there should be—but there is—a tendency to place the blame all on one side.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to get into any debate on this subject, but I felt that it was desirable to lay the facts before the House on the matters, and the sequence of events, which have developed. The hon. member is quite right that it is not desirable at this time to get into any discussion of the details of it because all parties, the unions and the companies, were involved in this matter in the same spirit of good faith, which is supposed to exist if any success is ever to be achieved in the field of labour-management relations.

In the meantime, this morning's situation causes some other feelings on the parts of many of us, and my immediate duty as the Minister is to endeavour to get this thing onto the rails, and to see that some common sense on both sides, whether it be the labour, the striking bush workers, or the company, is effected, in order that the economy of this province can be protected, and in order that the wage earners and the wives and children of northern Ontario are able to live, and have wages coming in through the wage earner of the family.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a final question I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour and then I have one I have given notice to that I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass).

My final question to the hon. Minister is this: Has the hon. Minister given any consideration to an independent study or survey or review or investigation of the situation? The reason why I ask him to give serious consideration to it is this: I think you have got a fundamentally dangerous situation in the system that exists up there. You have on the one hand a company that has cutting rights and unions that are in negotiations with it. On the other hand, you have The Department of Lands and Forests giving permits to settlers, and the company can play off these two. My question to the hon. Minister

is, is he going to make an investigation to resolve the conflict in this system where the company can play off two groups that are in effect supplying it with wood?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: For the past number of weeks I have spent almost all of my time or a large portion of it, keeping in touch and informed with this situation in northern Ontario. I shall continue to do that. There are many thoughts and questions that have gone through my mind during this period having to do with who is at fault in this situation and what can be done, and at an appropriate time I will deal with that further. In the meantime, my immediate concern is getting those men back to work and that company operating, so that the economy of northern Ontario will not be prejudicially affected.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a statement that I would like to add with respect to the matters under discussion.

When the strike mentioned by the hon. Minister (Mr. Rowntree) occurred and District Inspector Ralph Crozier of the Provincial Police at Timmins felt that we should send in additional men, the Ontario Provincial Police sent 25 officers with 10 cars to augment the Kapuskasing detachment. Inspector Crozier I may say, sir, is a man of great experience in the north country and a veteran of the Broulan Reef strike of several years ago.

They maintained patrols throughout the area which includes nine camps and a strike front of some 75 miles. Obviously this is a very large area to control. However, we decided against sending more men into the area because we did not want to do anything that might prejudice the negotiations then under way or which might cause any irritation that would lead to serious trouble.

The size of the policing job involved in this operation may be gained from the fact that the area contains 80 miles of provincial highways and hundreds of miles of bush roads and private roads, with the area comprising several hundreds of square miles.

It was considered whether the police should be stationed in the camps and also whether we should have police meet and escort the settlers with their wood to the mills but we decided against both of these courses, chiefly because the areas were too great to cover adequately and, again, we were anxious to avoid any causes of friction.

Two weeks ago the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle), and a group

of the settlers came to Queen's Park for a meeting with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), the hon. Minister of Labour and myself. The settlers told us that they were being intimidated by the strikers. However, they said they would not go into court and testify if charges were laid. As it was thus impossible to obtain any evidence for prosecution in court we decided to, and did, send Inspector H. M. Purdy, of the criminal investigation branch, up to the area to investigate the situation and advise us as to what measures might need to be taken to meet the situation and to obtain evidence of unlawful acts.

From a law enforcement standpoint the police considered that the situation was composed. Last week the CNR moved two loads from Senneterre and there was no difficulty. Last Wednesday, Staff Inspector R. L. Taylor, who was sent from headquarters to be in charge of the augmented police force, was approached by the settlers who told him they were going to start stockpiling wood at the Reesor siding, which is 37 miles west of Kapuskasing, on Friday last. They suggested that we should have enough men on hand to maintain order.

As a result of this advice from the settlers, we put 24 men—which was our total additional force there—on duty in the area, 12 men on each of two 12-hour shifts. The wood was being piled on private property and a chain with a sign marked "no trespassing" was put across the road at the entrance to this private property. The police maintained their position at this entrance to the private property where the settlers had stockpiled their wood. There was no difficulty in the evening. The settlers stockpiled until dusk, then quit work and retired to a cabin nearby. At about 12.40 a.m. 75 to 80 carloads of strikers arrived on the scene. They advanced towards the entrance to the property where the wood had been stockpiled.

The 12 officers on duty warned them to stay off the property. The strikers withdrew momentarily and then advanced in a mass, broke the chain, and began tossing the wood around. The police did not draw their guns although they had received no orders in this regard. They were just using good sense as good policemen. At that point, some 22 settlers emerged from the cabin and opened fire indiscriminately on the group—on strikers and police alike.

Two men died instantly, one shot in the head and the other in the chest. Twelve men in all received gunshot wounds. The police then advanced and disarmed the settlers,

some of whom had thrown their guns on the ground at their feet. The police arrested 19 men. Three others took off into the bush but the police know who they are and are searching for them. The police gathered up 11 rifles, two shotguns and a .38 calibre revolver. The revolver contained three empty shells. A third man died later in hospital so the total toll was three dead and nine wounded. The pistol belonged to the manager of the co-operative, who had earlier assured the OPP inspector that there would be no violence.

The police had checked the camp carefully yesterday and had received no indication that firearms or any other violence would be used. The strikers were not armed and were apparently intent only in throwing the wood around.

Chief Inspector H. H. Graham and Inspector Lawrence Gartner of the CIB have left by plane today for the trouble area to be in charge of the investigation of the occurrences of last night and 200 members of the OPP, drawn from 14 of the 17 districts in Ontario, are now on the move to the Cochrane-Kapuskasing-Hearst area.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, very much having to report these tragic incidents to the Legislature and I want to state emphatically right now that my department is determined to protect the rights of all the people involved and to see that the law is obeyed by everyone.

At this point, sir, I might answer a question, notice of which has been given to me by the hon. member for York South and which I have already answered in my statement. The question reads as follows: "Were the police aware that the settlers unloading pulpwood at the railway siding had arms?" The second question is: "If so, why were the arms not taken away?" The answer to the first question is no, sir. The second question is therefore answered by the first answer.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Attorney-General a question relative to the statement he has just made? In view of the apparent tendency to blame the strikers for the situation that developed I think it should be borne in mind that it was the strikers—

Mr. Speaker: Order. We have allowed a certain amount of latitude this afternoon in the questions, but I point out that we should not go too far. Therefore, I would suggest if the member has a question to ask he ask it forthwith.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General how it could be possible for an experienced police force to search the quarters of men who had shotguns concealed, which are by no means small weapons, and not discover those shotguns with which three strikers were killed and many others injured.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, of course I do not know the answer to that, all I can say is that anyone who thinks about it would know that these could have been brought in any time up to the time of the occurrence and after the searches and the assurances were received by the police with respect to firearms.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to address to the hon. Minister of Energy Resources (Mr. Macaulay), which has been given to him.

Last year, following the report of the Langford committee problems relating to gas storage were referred for further study to the Energy Board. Has the Energy Board completed this study and, if so, will this report be made public and an opportunity provided for submissions and discussions before the standing committee on energy resources?

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Energy Resources): I would say in response to the question asked by the hon. member I have asked for a report and I hope I will be in a position to give the hon. member an answer tomorrow.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, since you have allowed a certain amount of latitude, I wonder if you would allow some latitude to my problems? I have asked questions of hon. Ministers and have had some delay in getting answers. May I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question? He does not need any previous notice of this one. Since I cannot get prompt answers should I go on "the open line"?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question to ask of the hon. Minister of Energy Resources which goes as follows: according to the Owen Sound *Sun Times* of January 29, 1963, Colonel A. A. Kennedy, a member of the Owen Sound Public Utilities Commission and also a member of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, announced that there would be an increase of five per

cent in the hydro-electric power rate across Ontario in 1964. Is this statement true?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: In response to the hon. member's question, the advice I have is that this statement was retracted in the Owen Sound *Sun Times* January 30, 1963.

Secondly, the commission has made no decision yet with respect to the interim rates for wholesale power to municipal utilities for the year 1964. The adequacy of these interim rates is reviewed annually and an increase or decrease to individual municipalities for the forthcoming year is usually announced in November.

Clerk of the House: Seventeenth order, House in committee of supply.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I ask that we revert to orders of the day, please? I have a statement I wish to make.

Mr. Speaker: We will revert to orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry this comes on the heels of this very sad matter we have been discussing here before the orders of the day, but it is a pleasure for me today to be able to announce what I think is a very major breakthrough in our efforts in this province to create employment opportunities for our people and to stimulate the growth of our economy. I am very happy to be able to report to the House and to describe the first provincial guarantee which we have made under The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act.

This legislation was debated in this House and was passed in the early part of this session prior to Christmas and this is the first concrete action that has been taken under it. I am sure that all the hon. members of the House will be interested in the circumstances and how this worked out.

The guarantee was to the H. J. Fairfield Company of Owen Sound. I might say that we have been able, through the exercise of the powers given to the government under the Act passed prior to Christmas, to revive this company. We have been able to put back at work those who were unemployed as a result of its closing down and we have been able to revitalize it and allow it to assume its position in the economic life of the Owen Sound area.

As a result of what we have done, what has been done under this Act, the company, the H. J. Fairfield Company which closed

down on January 10, 1963, is now in full operation. Some 40 employees who lost their jobs as a result of the plant closing are now back at work. We anticipate that the restoration of the company—putting it back on its feet—will provide another 35 jobs for workers in this area.

In addition to this, of course, the people who have been supplying this firm and all the citizens of Owen Sound are enjoying the benefits of the fact that the plant is back in operation and doing business and the employees are drawing their salary cheques.

We have through this Act introduced a completely new, direct and a very effective, approach to our programme of assisting Ontario's industries. I do not think hon. members will find anything to equal this any place else in Canada, in fact I rather doubt any place on the North American continent.

The first prerequisite, of course, in any successful business, as all the business men in this House know, is adequate financing. We also all know that financing by itself is not sufficient to keep any enterprise flourishing unless there are managerial, technical and advisory skills as well. It was recognition of this latter fact that made it so difficult for this company to find and to obtain the funds and the credit it required.

Therefore, as we debated here before, the structure and the functions of the Ontario Development Agency were designed to meet these conditions, to provide not only the financial backing but provide also the managerial, technical and advisory skills to businesses if these were lacking and if the businesses needed them. We have therefore created an organization which will diagnose the overall problems of a company and will make recommendations on all phases of its activity in order that we can rehabilitate them and put them on a sound basis. To this end the agency, since we last discussed this matter in the House, has brought together and acquired the services of a group of retired senior executives of business—men who in their own background have experience, and long experience, in all phases of management and whose particular skills which might, in the normal method of the business community, not have been utilized. The agency has brought these skills to bear in a very concentrated area to help companies which might need it.

If I may speak about this company in particular, it was founded only about 10 months ago. It is called the H. J. Fairfield Company. It has a very unique operation in that it uses wool and cotton and synthetic clippings as the basic raw material. These

are shredded, woven into yarn and then the yarn, of course, is woven into socks and other textile products. These clippings, I might say, are by-products of the textile industry and if not used in this particular fashion probably would not be used at all and would be destroyed as waste.

As far as we know there is only one other company in Canada which uses this process. Because the raw material cost is so low, being a waste product of other textile plants, this process gives the company a very distinct competitive advantage in the market. The products which it makes have been judged to be of very excellent quality. It is very important, of course, when the textile industry as a whole is experiencing difficulties in this country, that new processes such as this should be given every encouragement in order that they may be developed.

Another very important feature of this particular case was the location of this industry in the city of Owen Sound, which has been hard hit already in the last few years by loss of industry and loss of employment as a result of loss of industry. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) upon some representations being made to him from this area, asked the Ontario Development Agency to act very quickly in re-establishing, if necessary, or in any event to investigate and report to him, on the possibilities there were of this company being put back on its feet.

As I say, it closed down on January 10 primarily because of the lack of working capital. It had substantial orders on hand at that time, it had good equipment and a good production process, but it simply did not have any working capital and the financial institutions with which it was dealing did not have sufficient confidence in its management to make available the additional funds which would be required for the company's continued operation.

Mayor E. C. Sargent of Owen Sound headed a delegation of citizens from the city of Owen Sound. There were some councillors, some representatives of the local chamber of commerce and—

An hon. member: And the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher).

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have known him for some years. But if the Opposition will allow me to go on with my story I will pay credit where credit is due. As the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has advised

at some length, the hon. member for Bruce was a member of the citizens' committee.

They came to Toronto and presented their case to the Ontario Development Agency. More than that, these citizens had sufficient faith in their own community, their own people, that they put up the sum of \$15,000 of their own personal funds in order to assist this company back on its feet. It was estimated that it would require approximately \$100,000 to re-establish the plant.

After this committee visited the hon. Minister, a complete study was undertaken immediately. From this study it became apparent that it was going to be necessary to completely overhaul the financial structure of the company and it was also going to be necessary to completely overhaul the managerial functions if it were to continue a successful operation.

The investigations carried out, revealed that the plant, the equipment, and the actual processes of the company were of the highest order. These were verified by consultants employed by the agency and were also verified by The Department of National Defence which had certain contracts with this firm. It was revealed as well that the company had firm contracts from The Department of National Defence in Ottawa for approximately \$175,000 and with every prospect of being able to obtain further contracts in the future. In addition it had contracts to supply other companies.

After all of this had been checked out the following recommendations were made to the hon. Minister. I am going into this in some detail because it will give the hon. members of the House an idea of how this agency will function. Of course these things will be done as a matter of routine, but I think hon. members are all interested in finding out just how this agency will carry out the duties we have entrusted to it.

The agency recommended to the hon. Minister:

(1) That a complete overhaul of the financial structure of the company be undertaken. In order to carry out this portion of their recommendations, the following things were done:

(a) The principal shareholders were asked to exchange some assets that they had in notes payable for preferred shares. The notes payable, of course, were an immediate and a current liability, whereas the preferred shares are a deferred liability.

(b) Certain directors who were owed fairly substantial sums were prepared, and did compromise these sums which were

owed to them; and settled for much smaller amounts thus improving the financial position of the company.

(c) The major creditors of the company were approached and asked if they would postpone their claims until the company was able to get on its feet and show a profit and then accept settlement of their claims against the company on a monthly "stretch-out" basis.

(d) The city of Owen Sound entered the picture and was prepared to settle its account for back taxes on a legal basis which removed this burden from the company as well.

(2) The second recommendation was that there should be a complete overhaul of the managerial organization of the company. This was done, and the following steps taken:

(a) Mr. Fairfield, the founder of the company, and other owners were asked to put their shares in escrow for a period of two years; in other words they froze their ownership. They were given, of course, legal safeguards to permit them to regain ownership of these shares after this period of time had gone by and the company had resumed operations and had enough time to get back on its feet.

(b) Five very prominent and able businessmen in the city of Owen Sound were persuaded to sit on the board of directors, to serve and advise the company, without remuneration.

I think it is only fair that I should tell hon. members who these men are, because this is undoubtedly a very public-spirited gesture on their part and we are grateful to them for it:

Mr. Ivor Wagner, president of Owen Sound Transportation Co. Ltd.;

E. C. King, president of E. C. King Construction Co. Ltd.;

Norman L. Smith, president of Canadian Foliage Co. Ltd.;

J. Fitter, president of Fitter Electrical Co. Ltd.; and

Alex Vasey, chartered accountant and partner in the firm of Radnett, Vasey and Myatt.

(3) That the company agree to allow a nominee of the Ontario Development Agency to sit on the board of directors, as an observer, with full powers of veto.

(4) That when these measures I have outlined had been adopted, a provincial guarantee was to be approved, not exceeding \$85,000, to be made available to the company for a period of two years at an interest cost of six per cent. This, together with the

\$15,000 pledged by the citizens of Owen Sound, has given the company \$100,000 which expert opinion says it needs if it is to continue to function.

(5) That the provincial funds involved because of the guarantee be secured by unencumbered assets of the company, whose appraised value is about \$300,000. Thus, we have managed to retain our security and, at the same time, provide the help that this company needs as well as protect our own taxpayers.

There were several other things which the agency was able to do in addition to re-arranging the financing and in addition to making arrangements to get proper managerial help for the company.

(a) The agency was able to arrange for the employees to draw unemployment insurance benefits which had been denied as the company had apparently failed to provide stamps when the plant closed in January;

(b) The agency persuaded The Department of National Defence to reschedule its delivery dates in order that the company could meet the commitments that it had and could take advantage of the sales it had made to The Department of National Defence, and had not filled.

(c) The agency was able to re-establish lines of credit for the company with some of its suppliers and persuade certain of its creditors to withdraw writs they had issued against the company in view of the fact that the company was going to be assisted and would in the course of time be able to pay these creditors in the normal fashion.

It was of course the action of the agency that persuaded the financial institution who, in fact, put up the money, because we only guarantee it. If it had not been for the action of the agency I am quite sure the financial institution would not have provided the necessary money.

Thus 40 jobs will be provided as soon as this company can get back into operation, and we foresee a further 35 jobs within a short time which will come to the city of Owen Sound. One very heartening part of this whole story is the way in which all the citizens of Owen Sound have gathered in support. It is a good example of combining a little help from here and a good deal of self help from the community itself combining to solve its own problems.

I think it is fair to say that we have a type of agency here which is certainly

superior to any that we have been able to discover, anything that has preceded it in any event here in Ontario. We are pioneering new ground, and I am very happy to be able to give to the House today this rather complete statement.

I can assure the hon. members they will not get as complete a report as this on all the functions of this agency, but in view of the fact that this is the first and in view of the fact that this is something new, I thought all hon. members of the House would be interested in this story.

I can only say that we are forming a financial advisory committee and—hon. members will remember there was some debate about this committee when the bill was before the House in the fall—I would hope that very shortly we will be able to announce the names of the businessmen whom we have asked from various parts of the province, to serve on this committee.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, if I may just say a word about this because I had a little bit to do with it and certainly what the hon. Prime Minister has said is correct as far as I know.

I thought the House might be interested in knowing how I was put in touch with this matter. I read in the newspaper that the firm was in financial difficulty, and after reading what their difficulties were I felt that the fund as set up by the government before Christmas could certainly help out this particular company. So I called the manager and offered to do anything I could as far as bringing himself and any other people in the Owen Sound area to have a meeting with the head of the fund and his advisors.

Mr. Speaker, while it is not too often that I congratulate the government on things they have done, might I say this for the benefit of hon. members who may be thrown into the position that I was? As far as this case is concerned, I was most impressed with the gentleman who has been put in charge of this particular fund, and I was also impressed with the advisory committee. They may not be the permanent ones that the hon. Minister has appointed, but certainly there were three gentlemen there who knew what they were discussing and they made a thorough study as the hon. Prime Minister has said. I do hope that it will come out for the betterment of the firm itself and for the city of Owen Sound.

My final statement, Mr. Speaker, is this: I wish that this fund had been put into effect last year and it might have saved

several of the firms that have gone bankrupt in the meantime. For now, Mr. Speaker, I would just tell the hon. Minister that I have two other inquiries and I am sure that we will get the same satisfaction in dealing with them as we did with the first one.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether or not the regulations pertaining to the Act are available yet?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: No, I am sorry, not yet.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. Minister says they are not. We will find out and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Bryden: What is the agency operating under?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: May I just answer this one question? We are operating at the moment by the seat of our pants. We had an alternative of letting this company go bankrupt or stand on a technicality. I thought it was a great deal better, while we were working out the regulations, to try to get this company going again—

Mr. Bryden: It would be still better to get the regulations out.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That is quite right, and if it was the only thing I was doing I would have them ready, but there are other things I am doing. I am spending as much time as I can on it.

Mr. Bryden: Is there no one but you in your department?

House in committee of supply; Mr. H. M. Allen in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE PROVINCIAL SECRETARY

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, it is again a pleasure for me to present for the consideration of the hon. members of this House the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship.

In outlining to the House the first step in respect of the Ontario Development Agency the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has indicated to the House the leadership that this administration has taken in that particular field in the continent, if not throughout the world.

I may say that in respect of the activities of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship we too have in a general way, and specific ways I believe, taken the lead. In matters assigned to this department we are doing new things and are looking forward to even further developments of a new nature for the benefit of our people. I propose this afternoon to take the opportunity of touching upon these matters.

If the hon. members will refer to the estimates generally as summarized before them, they will note that there is an innovation in respect of the items in which large expenditures were involved. In respect of item 1706, which is an over \$1 million expenditure, the hon. members will have been accustomed to the fact that over the years some detail has been outlined, but only in respect of that one vote. The other very major vote—in respect of the main office—for many years heretofore, was shown as in lump sum. This year in order to assist the hon. members of the House to be able perhaps to more clearly understand the workings of the department and to participate in the debate and to have an appreciation of the expenditures of the department, a further breakdown has been given.

The expenditures of the main office, in addition to general expenditures, have a breakdown of the four major divisions, that is, administration, marriage office, companies division and citizenship division. I believe that this year the estimates provide more detail than they ever have before and perhaps in sufficient detail to enable the hon. members to participate in discussion on the individual items of the expenditures.

In respect of the sums assigned by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) to the department, I am pleased to say that we have almost to a degree been able to hold the line on expenditures without in any way sacrificing either the service or the efficiency of the department. The hon. members will see that there is a very modest increase in the overall expenditures.

In respect of the estimates, I should like in reference to vote 1701 to touch upon two of perhaps the largest activities of the department as such, and they are with respect to the companies division and the citizenship division.

As hon. members will have been aware in previous discussions in this House, the companies division is responsible for the administration of The Corporations Act and other related Acts in respect of corporations. Their

work includes incorporation, issuing supplementary letters patent, varying provisions of existing letters patent, licences in mortmain, various types of orders in respect to corporations, the filing, examination and analysis of returns required by all Ontario corporations and other corporations having an office or carrying on business in Ontario. Of course, the division is also responsible for the filing of prospectuses and corporation securities and other documents required to be filed.

More new corporations are incorporated in Ontario each year than in any of the other 10 incorporating jurisdictions in Canada. In fact, with only one-third of the population of Canada, Ontario incorporates almost as many new corporations annually as are incorporated in the rest of Canada combined.

In our modern economy the corporate form of organization has largely replaced the sole proprietorship or partnership in the transaction of business. In affording to the public in a quick and efficient manner the corporate form of corporation, the division performs a vital function to the industrial and commercial community of the province.

I believe, and it is the aim of the division, that the service offered to the general public continues to be prompt and efficient. It is my understanding from the solicitors practising before the division that the service offered by it is unsurpassed by any other jurisdiction in North America. The large number of lawyer-members in this House can readily verify this with their own experience or by fellow-members in the profession.

And in this respect I should like very briefly to read from certain letters which have been written to the department in the immediate years. A letter from a firm of solicitors reads as follows:

Might I take this opportunity of expressing appreciation of the remarkably efficient and co-operative service which the companies branch of your department provides to members of our profession and the corporations for which they act.

I believe that this is a very important service and one that is much appreciated by the business community and which reflects credit on the efficiency with which business is conducted within our province.

An excerpt from another letter:

Because of your prompt attention to the request we have been able to complete the transaction and our clients are now busy building a new factory in the township of North York.

From another letter:

The prompt issue of the supplementary letters patent is of substantial importance to our clients.

Another letter:

My principals complimented me on the service rendered to them.

Another letter:

The very prompt attention to this matter is appreciated by the company. I would also like to express to you in order that you can relay it to the appropriate persons my appreciation for the very prompt, courteous and efficient service that I have been given in regard to the matters handled through your department. To a practising solicitor, service rendered by your department is of untold value.

Here is one of the most recent letters dated December 19, 1962:

Your department's work load is well known and the expediting of the engrossing of the Supplementary Letters Patent especially at this time of year is all the more appreciated.

And so this correspondence goes to hundreds of letters.

This popularity is not confined, Mr. Chairman, to our own citizens. For example, in recent years, a number of huge international mining and oil companies have chosen Ontario over every other jurisdiction in the western hemisphere to incorporate their operations, resulting in companies with over \$1 billion in capitalization being incorporated by them in this province.

During the fiscal year ended March 31, 1962, which is the last one, 5,923 new corporations were incorporated in this province. This is the second highest number on record.

From the statistics of the first nine months of this fiscal year it would appear that the number of new corporations will perhaps be slightly lower. But one of the most interesting of the statistics, Mr. Chairman—and I bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) this fact — the number of licences issued to corporations incorporated in other jurisdictions authorizing them to carry on business in Ontario shows a 30 per-cent increase, reflecting the fact that an increasing number of new industries are moving into Ontario from other jurisdictions. This statistic will be worthy of further analysis and examination by the hon. Minister's department.

During the last decade the number of new corporations in Ontario has sky-rocketed.

For example, when I entered this House in 1952 less than 1,800 new corporations had been incorporated in the previous year. Last year almost 6,000. In other words, more than three and a half times as many corporations last year as ten years ago. This huge increase is reflected more geographically in that it is noted that ten years ago somewhat less than 20,000 corporations filed annual returns; last year the number was close to 56,000, one of the highest in the history of the province.

More new corporations have been incorporated in the last ten years than in the first 160 years of the province's history. That is the record of the past and today.

Looking to the future, Mr. Chairman, in order that this province may continue its leadership within this field, I bring to the attention of the House the attitude of the department with respect to The Uniform Companies Act. It is very important to the industry and commerce of Canada as a whole that the Acts in relation to corporations be brought into a greater unification than presently exists, for we now have 11 jurisdictions within the field, with a multiplicity of requirements in respect of company law.

Apart from the divergence in various Companies Acts, each Companies Act outside of Ontario is at least 25 years old. Our own is ten years old. Some in other jurisdictions are 40 years old. I am delighted that the leadership with respect to The Uniform Companies Act has been given by the deputy Minister of this department. The Dominion-Provincial Conference on Uniform Companies Act is under the chairmanship of Mr. R. J. Cudney, QC and the secretaryship is under the Director of Companies. These two men have given leadership in the field.

Twelve meetings have been held in respect of this in the previous six years. The Uniform Companies Act has been printed, the department has provided copies for the knowledge of interested parties throughout the province. We are hopeful that in the coming year further meetings will be held with interested parties such as the Bar Association, the Institute of Chartered Accountants, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Certified General Accountants and Chartered Institute of Secretaries in order, perhaps, that this province again would give leadership. Perhaps this House will be in a position in the coming year or in the very near future to give consideration in order to pass as a statute of this House The Uniform Companies Act which is to the largest degree based on the present Corporations Act of Ontario.

Switching for a few minutes to a completely different function of the department, but no less important and, perhaps, just as important within the life of our province, I should like to touch on some of the highlights of the citizenship division, particulars of which are shown for the first time this year. It is significant, Mr. Chairman, that this jurisdiction at its level is unique in Canada and perhaps in the continent and throughout the world in having a citizenship division of this kind, and I, in all modesty, suggest to you that its programme is only equalled perhaps by one other jurisdiction, and that at a national level, that is, perhaps in Australia.

The interest of citizenship of this administration goes right back to the beginning of its responsibility in this province. In the Throne Speech of 1944 there is reference to the plans of the government of that day in respect of citizenship and, you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that was when this administration took over. Through the years that was developed and a large function was administered by the community programmes branch.

As a result of activities stemming in 1946, the then leader of this party forming the administration said that the programme "was intended to emphasize that part of adult education which has to do with the building of good citizenship and at the same time emphasize that people of every racial stock, who have made this their home, are citizens of the land of their choice in the widest meaning of the word."

He, at the time, spoke of the rich heritage of history and tradition arising from the heterogeneous nature of our combined population, and said as follows—and this has been the very basis of this administration's activities throughout the years. This goes back to 1946—

It is a good thing for Canada that those who trace their ancestry from nations should keep alive old memories of the achievements of their people and the special cultural attainments which are their own. In that way they will keep alive in their children's hearts a justifiable pride in the best of their own past and also enrich the life of all of us by what they add to the common store of culture, of art and of social developments. At the same time it is of the utmost importance that those who make Canada their home should become citizens of Canada of the finest type and take their full part in preserving and improving the life of our nation.

The leader of the administration who subsequently followed him devoted a great deal of his time to the development of the rights of the province of Ontario which, last year, were codified in the Human Rights Code of this province.

The culmination of the programme in recent years has been the development of the citizenship section within the department, subsequently forming a division and being taken into the name. At that time the leadership was given by the now hon. Prime Minister of the province of Ontario, at that time the Minister of Education. Now the programme is able to be consolidated and I should like to touch upon briefly, for the hon. members of this House, some of the highlights, the responsibilities and the functions.

The chief one, of course, is in language and the citizenship training programme. That is based on the servicing of classes under school boards and voluntary agencies. This past year there have been 441 such with a total enrolment of over 9,700. There have been 97 voluntary agencies classes with over 2,000 students. Then, of course, there is the provision of supplementary classes directly by this department—daytime classes for those who are out of work or on the night shift; institutional classes such as held for the Workmen's Compensation Board and the TB and mental hospitals, classes in remote communities; the summer courses; kitchen classes; and the like.

This department has handled 290,000 new Canadian registrants in English and citizenship in the last 16 school years. Over 250,000 have received their education under the school board auspices; 25,000 under the branches of this division; and 18,000 under voluntary agencies. The department is also interested in teacher training in co-operation with The Department of Education, and through seminars and advisory visits. Mr. Chairman, I shall touch upon that in more detail.

We have, as a function, the acquisition of the best resource materials for language training and we have the development of our own materials for essentially oral methods of language teaching. I am going to indicate to you shortly, Mr. Chairman, how this province is leading the field in that respect.

Another function is providing information services, through correspondence, persons calling at the office, seminars, publications, exhibitions, press releases and the like. We provide a translation service—I shall highlight that in a moment.

Then, of course, as charged by the Act setting up the department, we have as a function of co-operation with other agencies, all levels of government and community organizations in this great endeavour. We have embarked with others on research projects, in order to assist us in establishing the need and determine the direction in which future programmes should go.

With respect to teacher training we have the only course of its kind in Canada. We are training teachers to teach English as a second language and not only Ontario teachers. In the summer course, last year, we had 51 with six from other provinces.

In addition, for co-operation with The Department of External Affairs, the technical assistance branch, we are training teachers for use outside Canada—for Africa and Asia under the federal technical assistance programme.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, there were 10 such teachers; this year we are looking forward to 15 new teachers.

With respect to resource materials, we have for a long time been using the resource materials provided by the federal Department of Citizenship. A series of negotiations have been taking place in recent years, which I hope will culminate this coming year—and provision is made in the estimates for this culmination—so that an agreement will be worked out with the federal department that the resource materials will now be acquired by the province on its own. We will be reimbursed—instead of being given resource materials as in the past—by the federal department on a formula which will be worked out.

In order to enable us to acquire those resource materials which we believe are better than those presently being given to us by the federal authority, and to back up our desire to be leaders in the field, we have engaged the citizenship adviser who used to be with the department and who is going to go to the graduate school at the University of Michigan in the near future, to develop resource materials at the elementary and intermediate levels on our behalf so that they will be the most modern and up to date.

It has been my privilege to speak to graduating classes sponsored by the school boards and the department, and I was very interested in listening to a teacher, while saying farewell to her class, outline for those present the pleasure which she had had in participating in such an English and citizenship class. This woman is Mrs. Van Praagh,

an outstanding teacher within this province, and I quote her remarks:

In our citizenship class we endeavour to unravel the intricacies of Canadiana, its history, geography and government. From the jet age we turn back the pages of history and once again with the early explorers we stand in awe and wonder on the shores of the new continent. Or in Indian canoes we slip silently up the rivers and lakes of the great unexplored wilderness. Later on we look over the shoulders of the fathers of confederation as they draft the great British North America Act. Completing the circle, we are back in present-day Canada discussing problems, the election, the political leaders, European Common Market, space flights, or a TV programme on the night before.

What a thrill it is to have a teacher gently leading this group from just listening to asking questions, from observers to participants. It is a rare privilege to be part of this process.

Mr. Chairman, in listening to this teacher I almost wished that I had the time and opportunity of enrolling in her classes; it sounded fascinating.

In order to ensure that our programmes are up to date we are doing research in language training. We had a programme for our summer school last summer, and we are looking forward to further research in this project, especially to do again a project in bilingual teaching.

Ten years ago the community programmes branch carried out this method and determined, on the basis of their experience, that it was less successful than classes taught by the direct method. In recent times there has been a further reopening of this aspect. Discussions have been held by interested parties and we plan in the coming year to evaluate such a programme.

Hon. members will recall that a year ago I indicated to them the leadership that had been taken in this province in the use of television for teaching in a "Let's speak English" programme. I might say that I believe it was the enthusiasm of this department and the co-ordination that took place between META, and the CBC and the federal government which brought about this programme. I am delighted to report that in the past year an award was made, on the occasion of the 26th American Exhibition of Educational Radio and Television Programmes, in recognition of outstanding educational value and distinguished television production, in the classification for a college

and adult instructional programme, to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Metropolitan Educational Television Association of Toronto for the programme series, "Let's speak English".

This award is really a continent-wide award. It is the only type in its field and I would like the indulgence of the hon. members to read the citation. I quote:

Here is systematic instruction using the medium of television and related audio-visual techniques to suggest new dimensions to the craft and art of presentation. Using a clear and well paced style, this programme employs unusual integration of visual aids and illustrative material to reinforce them, a highly specialized type of instruction. A splendid contribution to the education of new citizens.

I am delighted to report that these programmes are being broadcast in other communities throughout the province of Ontario.

I touch briefly on the use of another medium, Mr. Chairman. The House will recall that I outlined in some detail the seminars which were held at the International Institute where the top people of various departments participated in transmitting information to leaders of the community. I am delighted to report that the seminars have continued and we plan to continue them with other departments.

During the past year a unique programme, which I mentioned briefly to this House, has almost reached culmination and I hope to have the opportunity before the end of the month of presenting it in concrete form to the hon. members of this House. The results of those seminars have now been published in 13 different languages—in 11 languages in addition to English and French—and I believe only the province of Ontario—I do not know of any other jurisdiction—would be in a position to have these brochures.

The hon. members of this House will see the quality of the 13 outstanding brochures in 13 different languages, and I say again, Mr. Chairman, that only this province has the facilities for such a production. A great deal of credit is due to the ethnic press of this province, who have assisted us tremendously in this production.

An indication of how the department has satisfied the demand within the province is indicated by the translation service which we have given. In 1960, when this programme was first developed, 400 documents were translated. Last year there were 3,500, over nine times the original number. At a glance

I would say translations in almost 40 different languages; roughly about half for general public and non-governmental organizations and half for departmental organizations.

I note that of the trade certificates which were translated that there were 60 different types, ranging all the way from air force mechanics, carpenters, cinema projector operators, excavation machine operators—I am only picking them at random—right down to one zoo technician. A large number of certificates, some 500, in relationship to motor mechanics and hairdressers, were translated for The Department of Labour, which leads me to believe that a great many of these certificates were of assistance in the employment of these people.

There were some 400 educational certificates which I am sure assisted the newcomers either in advancing their education or in establishing the level from which they should proceed, or in obtaining employment. Some 1,500 were of personal status, such as birth certificates and marriage certificates, and I am sure that a great many were translated in order that those involved might obtain assistance under the welfare programmes of this province and Dominion.

I think I have outlined some of the ways that this department is carrying out its function with respect to co-operative action. I now touch on the fact that we are embarked on several research projects in co-operation with other agencies. I will only touch on one or two.

We are co-operating with the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto and the University of Toronto in studying the problem of bringing community services to newcomers, the use of community health and welfare and educational services, the obstacles to the use of such services by the newcomers and an examination of alternative welfare agencies, if any, that are used by newcomers in meeting their needs.

Then there is a programme in respect of the International Institute of Metropolitan Toronto being carried out among Italian and Portuguese newcomers, to discover the conditions of life of the most recent immigrants in relation to jobs, to schools, to community services, to have some scientific basis upon which to proceed and plan future programmes.

I read from the letter from the Community Social Planning Council in respect of their programme:

May I express our appreciation for the support that the province has given in all our efforts to facilitate the adjustment of

newcomers to Canadian life. This support has meant a great deal to us in our attempts to achieve co-ordination of government and voluntary services developed to meet the needs of this group.

And there are other letters which are in my possession.

Those are co-operative actions with agencies to which we give financial assistance; there are many agencies with which we co-operate apart from financial assistance. I mention again the Canadian Association for Adult Education, the Canadian Citizenship Council, the Oshawa and Windsor citizenship councils, the Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations, the Toronto Board of Education, and Costi, so well known to so many of us, the Co-ordinating Committee for Citizenship receptions for Metropolitan Toronto, the ethnic press, and other media such as radio stations.

At this point I should like to refer to a letter which is typical. It is a letter from radio CHUM. It refers to the fact that it made 30 air announcements of our language classes free of charge. We saved the taxpayers of this province some \$750, and Mr. Stone, the executive vice-president, offers his assistance whenever it is needed in the future.

Then, of course, we have co-operated directly with the Canadian Scene to which I have paid tribute in the past and to which I pay tribute again at this time.

We had an interesting co-operative situation also with the Social Planning Council and the International Institute. We provided a language programme in reverse that was for assisting, by an intensive crash teaching, welfare workers and other members of other organizations to speak Italian. This included senior officials of large agencies, the Commissioner of Public Welfare, the Director of Training of The Department of Public Health, nursing division, and they have indicated their satisfaction.

I am pleased to have a letter from two of the students in which they say to me "the classes were not only useful and interesting but also most enjoyable. We were all surprised to see how much could be learned in such a short time and feel much more competent now to try to talk with the Italian people we meet in our work."

That is the programme as developed and I am looking forward to the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, in the immediate years ahead to work perhaps in new fields and new endeavours. I only touch upon the headings of such because the full ramifications of such programmes have to be examined.

The development of citizenship clubs; the participation perhaps in a more general civic education—to co-operate still further with universities and social agencies and local groups interested in integration programmes. There is further the field of publications and the use of mass media. In particular I refer to the fact there are now 24 radio stations in the province which have broadcasts in 18 different languages.

I am intrigued, as one being committed to collecting Canadiana as such within the province, a matter which has been a personal interest of mine, in a display of ethnic Canadiana, that in the Royal Ontario Museum or the National Museum in Ottawa or elsewhere suitable, an ethnographic section be set up to bring together and to highlight and preserve the various cultural attributes of the various ethnic groups that make up our population. In this connection also there could be encouraged the writing of histories of the ethnic settlements in Ontario in order that a ready and complete reference source be available for our citizens generally in order to further carry on the foundations which have been laid.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1701:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, one of the most rewarding pursuits that I have found in my young life is to make a study of the use of language. I do not usually cavil or quarrel or indulge in polemics about someone else's use of language. However, having suffered an initial shock on hearing the phrase "ethnic press", I was absolutely horrified to hear the use of the phrase "ethnic Canadiana".

Ethnic Canadiana?

My hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) says the hon. Minister actually did say it.

Now it might be very opportune, just when the country is to be launched on an election campaign, where attention will be directed to various groups, to examine precisely what is the meaning of this word "ethnic". I understand it to mean—I looked it up one time in both the Oxford and the Webster—and I understand it to mean "denoting racial origin." That is all it means. "Denoting racial origin". It is an adjective.

I see where some users of it, and they are most often politicians who change an adjective into a noun and now they refer to groups of people as "ethnics". Now a person who attended Balliol College of Oxford would be absolutely horrified, if not sent into an apopleptic stroke, at changing an adjective into a noun.

Ethnics! But if it denotes racial origin, then I daresay that everybody in the country is an "ethnic". But it is not used in that sense. If you are British, Anglo-Saxon, Irish or French Canadian, you are not an "ethnic". But if you come from any other racial stock at all then you are an ethnic. So ethnics are reserved to the Slavik people, presumably inhabitants of Asia who come to our shores, the Caribbean, and anyone else who is not from the British Isles or traces his origin to France. All the rest are ethnics.

No one would dare call an Indian an ethnic, because a North American Indian would turn around to you and he would say in the way Omar Martin, the Indian magistrate said. "All the rest of you are ethnics, I am the only native here."

Now it is about time in this country that we begin referring to our fellow citizens—I was almost going to say fellow Canadians—but our fellow citizens as Canadians, and we drop this adjective "ethnic"; or the prostitution of the adjective into a noun, we stop calling them "ethnics". Let us treat them as equals, as fellow residents, with the same respect, rights, fairness, as anyone else. If the hon. Minister pays attention to me, then he will not depart from grace of speech in using such phrases as "ethnic press" or "ethnic Canadiana". Now, I will leave that.

I listened with interest to the correspondence. I take it that there is quite a flood of it that comes in. He referred to the letters which he read, and they were all very interesting, as being typical. I do not see why he should read us a typical letter, Mr. Chairman, he should read us all of them, read them all; or maybe there is such a great quantity of them that it calls for the hiring of someone like Ann Landers in the department to answer them, someone who knows the responsibilities of the department and that could deal with social and domestic problems, give advice.

Now it was natural, before I got into that, for me to pass on to the citizenship department. I sometimes think, and I make no apologies for it, Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will live to regret it when I say it, that I am something of a centralist because I look upon myself as a resident of Ontario, and Ontario domiciliary. I live in Ontario, but I am a citizen of Canada. That I was born and that is what I will remain.

I am like the great Sir John A. Macdonald who said "a British subject I was born, a British subject I will die." I would have to paraphrase that, I was born a British subject but I hope to die a Canadian citizen, because a little transition took place during my life,

precisely in 1948 or 1949, when we all changed from British subjects to Canadian citizens in virtue of The Citizenship Act.

Now to go back to my little centralist tendency, I happen to believe that this government has no business getting into fields that are exclusively the jurisdiction of another level of government. I do not know what that citizenship means in there. I hope it does not mean citizenship of Ontario; no one would dare assert that. But I suspect it means that so far as the values of citizenship are concerned, that the moneys that are spent—they are not a great amount, \$266,240—that they are spent only on those citizens of Canada who are residents of Ontario.

I happen to believe that when a matter is in another level of government jurisdiction—and we do have a confederation here. Whether we like it or not, it is a confederation, that is what it was founded to be. It will celebrate its 100th anniversary in about four years time. I happen to believe that the inculcation of the pride and joy of citizenship in this country is the responsibility of the federal government. Let it take on the onus, spend the money, if any such need is required. But on the same score—here I stand open to be corrected—on the same score I notice that the federal government—is there a federal government? Well, if there is a federal government, let us assume there is a federal government—when there was a federal government, I noticed that they set aside a certain sum of money for the celebrating of that centennial.

I can just picture it now on or about July 1, 1967. The landscape will be filled with politicians who will have their lungs full and who will be talking about our past glories and future prospects. It will be at one and the same time a nation that has not lived up to its potential and one on which somebody else, speaking to another group some place at exactly the same time, will be looking back with pride of accomplishment.

However, the federal government has taken some steps to celebrate that great day, and a great day it is, but I have not yet heard what this government has done, or intends to do. I have not seen the voting of any funds, since I have been a member of this Legislature, to aid in the celebration or, what is more important, to evaluate in a sense what this country has done in the hundred years since its founding; to take a fresh look and then go on to a new impetus and stimulus for the using up of the last 30 or 40 years of this century in order to assess what its direction is going to be.

And instead of reading us letters from admirers, Mr. Chairman, all of which were very interesting, not all of which were very intelligent, the hon. Minister ought to have told us something about what the intention of his department is. I assume it will be the one responsible, in doing what is necessary or what the people of this country will want to do, when we come to the historic celebration of the first hundred years of our history as a united nation from sea to sea.

Another thing about this department that I have always wanted to say, and I have the opportunity to say it: This department is the one wherein we vote our own salaries, and I do not know that the members of the House should slough over that, pass over it, sort of look the other way as a substantial sum of money is voted for the payment of the members of this Legislature. I will not say how much it is but it is a pretty compendious sum that we vote, but I always did want to take the opportunity to differentiate the effect of the indemnity that we get between the members of the Opposition and the members of the government.

I want to put it this way: in my humble opinion there is some disadvantage to the people of the province by electing a government composed of a large majority. When this government came to office in 1955, 1959, pardon me, it seems to me they had 72 or 73 members out of 98; they have less than that now but still the government majority is quite large and the results of a large majority behind the ministry, so far as I am able to determine, is that there are considerable and substantial pressures put on the ministry, put on the Prime Minister, put on the other members that he selects to form part of the Executive Council to get other jobs—by the way, we call it 'moonlighting' when you have two jobs—to get fringe jobs within the government.

I took the opportunity one time to look over all the government members and I made a calculation, which I forget, but I would say that, outside the ministry which is composed of 22 or 24, you find another respectable number who have jobs elsewhere in the public service.

One would have to be blind not to recognize the pressures that are put on the ministry and the Prime Minister in order to secure those jobs. And when a large number, and I dare say it is the majority of the government members that are holding two jobs, then one sees what a disadvantage the Opposition is in insofar as the 24, 29 of us over

here giving up our time, for the public service, have to rely entirely on the members' indemnity.

Or to sum it up in one sentence, what we get is the indemnity but what the majority of the members who sit behind the government and support it get is much more than the indemnity and sometimes for other than Ministers that 'much more' amounts to a figure as high as \$10,000. In effect, private members of the Legislature are paid as much as Cabinet Ministers although they are not on the Executive Council.

Personally, what brings that to mind is the knowledge that when I come here and sit here I give up the most productive years of my life in the profession which provides me an income. And I do not know that it is right, I do not know that the system as it exists now is right, but you never get any system changed by overlooking it and not calling attention to it. And I do so without shame, without shame because I have deplored, since I have been a member of the House, the striving and the pulling and the ying and the yang that I see among government members in trying to put themselves forward in position to get the fringe benefits.

An hon. member: Some go to the Senate.

Mr. Sopha: Some go to the Senate, indeed some do.

An hon. member: Not enough, though.

Interjection by another hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: The former member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Belisle) whose seat is now vacant—a colleague of mine because he comes from the adjacent constituency—went to the Senate and I will tell you why he went, and I do him no disservice in telling you why he sought that job and why he got it. Because he never got anything from this government, it is as simple as that. First elected in 1955, he got nothing from this government—not that he did not ask because he did ask but, no, he did not even get promises, I say to my hon. friend from Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root); he did not even get promises, he got the cold shoulder. Finally, he fooled them all, he fooled them all because he applied down at Ottawa, and as the government at an historic moment was crumbling and falling, as if the lava of Mount Vesuvius was destroying Pompeii in the last spasm of life, so to speak, they were able to appoint him a Senator.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, a good deal for him, a good deal. I said to one of the private members who queried me about it, who also has a job that I referred to, a fringe job, I said he will draw the pay down there and do nothing. I said: I see you always carrying a brief case with you when you go home, you have to work for yours.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: No, there is no jealousy at all, no jealousy at all in it, I wish him well.

The hon. Minister, of course, as I said devoted a considerable time to the reading of letters, all of which were very interesting but he did not pay a great deal of attention, if I heard him right, and I followed everything he said, to some of the problems that confront this department. In fact, if you listen closely to the hon. Minister you would come to the conclusion that there were no problems confronting that department, and suffice it to say that we in the Opposition are content until we read the report of the Honourable Mr. Justice Roach to see what he has to say about that department, and no doubt he will have a great deal to say because his inquiry was preoccupied for quite a considerable period of time in studying the affairs of that department.

Particularly we will watch his recommendations in respect of social clubs and the granting of charters thereto. Let me say, and perhaps I tread where angels fear to go, that having followed the evidence closely, and seen and heard some of the disclosures made in reference to certain people who sit on the opposite side of this House in respect to social clubs, that I thought up to this time that being members of this Legislative Assembly, this House was owed the obligation that those members would rise in their place and make an explanation to it and to the members.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sopha: They have not seen fit to do so. We will wait to see what the honourable justice says about them and then perhaps we will raise it again.

Now, of course, one of the problems that confronts this department which one sees daily, almost daily, in the press if you pick up any of the financial papers at all, is the question of the disclosure of the affairs of public companies to the shareholders of them. And for over a year now, I venture to say perhaps longer, but at least for the past year, writers in all of the leading journals including the *Financial Post*, the *Financial Times* and

some of the less renowned journals have been arguing to the effect that The Corporations Act of Ontario is inadequate insofar as it does not require a fair disclosure of the corporate affairs to the owners of the company, that is the shareholders. I note in passing that an association of chartered accountants—I do not know the company, that is the shareholders—I note in passing that an association of chartered accountants, I do not know the exact name of the association but I know it was a body composed of chartered accountants, made representations to the federal government recently asking for an overhaul of the federal Companies Act in respect of this important problem, that is the disclosure of the corporate affairs of the shareholders. I read in that same news item that The Companies Act of Canada had not been amended since 1934 in these particulars.

The Corporations Act of Ontario, of course, was re-written in 1953, but even as it stands now it is entirely inadequate so far as it requires a company to make a full and fair disclosure of the dealings of the company in the preceding financial year to the shareholders. Or to put it another way, a shareholder looking at the annual statement, studying it—and there are people I am told who can look at annual statements and read them as if it was a symphony of Bach or Beethoven, I am told there are such people, I am not one of them. But I do know this, that if you look at many annual reports and you try to discern something about the workings of that company, you would not be able to do so. You would not really be able to reach an intelligent appraisal by the information furnished you in the report.

For example, I looked at one. In the list of assets it said "Other assets \$9,283,163." Well, I wondered, what is that? Is that a group of Rembrandt paintings that the president has in his home perhaps? From another point of view, that phrase—a phrase could not be more general than "other assets". My hon. friend from York Centre (Mr. Singer) says "Is it the petty cash?"

I thought that they might as well have put in an inscription from an Egyptian tomb there, or what would be more practical perhaps a new recipe for a martini. It would be of more utilitarian value than calling it "other assets". Under The Corporations Act, for example, many shareholder companies—and I assert here that I am echoing complaints that have been made, complaints that have been made to this government about the inadequacy of the fair disclosure requirements of the corporate dealings—The Cor-

porations Act requires that the company list the shares it holds in other companies, showing their nature, showing the nature of the shares. So a mining company in its financial statement will put in an item: "shares held in other mining companies, \$16,252,108."

Well, they complied with the statute, "other" showing their nature. Whereas the Act should say, if the government was really interested in this type of thing, the Act should say the company should be required to list the specific number of shares that the public company holds in other companies. There are some people in the country who are interested in vertical integration, are interested in the hierarchy of control of the economy of the nation. There are some who are worried that the control becomes vested as the years go by in fewer and fewer hands.

Then another one. Gunnar Gold Mines is not an Ontario company. I think not, it may be, but I think it is not. Hon. members may recall that when Gunnar Gold Mines wanted to merge with the McNamara Construction Company—this could happen to an Ontario company, this could be an Ontario company. I use it as an illustration to show the default of this government, its lack of interest. When it wanted to merge with McNamara it intended, or the directors of that company intended, that it merge without a shareholders' meeting. They were not going to call the shareholders together to ask them in democratic fashion: "Do you think we should get out of the mining business and go into the construction industry?" The directors were going to decide that.

It was the Toronto Stock Exchange, an independent body, a self-regulatory body, that required the directors of Gunnar to hold a shareholders' meeting to consider whether it was a feasible and desirable move to merge with McNamara. I say if that were an Ontario company, then there is nothing that I can find in The Corporations Act that would require the directors of the company to do what the Toronto Stock Exchange required of the directors of Gunnar. When it is a decision which affects the economic well-being of the company, perhaps the job opportunities and the employment of thousands of the citizens, is that really a role that should be made or a regulation or a requirement which should be passed by the Toronto Stock Exchange, an independent body responsible to no one except as it is responsible under The Securities Act to the securities commission and is responsible to its members?

Is not, I ask rhetorically, is not the government in default? Is it not in default that the

government does not come forward and take some interest in this from the point of view of its effect upon the economy? Ought not government to say: "Well, now this corporate development, this new corporation that you want to create, it might have some effect upon jobs and living conditions, and it is of interest to us?"

Well, not this government, it does not, you may rest assured of that. Because apparently when they passed The Corporations Act in 1953 they thought it was the be-all and end-all, for all time. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members of the House, from the little study that I have made of the question and the reading I have done, that it is entirely inadequate to promote the economic well-being of this province

Now another thing. One hears a great deal now, if one looks at the financial pages, about non-disclosure of directors of dealing in corporate shares. One remembers—and I will not name the company—one remembers about a year ago or a year and a half ago when two companies were going to merge and one was going to disappear. No, I put it wrongly—three companies were going to merge and one of the companies was going to disappear as a result of the merger. Three in all. One would disappear, the other two would remain.

There was a great deal of excitement caused on the streets, I remember, when a director of one of the companies was asked: "Are there any plans afoot for this merger?" And he answered in the negative: "There are no plans". Three days later the board of directors of his company announced the merger.

Now what is the vice? The vice is simply this: the directors of companies are people in a fiduciary relationship to the shareholders, they are trustees. And being trustees and being directors, they are privy to inside information about developments of the company and they are in effect not only the beneficiaries of inside information but they are subject to daily temptations in its use. I want to put it another way. A director of a company has no right to use information that comes to him in his position as a director for his private gain. He has no right to use it to the disadvantage of the shareholders in the company. He has no right to make a profit from the use of his inside knowledge which profit is not open in equal degree to every other shareholder in the company.

Now I want to illustrate two things. I think it is best to approach it this way. I

have before me the annual report of an Ontario company. I was surprised to find it was an Ontario company. I am not going to name the company, it might shock my friends to the left if I name it and I do not want to upset their tranquillity. I sent a message to the Deputy Provincial Secretary and asked him if it was an Ontario company and he assures me it is.

This Ontario company, and it is a very good example to use, happens to be listed not only on the Toronto Stock Exchange but it is listed on the New York Stock Exchange, and by reason, mark you, of its listing on the New York Stock Exchange and thereby coming under the jurisdiction of the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States, the annual report of the company becomes different and unique from those supplied by Ontario companies who are only listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange, because if you are listed in New York then before the directors or whomsoever is so moved can ask for a proxy to vote the shares of a shareholder who is not going to attend the annual meeting; they have to do certain things.

Then the American government and the New York Stock Exchange require that certain information be disclosed to the shareholder before he is asked to give a proxy, and I cannot think of anything more reasonable than that. If you ask a man for his vote, whether you are a politician or a director of a company or are running for head of the Cancer Society, it seems reasonable to me that you should disclose to the man whom you ask to repose confidence in you, you disclose to him what you intend to do. That is not a startling proposition, but it is a startling proposition when one considers what the American government requires in this realm as opposed to what the Ontario government, the Provincial Secretary's office, those in charge of the administration of The Corporations Act and those who write it, do not ask.

In this one, and I do not intend to read it into the record, but one of the first things that it shows is the salaries of the directors. They are not underpaid, I must say. The chairman of the board gets \$75,000, the president gets \$100,000.

Then the next thing it requires is information concerning nominees as directors. If they are running as directors for the ensuing year then they must disclose how many shares they hold in the company, either directly or indirectly. I notice one of them only holds one share. I wonder what he is doing.

An hon. member: It is likely the president.

Mr. Sopha: No, he is not. No, he is a partner of the legal firm.

Then, of course, there is information concerning a stock option plan. It is intended in the ensuing year to offer a stock option to certain key executives within the company. Ontario companies do this all the time with no disclosure at all. At the annual meeting—if you want to go to the annual meeting—you will hear about it, but if you do not attend the annual meeting then there is no requirement that this be mailed to you. I saw the worried frown on the hon. Provincial Secretary's face and I hasten to correct the wrong impression I have given.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I correct my hon. friend. I am not worried. I always, unlike so many on the other side, pay attention to what is being said on the other side and that is evidence of the intense intention I am paying.

Mr. Sopha: So the stock option plan of this company requires—I just hold it up and there are two pages and a third one of very fine print which sets out in the utmost excruciatingly painful and obtuse detail everything about the stock option that will be granted to key personnel within the company.

Then I say, in case someone did not hear me, I say again that the shareholders get that proxy statement by reason only of the fact that that Ontario company sells its shares on the New York Stock Exchange, and accordingly comes under the jurisdiction of the American Securities and Exchange Commission.

The thought has never occurred to this government to do anything similar. The thought has never occurred that such a provision in Ontario might be beneficial and might be salutary. It might impose a little bit of democracy, if that is the proper term, and I am not sure that it is, within the corporate affairs and direction of the company. I say I do not know if 'democracy' is the proper term to use because business is business and what counts within the corporate structure is the number of shares that you hold. It is purely a question of money.

Now, very significantly, the number of shares I observe, and I am going to make only one reference to The Corporations Act, determines a great many things. I was speaking a moment ago and I want to reiterate and attempt to tie all this together. I was speaking a moment ago about the concern of a great many people about directors taking

unfair advantage of the inside information that comes to them and using it to their own pecuniary benefit at the expense of the shareholders.

Now I would not have to, from a moral point of view, I would not have to argue very long to prove that it is wrong to do it, but in The Corporations Act in virtue of section 71 this wrongness can only be ascertained in this manner:

upon the filing of a requisition to that effect, signed by at least one shareholder of a public company holding shares representing at least one per cent of the issued capital, each director shall make a return to the company to be presented at the next annual meeting stating the number and class of shares of the company acquired or disposed of by him directly or indirectly since the last annual meeting of the company or the incorporation of the company where no annual meeting has been held, giving the dates of acquisition or disposition in each case.

Now, I put it this way. I feel that government, if it is really concerned, if it is really concerned about corporate management, if it wants to be fair to shareholders, if it desires that shareholders have an adequate knowledge of the running of the company, then government would enact legislation so as to require directors to do this very thing as the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States does.

Why should it be that the requisition needs to be filed, and mark you, Mr. Chairman, a requisition signed by one shareholder holding shares representing at least one per cent of the issued shares of the company? Now, suppose a director who was privy to a knowledge that the company was going to merge—no, let me take another example. Supposing that a director was privy to the knowledge that it was intended that the government expropriate the company and he was privy to the further knowledge that the government would pay "X" dollars a share. This very thing is going on in Quebec now for the issued shares of a company.

The shares were trading on the market at X minus 10 at that very time, that very day, when he got the information; and he goes and buys up the shares; he buys up a block of shares. He is using information which comes to him in a fiduciary capacity to his private gain, at the expense of the shareholders of the company. Now what do you need—a shareholder who holds one per cent—to file a requisition to obtain that information?

Most mining companies in the province, incorporated under this statute, have usually issued shares of 3 million or that neighbourhood. If it is 3 million—my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. Whicher) says often 5 million; it is true, but let us take the 3 million figure—then the shareholder has to hold 30,000 shares, if my mathematics are correct. I am about as good in mathematics as the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, Mr. Chairman, he will correct me if I am wrong. He would have to hold 30,000 shares. In other words, if a director—here is the way it boils down logically—is doing wrong, then he could only do wrong to a 30,000-plus shareholder. He cannot do wrong—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member would not want to continue under an error. If he would only take a moment out to actually read the Act, it says: "at least one shareholder". You could have two shareholders, you could have 100 shareholders, joining together; you could have 1,000 shareholders together. So the great difficulty that the hon. member is building up does not exist.

Mr. Sopha: I do not care if you have to have 76, they have to hold one per cent of the issued shares.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But that is not the one shareholder which the hon. member was flogging just a moment ago.

Mr. Sopha: I will put it another way. Then a director can only do damage to those who hold more than one per cent of the issued shares; he cannot harm the ones who do not. Of course he can carry on his wrongdoing as long as they do not know. I am asking for the simple proposition that the Act be changed requiring directors every six months—that is the nub of the thing—to publish the change in shares, to publish their change in shareholdings.

But I want to underline what I am saying again, Mr. Chairman. I want to underline it by saying that for the last year, like the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—whom I much admire on this score and I do not criticize him; I am speaking in commendatory terms about him now, the hon. member for York South who cuts out all these clippings and documents what he says with them. I am not a clipping-cutter; I do not have them, but I have noticed for the last year that the financial papers over and over again—the *Financial Post* has it just about every week—say it is time to get a sane and commonsense revision of The Corporations

Act requiring full disclosure in the annual statement of the dealings of the directors in the corporate affairs of the company. Two-pronged, two-sided.

But instead of hearing something like that, the hon. Minister gets up and reads the letters that he received—complimentary letters. He did not read any letters that were not complimentary.

The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy) was saying—and I have seen the frustration etched on his furrowed brow—that in order to ask questions of the ministry he will have to go on the open line on one of the radio stations. I understand there is a programme on now, I have not heard it, called "Ask the Premier". I am told that.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is the Diefenbaker line.

Mr. Sopha: No; not Premier Diefenbaker.

Well, I wanted, in the same way as the hon. member for Nipissing, to express a beef. I notice—and I have gone at this thing backwards, which will elicit some comment—I started with the members' salaries and I worked through the citizenship division and now I want to talk about the office of the Speaker for a moment, who is also paid out of this department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, subject to your ruling, perhaps the hon. member could leave that until we get to that item in the votes.

Mr. Sopha: I do not mind.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): That means we have the opportunity to hear him twice.

Mr. Sopha: I have only one other thing to say. I want to end by saying this: I am going to wait until I have the hon. Minister's attention. In respect of the commission before the Honourable Mr. Justice Roach it is my understanding, from information that I have to hand, that before the deputy provincial secretary gave his evidence before that commission, certain discussions took place between the hon. Minister and the deputy provincial secretary about the evidence the deputy provincial secretary was going to give. I understand further that during those discussions the hon. Provincial Secretary lost his temper at the deputy. I understand further from information I have to hand, which is absolutely reliable, that in the preparation of the brief to be presented to the Honourable Mr. Justice

Roach—that compendious document—the Provincial Secretary asked his deputy to sign that brief and he refused. I say this: The hon. Provincial Secretary, knowing that his deputy was to give evidence before the Roach commission, had no business morally or legally to discuss the nature of that evidence or anything about it.

Those of us who watched the newspapers could not help but come to have the highest admiration for the deputy provincial secretary, for the manner in which he gave his evidence. I think this House is entitled—this rumour has been ricocheting from the walls of these buildings ever since—to an explanation from the hon. Provincial Secretary about the nature of those discussions; why he lost his temper; what was said when he asked the deputy provincial secretary to sign that brief; and why the deputy provincial secretary, who cannot speak for himself in this House, refused to sign it.

Why did the hon. Minister want him to sign it? Why was it important? What hand did the deputy play in its preparation that he should be asked to affix his signature and bear the responsibility for it? I think the House is entitled to hear that explanation from the hon. Provincial Secretary about this very important matter—important as it is so far as it relates to the relationship of a permanent civil servant of the highest integrity to the hon. Minister, who is transitory and responsible to this House.

In conclusion, I say that if the hon. Provincial Secretary was at all concerned about the nature of the evidence to be given by the deputy before the Roach commission, one wonders why—since the hon. Provincial Secretary only came to this department on May 26, 1960, and the Roach commission revealed this department's history for a much longer period than that. I think they went through the tenure of six Provincial Secretaries. Why was the hon. Minister so concerned about what the deputy would say? The deputy has been there for a good many years; I do not know how long but it is more than 20.

Well, I put the question and I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that it demands an answer.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I see the hon. Minister is not jumping to his feet to give that answer, so I shall proceed with my contribution to the debate.

There are many things I would like to say—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In deference to the established rules to give the hon. member an opportunity of speaking.

Mr. MacDonald: I have seen occasions when the hon. Minister bounded to his feet with a zealotness that could not be contained. I suspect that he must ponder his reply in this instance.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me get back to one or two general comments. In addition, there is one issue on a policy level with which I would like to deal.

May I say, with regard to the hon. Minister's introductory remarks, that it is my understanding that the purpose of the introductory statement of the Minister is to deal with the policies of his department. I would like to say in the friendliest way that I can to the hon. Minister that it is utterly useless to come in and present to this House an endless succession of "thank you" letters—this orgy of self praise. Even when somebody questions the furrows on his brow, his comment is one of self praise—he is deeply listening, that was the reason why. It just becomes a bit too unctuous.

We would like to have some of the policies of this department, not the "thank you" letters. The only thing that has matched this performance is what we usually get from the departing member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle); he could really outdo even this Minister but I do not think it is an achievement to which one aspires.

I want to direct my fire against the government where it should be directed, but there was one contradiction in the very interesting and colourful comments of the hon. member for Sudbury that I want to note in passing. I am a bit puzzled as to exactly what the view of the Liberal party is with regard to The Department of Citizenship.

Last year the member who led off on this was the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson). He started out on somewhat the same lines, highly critical of this government muscling in on what, in effect, was the federal government's responsibility, but it became very clear at the end that he was deeply interested in The Department of Citizenship. Indeed, as I said to him, he was, in effect, the pot calling the kettle black, because I know of no two people more than the hon. member for Dovercourt and the hon. Minister here who have been professional cultivators of the "ethnics"; now we find another spokesman for the Liberal party—

Mr. Sopha: I spoke for myself, not the Liberal party.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, Mr. Chairman, that was a very significant interjection. The hon.

member for Sudbury said he spoke for himself, not the Liberal party. This is another thing about the Liberal party. I never know when their leader is speaking for himself or his party, because the policies change week from week.

However, I am really not interested in the Liberal party this afternoon—but they are so fascinating in terms of their contradictions.

The point I wanted to draw attention to at the moment was this: When the hon. member for Sudbury started out, in effect, chastising this government for getting into the citizenship issue when it was a federal affair, in the very next breath he was chastising this government for not getting into the question of celebrating Confederation in 1967.

An hon. member: Well, that is very versatile.

Mr. MacDonald: You are versatile; you certainly are. In that respect you are a Liberal; your versatility is that you can be on both sides of the same issue in succeeding breaths.

However, let me get back to what I wanted to deal with.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): That would be by way of a change.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): This is exactly what your followers are complaining of.

Mr. MacDonald: Have you heard what your followers are complaining about?

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one aspect of the policies of this department. It is a bit of an addendum to a matter I dealt with last year. When I raised it last year I conceded to the House that the estimates of the department had been brought in with little notice and therefore I wasn't in the position to give the full information, but I think I am in a position to give somewhat fuller information today on the way this department handles the question of racing charters.

I might also say, Mr. Chairman, that there are many aspects of the Roach Commission that I would like to deal with in a tantalizing way, in the fashion the hon. member for Sudbury did this afternoon, but I think we will leave that until the Roach Commission report comes down. There are many things that can and should be said at that point.

However, if I may tie these two points together, just let me emphasize this: There

was an effort made to bring before the Roach Commission what was felt to be relevant information regarding the handling of racing charters—in the whole context of this department's handling of charters. Justice Roach, rightly or wrongly, and I am not criticizing him on it, said as far as he was concerned that this was outside the jurisdiction of his terms of reference.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is appropriate to talk about it here.

Last spring I raised in the House, and detailed in a solidly documented form, the manner in which a group of racing charters were collected to bring into being the so-called Rideau Carleton Raceway Holdings in Ottawa.

Incidentally, some of us who are critical of the way it came into being have been a little amused at its tortured existence since, but that is their business and we will leave that to them—all their financial difficulties. But when it was brought into being the remarkable thing about it, as I pointed out in the House last year, is that even before the building had been erected; even before they had taken up options for the land where it was going to be built, even before there had been authorization for the public issuance of the stock and the raising of the revenue, they came before the Racing Commission in the province of Ontario and were granted their charters for, if I recall correctly, 70 days of racing.

When that happened it was interesting that Magistrate Bigelow, the chairman of the Racing Commission, very neatly and clearly exonerated himself of the responsibility for this. He, in effect, said that he had assurances from the hon. Provincial Secretary that these charters were in order. Let me requote into the record a very relevant comment from the *Ottawa Citizen* at that time last year which sets this aspect of the story in context:

The commission chairman [that is Magistrate Bigelow] said as regards the charters obtained for Rideau Carleton Raceway that he had not seen them personally but he has been assured by the Provincial Secretary John Yaremko that they were all in order. For that reason the Racing Commission had approved a licence for the new track.

In other words, Magistrate Bigelow said anything we did in approving the licence giving the racing days was only because we had been assured by the hon. Provincial Secretary that everything was in order in the charter that this company had been granted.

The *Ottawa Citizen* continued as follows:

He [that is Magistrate Bigelow] explained in addition that in certain cases a charter might lie dormant for years and could be legally brought back to life by an order of revivor issued by the provincial authority. The conditions upon which such an order might be issued would include proof that the stockholders in the particular club or association still existed and that those stockholders had agreed to the corporate body being revived.

Just let me emphasize that, Mr. Chairman, because this is the point I want to deal with.

Magistrate Bigelow, and I think quite rightly, said that there could be a revivor if "the stockholders in the particular club or association still existed and that those stockholders agreed to the corporate body being revived".

What happened in this instance, Mr. Chairman? Well, what happened was that three old men down in the Niagara Peninsula, in the Grimsby area, in the instance of one of the charters—there were many that were gathered up and strung together to give them their racing days—were approached. One of them is Wilson Sutherland, the second one is James Orlan Livingston who is the publisher of the *Grimsby Independent* and I believe in his late 80's—and James Lawrie, a former driver, who is 91 years of age.

There is one other factor that I want to bring into the picture, just to remind the House, because it is very relevant. The man who acted as lawyer for this whole development was a man who, two or three years before, had left this department—Donald McNeil by name—was familiar with the workings of the department, and presumably was familiar with the existence of these charters. Now, the interesting thing is that the charters—there were two of them here in the Grimsby area—had been granted away back in the 1890s. In one instance there had not been annual returns for 65 years, and suddenly one of the men, this old gentleman, Mr. Livingston, who at that time was ill and in a nursing home, received a letter from this department telling him that the company was in arrears some \$162—the annual returns for a period of some 60-odd years.

Now the first question I want to put to the hon. Minister is, can he give any explanation as to why, out of the blue, from this department a letter comes to a very elderly gentleman which said in effect that for this company there had not been annual returns made for some 65 years. Had the department

investigated as to whether there was anybody else who was a director or shareholder, because the interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is that this man was not a director and was not a shareholder.

All of the original directors, all of the original shareholders are dead. This man happens to be a son of one of the people who incorporated the company originally. I have every reason to believe that it is accurate, that there were no share certificates distributed at all. In the first instance various numbers of people put \$100 into this community venture in the fashion they built these raceways back in the early days.

So this man was not a shareholder, he was not a director—to be honest about it, he believed that he had inherited the charters from his father—his father had died many, many years ago—but he had no physical document to indicate that he had the charter.

Let me go back on my story. He suddenly got a letter from this department saying that there had not been any annual returns made for a period of 65 years. A very few days passed—this is back in the early months of 1961—a very few days passed when he was called from the city of Toronto and told that a couple of gentlemen wanted to come out and see him.

And who are the gentlemen? James Baskin, M.P. for South Renfrew, and the gentleman, McNeil, who was acting as lawyer for the firm. They came out and discussed the matter with the old gentleman and as a result of these discussions a series of actions to meet the legal requirements were set in motion.

For example, early in April of 1961, as I quoted into the records last year and is to be found before and after page 2111—for those who want to refresh their minds on the whole fascinating detail of the thing—early in April a letter was sent out saying:

Take notice that a meeting of shareholders of the Grimsby Driving Park and Athletic Association shall be held at 26 Ontario Street, Grimsby, Ontario, on Saturday the 15th day of April, 1961, at the hour of 10.30 o'clock.

May I repeat, Mr. Chairman, there was no shareholder alive, they had all died, there was no director alive!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: So this meeting was held at 26 Ontario Street, which happens to be a frame house and is the residence of James

Murray Lawrie, one of the three old men involved in this. He, incidentally, is 91 years of age.

After this alleged meeting was held, a letter was sent to this department signed by Mr. McNeil which said: We are enclosing herewith the annual returns for the above company taken together with a cheque in the amount of \$190.

The annual returns, Mr. Chairman, for 65 years; now, I repeat once again, why did the letter come to remind this man? And why should they have picked on this old man, saying that he should pay this? And how come Mr. Baskin and Mr. McNeil, not without their connections with this government and its departments, should suddenly turn up shortly after the letter? These are a few questions that I just throw out. This was early in April. Very shortly afterwards another meeting was held and as a result of that a letter was sent by Mr. McNeil to the department reading as follows:

This is to advise you that shareholders of the above company held a shareholders' meeting on the 15th of April, 1961, electing the following directors and officers:

William Sutherland, President and Director; James Orlan Livingston, Vice-President and Director; James Murray Lawrie, Secretary and Director. Kindly revise your records accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, no such meeting was held; they were not shareholders, Mr. McNeil could not but be aware of this. So that a former official of this department wrote to the department and gave false information. A month or two went by and another meeting was held—the legal processes are being followed through. At this meeting—which was reported only in the fall of 1961 to the department—it is reported that these old and aged gentlemen who were put into these positions had been deposed and somebody else put in in their place: Robert J. Page and Raymond Bury. Very soon after that, Robert J. Page and Raymond Bury applied to the government for a revivor of this charter and the government granted it. And after the hon. Provincial Secretary had granted it—even before they had taken up the option on their land for the raceway in Ottawa, even before they had their public issuance of stock—granted it on the basis of the information given by this hon. Minister, then another agency of this government gave them this racing charter which helps them to go out and raise their funds.

I repeat once again: the fact that they got into such great financial difficulties since is

a little ironic, but I am sure the promoters did not envisage these difficulties—even H. J. McFarland or James Baskin or any other of the top money raisers and contributors to the Tory Party who are involved in the deal.

I want to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister: Clearly this was illegal from the word go. The men involved were not shareholders. If the hon. Minister did not know that they were not shareholders he is guilty of not fulfilling the responsibility of his office.

Secondly, I do not know how he could not have known they were not shareholders and therefore the hon. Minister wittingly or unwittingly—I do not know what is the correct term here to deal with such a delicate situation—was himself an accomplice in what in effect was a fraud—because an old charter was illegally revived when there were no shareholders alive to be able to revive it. Either he knew about it—

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): The hon. Minister has already stated in his opening remarks there were some 6,000 companies incorporated and in each of those incorporations there is information filed with the department. Now, am I to assume from the remarks you are making that the hon. Provincial Secretary as the Minister in charge would be personally responsible for the accuracy of everything filed in 6,000 applications for incorporations? Surely he must be able to—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, we have argued this many times in the House and I can quite understand the hon. Prime Minister wanting to get up and defend his Minister. But the fact of the matter—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is not his responsibility to check everything out and be personally responsible.

Mr. MacDonald: But the fact of the matter—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I defend the system—

Mr. MacDonald:—is that the Minister in British Parliamentary practice is responsible in this House for what happens in his department.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Secondly, he is responsible—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I accept that responsibility completely.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: And I claim he is not.

Mr. MacDonald: And secondly, Mr. Chairman, he is legally responsible in this House, it is his obligation for what goes on in his department. I would just say—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That doesn't go on in his department, that was the filing of somebody else, that was not his thing.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would just say here, if I may venture a reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Sudbury, this kind of shenanigans is the reason why the deputy Minister would not sign a submission to the Roach Commission which was designed to cover up rather than clean up the situation.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I can only ask the hon. member this, if we carry this matter far enough, are you going to hold that this Minister is responsible for all misinformation filed for instance on an application for a birth certificate? Or an application for a marriage certificate? Now, he must issue certificates on the basis of information filed in these cases and I assume that you are saying that the Minister, whoever he may be, is personally responsible and an accomplice, you have already said, an accomplice, if he does not check the veracity of every statement made on any application in this department. Now this is what the hon. member is saying, this is what he is telling this House.

Mr. MacDonald: I might remind the hon. Prime Minister of a few facts that he may have forgotten. This was not an isolated innocent development—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am talking about the principle that the hon. member stated in this House.

Mr. MacDonald: This was a development which was emblazoned in the papers. Charlotte Whitton was screaming from the roof tops in her inimitable fashion about it for months. If the hon. Minister did not know what was going on in this connection he was the only person in this province who did not know—certainly the only person in the Ottawa valley who did not know about it. And furthermore, even if the hon. Minister had unwittingly not been aware of something that had gone on in his department, we have the comment in the paper of Magistrate Bigelow, who said that he had personally secured the assurance from the hon. Minister that these were in order.

So you have Charlotte Whitton screaming about them in Ottawa and Magistrate Bigelow coming and saying "Are these in order?" I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he has no grounds to get up and suggest the hon. Minister was unwittingly involved in something he did not know anything about.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am not suggesting that, I am just drawing a parallel of what the hon. member is saying is a ministerial responsibility in this government and the hon. member knows he is wrong.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not. I say that the facts indicate clearly that the hon. Minister knew what was going on and he is condoning it; this is what I am complaining about.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if I may just say this, because—

Mr. MacDonald: I thought the hon. Provincial Secretary was going to give me the right to speak and then at the end he would reply. I thought he wanted to reply at the end when I have finished.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Before any order was made by me, it was established to the department by affidavit evidence and otherwise that all the requirements, both of the statute and of the departmental policy imposed by me and the department over and beyond the statute, had been complied with.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, all I say to the hon. Minister is that he is flying in face of the facts.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not flying in face of the facts.

Mr. MacDonald: But it requires that you have the meeting of shareholders and the shareholders in the instance of this company were dead, every one of them.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: He had an affidavit—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is digging himself a hole and he is going to be deeper in it before I am finished.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, I will not be digging myself a hole, not with any shovel the hon. member has; that is for sure.

Mr. MacDonald: This is the kind of thing that goes on—collusion of Tories with influence in this government, in violation of both the letter and the spirit of the law, to get privileges for their friends.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, every single application, regardless of what the source was, if it complied with the statute and the departmental policy, was granted regardless of who made the application so long as they met the requirements of the statute and the departmental policy, without exception!

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder how much smoke the hon. Minister must see, and be enveloped in, before he will decide that there is a little fire there.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, the hon. member is going so far astray.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay now, Mr. Chairman, just let me proceed because this is only one chapter in the story, and it is a long story.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have the whole thing right here in my hand, everything.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, and I submitted it to the hon. Minister last year and he did not do anything about it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is a matter of public record.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is condoning what is the shadiest kind of procedure, what is in violation of the law.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is what the hon. member says.

Mr. MacDonald: All the hon. Minister does is take an affidavit from a man, who was in the department and used his prior information from being in the department, to assist to get these things; and only good Tories can get them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I said granted "without exception".

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, just let me read into the record now, because this is not the end of the story.

Mr. Singer: This is not what they think in Ottawa.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am going to read this into the record because this is a matter of some delicacy now, but it is still a matter which should come before this House.

I am quoting from an article written by Don O'Hearn which appeared in the *Hamilton Spectator* on September 12, 1962:

The comic opera procedure of securing horse-racing privileges in Ontario would seem to have reached a new high. As of last Friday, the Honourable Earl Rowe, federal Member of Parliament for Dufferin-Simcoe, and at one time Conservative leader in Ontario, and his son, Lennox Rowe, hold seven old racing charters. The charters are to qualify the new Windsor raceway, of which Mr. Rowe is a founding member, for 84 days of racing next year. The sanction of the 84 days was considered yesterday afternoon by the Ontario Racing Commission.

The meeting of the commission, which is appointed by the Ontario government and handles racing on its behalf, was closed. The original legal spadework for the new charter was started in September of last year and at that time the legal work was done by the firm of Willis, Dingwall and Newell.

The senior partner of this firm is Harry Willis, Q.C., for a long time one of the leaders of the Conservative organizations in Ontario, and recently elevated to the Senate by Prime Minister Diefenbaker. Another Toronto legal firm since has replaced it.

A search of the files in the Provincial Secretary's office here leaves clothed completely in mystery just how Mr. Rowe and his son gained control of the companies controlling these charters. They were all formed in the last century.

The oldest is the Clifton Driving Park Association, which was granted its charter in 1877. The youngest would appear to be the Amherstburg Driving Park Association, which was formed in 1889 and apparently went out of business in 1890.

The last that was heard of any of the seven companies until last year was in 1906. Then last fall correspondence reached the government from solicitors acting for the company and naming Governor Earl Rowe as president, Lennox Rowe as secretary-treasurer.

The records in the Companies Branch were vacant from 1906 to 1961, 55 years of no returns of annual returns until the solicitors filed retroactive annual returns with accompanying fees for the years in between. On none of these returns, however, is there any mention of a change of directors or the appointment of new directors.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if I may intervene, this presumably is in accord with the law?

Following the opening of the files, there is a notice that:

at a meeting of shareholders it was decided to ask that the corporate powers be revised but there is no word how these meetings were called. There is an affidavit, however, saying that a search for minute books was made and no records were found, including that of the procedure for calling meetings.

Mr. Chairman, I just intervene since the hon. Minister claims that everything here is done legally, I am wondering how many of the original shareholders attended that so-called meeting, and does the department wink at the fact that all of the shareholders were likely dead?

I continue, Mr. Chairman:

Despite the fact these companies have been dormant since 1906 a letter to the government in the file of the Deseronto Driving Park Association and dated 1906 said "this company passed out of existence seven years before" the law required no proof that there are shareholders existing.

This is hypothetical, it is true, but it would seem quite possible for a person not holding any actual interest, to claim to be a shareholder, to swear a meeting had been held and then to ask for a revival of the company.

In this instance the department did require the lawyers to advertise notice of a shareholders' meeting in the local papers concerned, but this was the only official action to ensure that the principals asking for a revival were bona fide.

What would seem to be loose procedure under The Companies Act becomes ludicrous when it concerns these old racing charters. And so the province which both licenses and taxes the tracks must go along with this old and usual procedure. It has not the power to do anything about it on its own.

A point incidentally which I would rather question.

Nevertheless the matter of the Rowe charters will certainly become a political issue. There already has been heated debate about the granting of the dates to the Rideau Raceway near Ottawa where the charters are held by another federal PC member, James Baskin.

The Windsor track situation will add fuel to this fire and it will bring out again the charge that only those friendly to the

government can get close enough to the Companies Branch files to dig out these old charter companies which have been dormant practically since the last century.

Mr. Chairman, I just leave that without any further comment, except to say that I think it is a rather shocking proposition, that a man who used these questionable procedures to get these old charters, with all of his influence within the Tory party, should have since been appointed to high office in the province of Ontario.

This is just how unfortunate it is, that the hon. Minister and this government tolerate this kind of thing and that only Tories can get in and use them. The interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is that this is not the only way in which you can get a racing charter, and the rights for parimutuel betting—there is an alternative procedure. You can go to the House of Commons or any provincial legislature and have a private bill passed.

Last year when Mr. Baskin was asked why that was not the procedure followed in the instance of the Rideau Carleton Raceway he said that he would not ask favours of the government to do this kind of thing. So he did not ask favours of the federal government, but came down here and used every influence he had in terms of manipulating the operations of this department in what I submit, without qualification, is an illegal procedure.

If the hon. Minister does not know about it, it is because he is hiding behind affidavits which he accepted, though they were false. I remind him now, as I reminded him a year ago, that it is an illegal procedure and it is about time he got his head out of the sand and took a look at it because it is the Tories who are getting the benefits in all instances. It is not without any accident that the promoters—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would say to the hon. member that that is not so—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister will have an opportunity to sneak and answer all the questions that have been raised.

I would draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, that the promoters, for example in the instance of the Rideau Carleton Raceway, are a Tory MP, James Baskin, and H. J. McFarland, who kicked in tens of thousands of dollars to the Tory funds in eastern Ontario in the last election. In fact I think he thought he was going to get a Senate appointment for it—but sometimes Senate appointments are awfully costly—because I

am sure he has already contributed to the Tory party the equivalent of 10 or 15 years of salaries in the Senate.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I think this is something it is about time the government faced up to, and did something about, rather than winking at it so that their friends in the Tory party can continue to get privileges nobody else apparently can get.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I feel I am entitled to an answer to the questions I asked the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have got a deputy.

Mr. Sopha: If the hon. Minister is abusing his deputy the House is entitled—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intent or purpose to make any reference to the Roach report. I have the utmost of deference to the Royal Commission appointed by this Legislature and I am awaiting his report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just sit down; I have got the floor. Mr. Chairman, I have got the floor. Now, please. You know the hon. member. When he was renominated the man said, "as an indication of the hon. member's value to the House, that *Hansard* would be only half the size if he were not a member."

Please give me a chance to say at least two words.

Mr. Chairman, it has not been my intent to make reference to the Roach report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, for some reason the hon. members opposite seem to have a particular interest in my not being a member of this government. I will let the electors decide that. But getting back to the Roach report I have the utmost of deference to that. I have not uttered a single word since those proceedings were concluded, in deference to the report that I can assure the hon. members of this House I anticipate as anybody else does.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now, just a minute. Mr. Chairman, give me a chance.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister has not got the courage to answer.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member speaks as if he had courage. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MacDonald: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. members opposite can hardly wait. I have the utmost deference to his lordship and the report he is going to give us. You on the other side, on the other hand, have prejudged—you have prejudged inside and outside of this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: All I can say is that the attitude of the official Opposition inside and out of this House, and of the NDP towards the Royal commissioner is a disgrace to British institutions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege.

My question of personal privilege is this. I made no reference to the Roach report. I dealt only with what Mr. Justice Roach said was not within his terms of reference—so you deal with the issue. Listen to your fellow Cabinet Ministers who criticized the Roach Commission.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I conclude my remarks by saying this, Mr. Chairman. The hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Sudbury had better get together because the charges of the hon. leader of the Opposition were not directed solely towards Cabinet Ministers and Ministers of the department; they were directed towards The Department of the Provincial Secretary and every one of the 400 or so employees in the civil service in the department had a right to have their say.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, that I saw the hon. member for Sudbury, and I tell him this, one afternoon over at the hearing; and I thought that he was finally going to have the guts to get in the witness stand as I did and as the deputy did, but he did not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has made progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof it do stand adjourned until 2 of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the remarks of the

financial critic for the official Opposition, and after that we will return to estimates, and any of these items that may be on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

An hon. member: Will there be a night sitting tomorrow night?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, there will be no session tomorrow night.

The House adjourned at 6.15 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, February 12, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963

CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 12, 1963

Second report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Morrow	627
Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. Wintermeyer	628
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to	645
Estimates, Department of Travel and Publicity, Mr. Cathcart, concluded	645
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	665

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1963

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature. Today we welcome as guests in the east gallery students from the Western Ontario Agricultural School, Ridgetown.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. H. Morrow from the standing committee on private bills presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr2, An Act respecting the town of Fort Erie.

Bill No. Pr12, An Act respecting the Boys' Home.

Bill No. Pr30, An Act respecting the Sudbury High School Board and The High School Board of the town of Coniston.

Bill No. Pr33, An Act respecting the High School Board of the township of Gloucester and the Collegiate Institute Board of the city of Ottawa.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the Sudbury youth centre.

Bill No. Pr21, An Act respecting the Young Men's Christian Association-Young Women's Christian Association of Cobourg, Ontario.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on the following bills:

Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the Sudbury youth centre.

Bill No. Pr12, An Act respecting the Boys' Home.

Bill No. Pr21, An Act respecting the Young Men's Christian Association-Young Women's Christian Association of Cobourg, Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), notice of which has been given to him. Because school boards are being pressed by municipal councils to present their 1963 budgets, and further because school boards cannot make proper estimates until they know the 1963 grants structure, is the hon. Minister prepared to announce what this grant structure will be?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for notice of this question. I can tell him that it is expected that the regulations governing the general legislative grants will be available for distribution to the boards in a very few days.

Mr. Troy: May I ask a supplementary question? Is the hon. Minister not aware that his department officials told the representatives of the school boards that this information would be in their hands before the end of January? It is now almost mid-February.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Auld), a copy of which I have submitted to him in advance. Has The Department of Transport's study of motor vehicle taxation in Ontario been completed and if so, has the hon. Minister received a report of the study and will he make it available to the House or at least make a statement to the House on the findings of the study?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of the question. I would like to inform him and the hon. members of the House that the draft of the study referred to has been received by me. I have just now received a copy of this draft

and I have not had an opportunity to give it the detailed study it should receive. Consequently, until I have had a chance to go into it, I am unable to comment on it.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, some time ago I was asked a question by the hon. member for Nipissing and the hon. member for York South in relation to research into bark and so forth in the north. I have the answer now, as it has been given to me by the Ontario Research Foundation.

The hon. member for Nipissing—this is to refresh the memory of the House—said this on December 14:

November Newsletter of the Ontario Research Foundation discloses that research indicates that extracts from spruce bark, hitherto a waste product, make tanning agents. What research, if any, is being conducted by one of the agencies of the hon. Minister, or some other agency of government over which he has control or affiliation with, to solve the economic problems involved therein?

The hon. member for York South added a supplementary question and stated:

When we were up north we saw one mill outside Cochrane which debarks the log before it is cut up, therefore removing the problem of having the bark in the chips. If the bark is in the chips they cannot be used for any purpose. I wonder if research has reached the stage where it is possible, economically, to debark all logs so that what was great waste of chips in the past might now become available as a by-product of the waste product and add to the income of our forest industry?

In relation to the question asked by the hon. member for Nipissing, I am advised that the Ontario Research Foundation has completed the laboratory and pilot scale work on this project and has shown that, technically, spruce bark extract can be used as a tanning agent and possibly for other purposes—such as a drilling mud dispersment.

A preliminary economic study has been under way. An item under this year's estimates under the heading of "northern Ontario development" will be used to continue the study, assuming that this is approved by the Ontario Economic Council, which I am sure it will be.

In relation to the question of the hon. member for York South, I am advised that the wood chemistry section of the Ontario Research Foundation is keeping abreast of

developments in the debarking of logs. At present the broad problem of better utilization of the whole tree is being studied in this laboratory with the support of the provincial Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Troy: That would include leaves, too, I suppose?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, I did not ask specifically whether it included leaves, but if the hon. member would like that information I will obtain it for him.

Mr. Troy: I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, because I understand the federal research department is conducting research on the use of leaves.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee on ways and means.

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before commencing my examination of the budget, I want to express my personal regards to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). He is a gentleman whose genial personality has earned him the good wishes of all hon. members of this House.

I want to compliment him on his presentation of the budget last Thursday. I cannot think of anyone else on that side of the House who could have done it as well under the circumstances.

In presenting the budget he was, of course, not speaking for himself. He was speaking for the government, Mr. Speaker, and that kind of handicap would be enough to break most men.

An hon. member: Either in Toronto or Ottawa.

Mr. Wintermeyer: And it is a credit to his courage that he persevered in spite of his difficulties. That the budget was one of the dullest documents presented to this House in years is the fault of the government, not the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

The great characteristic of this budget is its undeviating similarity to the 19 budgets that have preceded it. It is cast in the same mould as its predecessors. It parades the same old clichés. It seeks to leave the same inferences. It is a product of the past. Only

the date on the cover and the numbers inside have been changed.

The budget was dull because this government is dull. The budget looked backwards because this government is a hangover from the past. The budget is a picture of smug complacency because this government is smug and complacent.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They have got a new ghost writer here.

Mr. Wintermeyer: The budget fails to convey any sense of urgency about the problems facing Ontario—

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Who wrote this one?

Mr. Wintermeyer: I wrote this one. The budget fails to convey any sense of urgency about the problems facing Ontario because this government apparently does not recognize the needs of the people.

The budget is a stand-pat budget because this is a caretaker government.

The budget gives no indication of what the government considers to be the priority needs of the people of Ontario because the government has no priorities, no appreciation of need, and lacks the will to take positive action. The budget is a think-small budget in the most dynamic period of Ontario's history.

Mr. Speaker, the pattern of expenditure set out in this budget was laid down by Mr. Drew in 1943. I know because I have read that 1943 budget many times and there has been no change since. The government has taken the 1943 pattern and each year since it has spent a little more money in each department because there are more people in Ontario and costs go up. But there is no sense of priority.

Last year we pointed out this unselective, haphazard ballooning of administrative costs without any sense of economy or priority. Now, this is said particularly for your benefit, sir. For example, in 1957, The Department of Agriculture expenditures were about two per cent of the budget, and they are the same today and have been in all these intervening years. In the same period the Attorney-General's estimates have been about three per cent of the budget. The same thing applies to The Department of Lands and Forests at approximately three per cent; Public Welfare at approximately six per cent; Reform Institutions at two per cent; and so on.

This demonstrates clearly that the policies of this government are those of drift. There is no sense of direction. This budget, like its

predecessors, conveys an overwhelming sense that the government is committed so powerfully to the past that the inevitability of the budget takes precedence over the needs of the people and the realities of a changing economy and a changing society.

The budget piously proclaims that the government has managed the finances of the province prudently, and because of economy has been able to keep the increase in debt to the tiny sum of \$107 million.

Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence anywhere in the budget that the government has managed prudently or made economies. In the budget forecast last year it was estimated that Ontario's net ordinary expenditure in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963, would be \$939 million. Nine months later we find on page A-2 of the budget that net ordinary expenditure will exceed \$985 million. Now, is this what you call economy? Is this prudent management?

Mr. Speaker, the best evidence of the indifference to the needs of the people is the budget statement itself. The problems facing the people of Ontario are enormous. The solutions offered by the government are non-existent. Education presents one of the most important challenges ever faced by a government at any time in Ontario's history. From the elementary school right through university we are faced with a crisis. Important and serious representations have been made by many groups vitally concerned with educational problems, especially by rural and separate school bodies. Yet there is not the slightest hint that the government has given any consideration to their representations in order to remove inequities.

In our foundation programme we have promised to make equality of opportunity and equality of treatment a reality.

The universities, already forced to raise their standards artificially because of a lack of space, are being given less than one half of the minimum assistance which they require if they are to provide adequate education for our young people.

The municipalities, starved for revenue because of an inadequate property tax and forced to go ever deeper into debt in order to meet minimum requirements for schools, roads and services, are offered no new help.

The farmers of Ontario, caught ever tighter in a cost-price squeeze, are faced by the challenge of vertical integration by processors that, unchecked, threaten the existence of the family farm. The government's answer in this budget is that they never had it so good.

And nowhere in the budget is there a word about medical care insurance. The subject obviously does not interest the government sufficiently to persuade it to mention it in a document that runs to more than 60 pages.

Tax reform is long overdue, and the government raises the exemption on sales tax from 17 to 21 cents. It would be absurd if it were not so tragic.

This budget is dull because it is unreal. It produced no enthusiasm or hope anywhere because it does not come to grips with the real problems of Ontario. What is needed is a complete change of attitude toward the budget by this government. It is time that the government took its head out of the sands of 1943 and looked around at the changed and changing world about it.

What is needed is a complete overhaul of provincial and municipal government in Ontario. Responsibilities are going to have to be redefined and revenues are going to have to be re-allocated. The tax system itself must be reformed.

The real needs of this province in education, in municipal growth, in transportation, in health and welfare, in agriculture, in natural resource development and in the promotion of economic growth will only be understood in the context of the fundamental changes in our population and in our economy. Patchwork adjustments just are not good enough.

An approach based on 1943 and more of the same will only compound our difficulties. Real economy will only be possible if the structure of government is revised to correspond to the functions it must perform and the needs that it must meet.

Real reform in the tax system will only be possible if there is a determined effort made to relate taxes to services in a way that is understood by the taxpayer and accepted by him. Irritating nuisance taxes, minor adjustments in rates, to get a dollar here and a dollar there, will only perpetuate the slipshod procedures that have caused us to skid into so much trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that this budget is patterned on its predecessors. There is an abundant evidence to support that observation. For example, there is a continued reference to a surplus, when in fact the increase in net debt, as set out in the budget statement on page A-6 is in excess of \$107 million.

It is true that the government has stopped calling this a deficit. It is now called a "short-fall". By whatever name it travels, it is still debt.

On page two of the budget speech the hon. Treasurer has reverted to the old practice of talking about gross provincial product. He cites a gross provincial product of 16.2 billion and uses it to bolster his contention that Ontario's gross product rose last year by eight per cent. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, estimates of gross national product, this 16.2 billion represents exactly 41.0 per cent of the gross national product.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that this hon. Treasurer and the people opposite do not compute any provincial gross product. For the last 15 years they have simply taken what the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has determined to be the gross national product and have computed 41 per cent of that. Because there was an eight per cent increase at the national level they have said: "We have done wonderfully well in Ontario, ours is an eight per cent increase here".

Now, Mr. Speaker, each budget statement for the past 15 years, except last year, when no reference was made to gross provincial product, has shown Ontario's gross provincial product as 41 per cent of the gross national product. The reason for the striking similarity and stability is obvious. This government does not calculate gross provincial product at all. It merely assumes that Ontario's activity represents 41 per cent of the national total, and does some simple arithmetic on Dominion Bureau of Statistics' figures. Statistically Ontario has moved up or down on provincial product at exactly the same rate as the rest of Canada—no better and no worse. The artificiality of this kind of reckoning has no place in a serious budget statement.

The budget also revealed the same old tendencies on the part of this government to underestimate revenue and expenditures at the start of the year and then cover the differences by transfers at the end of the year. The transfers continue to be made to sinking fund or capital account.

Nothing reveals more clearly the completely unplanned programme of debt retirement pursued by this government than the wild fluctuations in extra payments to sinking fund from year to year. And nothing reveals the haphazard approach to financing capital programmes more than the ups and downs in the amounts or ordinary revenue shifted at year-end to meet capital costs.

Some years ago, the government had a special book-balancing device which it called the highway reserve fund. We criticized that highway reserve fund for several years, sir, and finally the government, conceding the wisdom of the argument, did away with that

fund. However, this year they seem to be reverting to their old ways again. This time they have put \$20 million into supplementary estimates to provide an advance payment on educational grants.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an additional payment to the school systems. It is an advance payment on next year's grants. Instead of being charged against next year's revenue it is being paid from this year's surplus of ordinary revenue. If this particular procedure had not been followed, the hon. Provincial Treasurer would have ended the year with a surplus of \$20 million and \$30,000, instead of the \$30,000 which he reported on ordinary revenue.

Of course it might have been embarrassing for the government to report such a surplus. People might have thought it appropriate to remove some of the nuisance from the sales tax. Or the government might have been called upon to introduce a medical care programme, or the government might have applied the revenue to the first stage of a foundation programme for financing education that would have effectively increased the provincial government's share of educational financing. It, of course, did none of the constructive things it might have done.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Sir, that does not sound like a love song at all.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I am talking about the hon. member for York South—

Mr. MacDonald: It took the hon. leader of the Opposition 30 seconds to decide what he wanted to say about —

Mr. Wintermeyer: It does not take me 30 seconds at all. I just thought the hon. member would be more co-operative—considering all the circumstances that are back of his leadership at the present time—than what he appears to be.

An hon. member: Of course, nothing is nothing, anyway.

Mr. Wintermeyer: What it did, sir, was to revert to the bad old practices of the past, of juggling the books to produce an artificial surplus of such a small amount that it can then talk about prudent management and careful budgeting.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. leader of the

Opposition whether he objects to that procedure, what we did with that \$20 million?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I was at a meeting of the Association of Rural and Urban Trustees last night and they were very happy about what we have done.

Mr. Wintermeyer: You see, Mr. Speaker, this is typical of the position of the government. There is an element of good in what has been done, the element is simply this—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Why deny it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: The place to fight this out is right here, because the simple fact is that the people of Ontario have been hoodwinked by this budget for more than 20 years. For years we complained about the fact that surplus of ordinary revenue over ordinary expenditure was put into a highway reserve fund to be disposed of arbitrarily without permission of this Legislature and without the approval of the Legislature.

Now what is happening is that this year there was \$20 million in excess of revenue over ordinary expenditures. Now that sum should have come to this Legislature for disposition as such. What the government did is to say: "We will make 13 payments instead of 12 payments, if you will, over the next 12 months to the school boards so they will get that first payment before the beginning of the fiscal year, March 1."

Now that is good. I realize that the school boards have to begin budgeting, as the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy) said before March 1. They start on January 1, and what they are interested in is knowing what they are going to get in the 12 calendar months. They are not interested from March 1 to March 1—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Oh yes, they are!

Mr. Wintermeyer: Of course they are, but primarily they want to know what they are going to—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That is a quicker switch than usual.

Mr. Wintermeyer: What about the NDP position in respect to sales tax?

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. leader of the Opposition promoted sales tax all over the province.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, I am going to take care of this fellow. He runs around the province belittling everybody else, making ridiculous statements.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: But, Mr. Speaker, if anybody ever took the time that he takes to criticize the inconsistencies in other programmes, you could find far more inconsistencies in his own. A year ago he campaigned throughout this province on the score that he would abolish the sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, my complaint on the \$20 million—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I know the members realize that the Speaker does not wish to operate on too strict a basis and a certain amount of leeway is allowed, but I would ask the members to control themselves to the extent that the Speaker does not continually have to call for order.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): You might start by expelling the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope).

An hon. member: Carry out the dead.

Mr. Speaker: I would add that in that case, the member who has just spoken would lead him out, no doubt.

An hon. member: Carry him out, not lead; carry him out.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I want to make this point. As the hon. Prime Minister has said, the school boards, of course, appreciate the fact that they get the first payment before March 1, but it does not mean they are getting an extra \$20 million; the grant system has not been increased by \$20 million at all. They are not going to get an additional \$20 million.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not say that it had.

Mr. Wintermeyer: No, but I want to make that point. Of course the hon. Prime Minister did not say they did. I hope that the public appreciates this. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the public of Ontario understands that the educational grants are not being increased by \$20 million.

Mr. MacDonald: He is labouring the obvious, as usual.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now, Mr. Speaker, in the case of gross provincial product—excuse me.

An hon. member: Wrong page.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I made half my explanation and now I have got to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I do not need any assistance on this one, sir, not at all.

It is sad, Mr. Speaker, in the case of gross provincial products, and the cul-de-sac approach to surpluses in ordinary account, to see the government returning to its old ways after having aroused some semblance of hope last year that our criticisms were having some effect in getting them to mend their ways.

Mr. Speaker, one of the more intriguing facets of this year's budget address is the government's discovery of economic growth. From the many references to economic growth in the speech, an unwary reader might conclude that this government had something to do with it. The second paragraph of the budget states, and I quote:

Economic growth has provided us with increased revenue which, when combined with prudent management of our finances, has enabled us to carry out a bold extension of services and still end the current fiscal year with a smaller increase in net debt than occurred in the fiscal year 1961-62.

Now, sir, let us examine for a moment the reference here to economic growth. In the fiscal year 1962-63 the province, according to statement A-1, will have net ordinary revenue of \$985 million. This is an increase of \$160 million over ordinary revenue of \$825 million in 1961-62. But now let us look for a moment at where that extra money came from, sir.

An hon. member: Sales tax.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Exactly. The first thing that is apparent is that the retail sales tax, in its first full year of operation, produced \$174 million, or \$96 million more than it did in the previous year. The personal income tax rebate of \$152 million last year is approximately \$31 million higher than the previous year. But that is due largely because of the increased rebate under the tax rental agreement with the federal government.

In fact the rise of the rebate from 14 to 16 per cent of the amount of personal income accounted for some \$19 million of this

\$31 million increase, and the fact that there are more people at work and presumably paying more tax would also account for part of the rise.

The increase of \$4 million in revenue from succession duties can hardly be credited to economic growth. The government itself admits that there has been an inflation of one per cent which would account for \$9 million to \$10 million of increased revenue.

Increased taxation and inflation, therefore, have added \$125 million of the \$160 million of increased revenue. The remaining \$35 million of increased revenue is obviously a result of growth—growth of population and the increased consumption of liquor and gasoline.

The question arises as to just what role this government played in economic growth. Since the increase in revenue this past year is of the same order of magnitude as increases each year of the past ten years without increased taxes, it is hard to understand just how this government arrives at the conclusion that anything it has done has promoted an increase in economic growth.

The budget statement says "The government has long considered the promotion of economic growth and development to be one of its major responsibilities."

What has it done in a specific and concrete way last year that has significantly and measurably aided economic growth? The budget gives us no information on that point at all. All that the figures reveal is that the government is continuing to carry out the same programme in the same way at greater expense.

On page two of the budget speech the government says:

Perhaps a key to our future success in the promotion of economic growth has been the development of programmes through which we can stimulate the vital secondary manufacturing sector of our economy.

On the same page the government says:

Generally speaking, the major source of strength lay in the durable manufacturing sector, with the motor vehicle, machinery, heavy electrical machinery and primary iron and steel industries leading the way. Volume of automobile production rose 31 per cent, followed by primary iron and steel with a ten per cent increase.

The budget does not tell us what this government did that assisted the automobile industry to increase its factory shipments 31 per cent, nor what it did to increase the

production of iron and steel by ten per cent. Since the only notable thing the government did do affecting these commodities was to levy a sales tax of three per cent on the price of the products, I can only assume that these gains were registered in spite of the government's programme.

Evidence of the neglect in fostering economic growth was supplied by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development himself in his report to this Legislature last February 27.

Employment in Ontario's manufacturing industries was lower in 1961 than it was ten years earlier in 1951. In 1961 industrial employment was 593,000, whereas ten years earlier it was 599,000. Industrial employment in Ontario in 1961 was 51,000 lower than it was in 1957. And this in a province that must find 60,000 new jobs in each of the next five years.

There is another equally revealing measure of the government's failure to encourage manufacturing, and that is the slow-down and decline of new capital investment in Ontario's industries. The hon. Minister's own figures on page A-23 show that new capital investment in manufacturing in Ontario declined from \$630 million in 1956 and \$675 million in 1957 to \$554 million in 1961. New capital investment in 1961 was therefore \$100 million or 15 per cent lower than the average of the years 1956 and 1957. New investment in utilities has declined in every year since 1957, from \$785 million to \$517 million or by 34 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Is this 1961 or 1962?

Mr. Wintermeyer: 1961, the last year that the budget—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just left out this last year.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, this is very interesting. I am using the figures of the budget. I would have been very intrigued and interested to have these figures for 1962 but they were not supplied.

Everyone knows that it is new capital investment that creates employment and income, that provides the core for new services and makes possible higher revenue without tax increases. This government has failed in these manufacturing and utility fields.

It is the same thing in the primary industries. New investment fell each year since 1957 from \$420 million to \$225 million, a decline over the past four years that totals 46 per cent. Total new capital investment

in Ontario, sir, in 1961, was \$362 million lower than it was in 1957. It has declined in each year except one.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Where did the hon. leader of the Opposition get his figures?

Mr. Wintermeyer: From the budget; look at it. These figures, sir, supplied by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, condemn the hon. Minister's policies and condemn the government's policies as failures.

The budget speech devotes three full pages to the subject of industrial development and trade expansion. It boasts of a 20-point programme that includes among other things the opening of trade offices overseas, government-sponsored and government-paid for business trips to Europe, the United States, Mexico, and other places for Ontario business men; trade shows; conferences; product shows and the like. This is all very well and very good as far as it goes, but there is no indication whatsoever, sir, that any of these things affected the automobile and the steel industries which contributed more significantly to economic growth than any other division of Ontario industry. The Trade Crusade, so far, has been highly publicized, and a highly publicized effort—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Jealousy will get the hon. leader of the Opposition nowhere.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I am not jealous. Salesmanship is part of any industrial promotional activity, but you have to have something to sell before you go out on the road to sell it.

The Trade Crusade, as it is currently being pursued, is premised on the supposition that we can have our cake and eat it. The new offices being opened in Dusseldorf, in Milan, in England and in the United States all have the admirable purpose of persuading the people of these countries to buy more of the things produced in Ontario. This is laudable. And it is to be encouraged.

At the same time the people of Ontario are being urged to stop buying the products produced by the people of Dusseldorf and Milan and England and the United States, and buy instead the things produced in Ontario. This too has a certain appeal.

For a very short time in fact the Trade Crusade might register moderate gains on both fronts, but in the long run, sir, such a plan is self-defeating because as our export purchases decline, the harder it becomes to sell our products abroad for the simple reason that foreign purchasers have less and less Canadian money to spend.

The hon. Minister, of course, appreciates this fact; he is quite cognizant of it; and I get the impression he feels that if he can keep moving fast enough the consequences will not catch up with him.

The budget also goes into considerable detail about the stimulus which municipal capital expenditures have given to the economy. I agree that they have. But what credit can this government take out of a capital expenditures programme that has been financed in ever-greater proportion by the municipalities themselves?

Since the statistics on municipal debt are available only up to the end of 1961, let me make the comparison in the growth of provincial and municipal debt for the years 1945, 1946 and through 1961. From 1945 to 1961 provincial debt rose from \$483 million to \$1.1 billion, an increase of about 120 per cent. In the same period of time, sir, municipal debt rose from \$231 million to \$1.6 billion, or an increase of about 600 per cent. The heaviest share of the capital investment that is promoting growth in Ontario is obviously being borne by the municipalities. If any pattern of provincial government action can be detected in promoting growth at the municipal level, it can only be that the government is prepared to continue to let the municipalities bear the heaviest share of the expense.

Mr. Speaker, a government seriously interested in promoting economic growth can do many things to help. For example, it can provide incentives to industry through tax concessions, it can provide credits to assist growth and development, it can make available power at attractive rates, it can invest directly in capital works. What is this government doing to directly promote economic growth?

Let us look for a moment at its tax policies. The budget refers to four changes which we may expect in the taxes on corporations. Two of them are changes which will bring provincial legislation into harmony with recent changes in The Income Tax Act of Canada. I refer of course to the allowance deduction of 150 per cent of the increased expenditure on scientific research, and the extension of the deduction of cost for exploring, prospecting and developing by corporations in the petroleum, natural gas and mineral industries.

These adjustments, small though they are, are helpful. They do emphasize, however, the interlocking nature of the federal and provincial corporation tax. These adjustments remind us once again that any change

in corporation tax to be fully effective must be incorporated into federal and provincial legislation.

I am intrigued, therefore, by the reference in the budget on page 42 under the heading, "The Corporations Tax Act", to, and I quote:

—to further incentives which are designed to stimulate companies engaged in manufacturing in Ontario, through the granting of tax credits. These tax credits will be related firstly to increased employment and secondly to increased production facilities.

I assume that incentives and credits mean a reduction in taxes. For all practical purposes, The Ontario Corporation Tax Act is identical to the federal Act with the single exception that Ontario's rate of tax of 11 per cent is two per cent more than the federal government will allow corporations as a credit for provincial tax payments. The budget does not say that the government intends to repeal its two per cent surcharge on corporation profits, so we can rule out that avenue of relief.

The federal government's definition of income is the governing feature of corporation taxation in Canada. Any change in the definition of corporation income may mean the nuisance of a separate set of books, which would have to be imposed on Ontario corporations. In other words, you would have to make two returns.

The question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer would be this: If you are not going to reduce the surcharge and reduce your corporate tax from 11 per cent to nine, the only way I can see that you are going to effect a saving to Ontario corporations is to change your definition of "income", which currently is the same as the federal. And as soon as you change your definition of "income" it means, of course, two returns for each Ontario corporation.

This, I think, the government should spell out, is required to spell out. Had they come to us during the budget and said: "We are going to reduce the total corporate tax from 11 per cent to nine," or eight, or any other figure, it would have been understandable. But that is not what was done, sir. The only suggestion that was made is that by means of credit, somehow, relief would be given to the Ontario corporation.

I don't propose to be a great economist or accountant, but it is obvious, and it is just common sense, that the only way you can effect that type of relief is to change your definition of "income". This would mean, in effect, that the definition here would be dif-

ferent to the definition in Ottawa. It should be spelled out, sir—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It will be spelled out.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Sorry. But, now—

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): We may not live that long.

Mr. Wintermeyer: The only, the direct, the immediate way, the complete way, Mr. Speaker, would be a clause to reduce the corporate tax at the difference between 11 per cent and nine per cent; but this has been ruled out. So whatever further relief, and whatever the method of the relief, it is going to be in some fashion other than that.

The hon. Treasurer's address did not indicate that any such efforts are being made by the government. In fact, in recent days, there is overwhelming evidence that the members of the federal government cannot agree among themselves, sir, and the members of this government are less than enthusiastic about being found in the same room with them, let alone co-operating with them.

An hon. member: It doesn't matter whether they are here or in Ottawa. Where art thou, John? They are all in the one boat.

Mr. Wintermeyer: So much for the government's programme of promoting economic growth by tax incentives.

What plan does the government have, sir, to help strengthen the economic development of northern and eastern Ontario, regions which have not shared in the overall development of Ontario? The budget makes no mention of special assistance, encouragement to industry to locate in these regions. It makes no mention of adjusting hydro-electric power rates to make it attractive for industry to disperse beyond the metropolitan areas of southern Ontario. The budget makes it abundantly clear that this government has no policy or programme for economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the words of the budget speech have the gloss of press-agentry. The budget figures demonstrate clearly that there is no such plan, that there is no such programme, that the government has, in fact, not really influenced economic growth in the past year. This kind of double-talk is just another example of the generally woolly and unguided course into which this old government has fallen.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest contributions governments can make to the economic development is in the promotion of labour-management co operation. Co-operation cannot be translated easily, sir, nor simply into

dollars. But the consequences of labour-management co-operation, Mr. Speaker, would have a vast and beneficial effect on the whole economy.

Recognition of the need for labour-management co-operation has long been coming in this country. The attitude that labour and management are natural enemies doomed to perpetual conflict dies hard. Fortunately, however, that attitude is being challenged by forward-thinking labour leaders and business executives.

What is needed to translate this developing climate of good will on both sides into positive action is the catalyst of a third party. The Liberal Party in Ontario has advocated for many years that a vehicle for achieving co-operation is the establishment of labour-management councils under the auspices of government. A Liberal government in Ontario—

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): He speaks well of you.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Ancient history.

Mr. Wintermeyer: A Liberal government in Ontario, sir, would promote labour-management co-operation through the establishment of an economic development council.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: He is dead and you are too.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I recognize, sir, that there are many and formidable obstacles in the way of achieving the goal of an effective economic development council. Among the obstacles is the attitude of management toward labour, of labour toward management and their joint suspicion of the role of government.

Management must recognize labour—and sir, there is nothing more important in this speech than the point I am trying to make now—management must recognize labour as an equal partner with equal status and with equal rights. Labour must acknowledge and recognize that profits are legitimate—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I refer to enlightened labour leaders. Labour must recognize that profits are legitimate, that capital is entitled to a fair profit and management a rightful share of that profit for its skill.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): These are all old clichés!

Mr. Wintermeyer: No, it is not, it is not at all. We will get into something far beyond clichés.

Government has the responsibility to create the climate for co-operation and to develop the policies and programmes of development and growth including tax, power and transportation programmes.

Another obstacle to the effective formation of an economic development council is that management has no spokesman who can speak for employers as a group. For example, the Canadian Manufacturers Association represents the views of only one group of employers. So does the chamber of commerce, the retail associations and so forth.

Here I take my hat off to a great leader in this respect, a man from my own community, the president of B. F. Goodrich, who said that management must assume the responsibility for finding a spokesman for all the employers of Ontario. I agree wholeheartedly.

Now if that is a cliché, if that is the type of platitude in this talk that you think is unworthy of this side of the House, then I differ with you, because this is the type you will get.

The development council must include a spokesman for labour. The unions in Ontario represent about 30 per cent of the labour force. Ideally, if labour is to have an effective spokesman at the council table collective bargaining should be extended to include all employees. I am not suggesting that government legislate compulsory union membership at all, but I do think that government can and should reduce some of the roadblocks that currently exist in the organization of unions. Much common ground could be explored by the economic development council. The council could work out ways and means to achieve the kind of economic growth we need to create full employment and provide security for our people. It could work out a plan to cope with the problems of automation, the relocation of industry, the adjustment of communities to the loss of industry. The council would be a valuable instrument in devising programmes of trades training and retraining. It could do useful work in coping with the problems of the unemployed workers over 40.

Labour-management councils organized on an industry-wide basis now—this is the second division—could deal with special problems affecting each industry. Government's role in such bodies would be one of assisting the councils with technical help. At the level of the plant itself, labour and management

would continue to bargain on wages and hours and such matters as they do now. I do not believe the government has any place at that level.

Any worthwhile plan for the growth and development of Ontario would include the direct participation and co-operation of labour and management and the vehicle which I have suggested makes their participation and co-operation an integral part of such a plan.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to the subject of agriculture. The budget address commences the section on agriculture with the following words:

In 1962 Ontario's agricultural production reached the highest level ever attained in our history. A preliminary estimate places the gross production at almost \$1.3 billion or about three per cent above the previous high recorded in 1961. Output of most products held up and prices remained firm over the year.

That is the budget statement.

But now, let us look a little more closely at the agricultural industry in Ontario. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development in his report to the Legislature on February 27 of last year provided this House with several tables relating to agricultural production and farm income. On page A-29 of this report he showed that the gross value of farm production in Ontario was lower in 1961 than it was 10 years earlier in 1951, and in fact had not really grown in the whole ten-year period.

Mr. Speaker, you will note in the hon. Minister's table that the gross value of farm production in 1951 was \$1.26 billion, and this year the budget says the gross value of production is almost \$1.3 billion. In 11 years, sir, the gross value of Ontario's farm production has risen by less than \$40 million or less than three per cent. In the same period of time the overall gross production of Ontario has risen by more than 100 per cent.

The true picture of the farmer's plight becomes more readily apparent when the prices for the farmer's products are compared with the cost of the things he has to buy. I would refer the House to the hon. Minister's report of last year at page A-20.

In the ten-year period from 1951 to 1961 the wholesale price index for farm products fell from 268 to 217 for a fall of 20 per cent. In other words, farm prices overall fell 20 per cent in the past 10 years.

When the budget refers to prices remaining firm over the past year I would add that

it is the firmness that comes from hitting rock bottom.

On the same page, A-20, the price index for commodities and services used by farmers in the period 1951 to 1961 shows an increase of 19 per cent from 219 to 260. This means that for those things which a farmer uses in farming his costs have risen 19 per cent. The general consumer price index, also on the same page of the budget, from 1951 to 1961 shows a rise of 15 per cent, from 113 to 129.

Mr. Speaker, a 20 per cent reduction in prices and a 19 per cent rise in costs in ten years is the measure of the cost price squeeze on Ontario farmers.

Let us look at what it means in terms of the farmers' net income. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture in its brief to the government dated January 29, 1963, on page 10, points out the impact of the cost price squeeze by predicting:

"—a total net income for the year 1962 approximately the same as 1961. Some modest gain over 1961 is possible. It is likely, we believe," continues the brief, "that 1962 net income will be about \$340 million. This amount, if realized, would be about \$90 million less than the all-time highs for net income reached in 1951 and 1952."

The federation concludes its submission on net income by saying, and I quote, "because the results would be in terms of current dollars there would be a loss in purchasing power of the order of 18 per cent."

Surely the real position of Ontario's farmers is reflected more accurately by farmers' net income. The budget's second paragraph on agriculture says, and I quote, "In recognition of the continuing challenges of farming today, provision is being made for increased help and assistance to the farm community through The Department of Agriculture."

Now, the 1963-64 estimates for The Department of Agriculture show an increase of less than \$1.8 million over the estimate for the previous year. Of the increase, \$700,000 is for the agricultural colleges and \$200,000 is for increased travelling expenses for personnel in the dairy branch. I am moved to wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the increased travel allowances for the dairy branch is the department's way of bidding a personal good-bye to the farmers leaving the land because of higher costs and falling income.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Ontario have come through a revolution in agriculture by increasing capital investment, by increasing

their holdings of machinery, by increasing their stock, by enlarging their farm, by improving their crops. In short, those farmers who have survived the changes in farming, and farm marketing in the past 20 years have done so by becoming some of the most efficient farmers on earth.

The most recent brief of The Ontario Federation of Agriculture, again dated January 29 of this year, spells out statistically the change in farm operations in Ontario in the past 20 years.

Professor Stewart Lane of the Ontario Agricultural College has summed up the changes by saying that an agricultural worker producing enough food to support ten people in 1941 is now producing enough food to support 30 people.

He has also made the point that this record has been achieved mainly on farms described as family farms. Professor Lane's statistical profile of the family farm in 1961 as compared with what it was in 1951 is very interesting. For example, he points out that in this 20-year period the farm labour force declined by 36 per cent and the labour force per farm declined 17 per cent. At the same time production increased 28 per cent and production per worker by almost 100 per cent. To make possible this production increase with a reduced labour force Ontario farmers turned to mechanization and increased capital investment in their farms.

Professor Lane then supplied the following figures: farm capital increased threefold to \$3.5 billion. The value of equipment increased from \$150 million to \$580 million. Capital investment per worker rose from \$4,400 to \$20,000; the value of equipment per worker from \$559 to \$3,300, and investment per farm increased from \$6,600 to \$28,500; the number of cattle, milk cows, heifers and hogs per farm increased by almost 100 per cent in each case. The number of farms, sir, decreased from 160,000 to 127,000.

Mr. Speaker, now what I want to emphasize from these figures and what these figures emphasize is the nature and extent of the agricultural revolution in Ontario.

They reveal the social dislocation in our rural areas by the withdrawal of farmers from the land. They emphasize the increasing need of farmers for access to credit to establish and to operate what has become a sizeable capital investment in land and buildings. They emphasize the efficiency with which Ontario farmers have produced for the past 20 years. They emphasize the efficiency of the family farm.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the family farm is faced with the challenge of vertical integration by processors and this challenge is coming in a variety of ways.

In Norfolk and Simcoe counties, for example, one firm has leased 7,000 acres of corn and peas. It is readily apparent that the total production of that company's holdings will be used by it before an independent farmer has a chance to sell his products to that market.

In Essex county, sir, a processing company is now negotiating canning-crop contracts on the following basis: it approaches a farmer who has held a contract for 10 acres of tomatoes and says that it now wants to lease 5 acres of the 10 from him and on the remaining 5 it will take 17 tons of tomatoes per acre.

But the farmers in Essex produce on the average 21 to 25 tons of tomatoes per acre—the company, therefore, will take from its leased acres a crop of 21 to 25 tons at a fixed price and is then obligated to purchase from the farmer only 17 tons of tomatoes per acre from the remaining acreage. If a canner decides he does not need the extra production the farmer takes the loss. In this case the loss would wipe out the farmer's profit.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party believes that vertical integration by processors is not a good thing for farming and that government should move to limit its spread.

We believe that vertical integration by processors can be checked by encouraging the establishment of producer-marketing organizations which will exercise control over the marketing of their products. We also believe that the time is here and fast approaching when some form of production control will have to be exercised that will limit the amount of any product that may be grown by any processor for his exclusive use.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the budget address refers to a committee which is studying vertical integration. I know that the Federation of Agriculture has made representations to all parties in this House about this subject. I will only add at this time my urging to that of the federation for an early report from the committee so that this Legislature can take appropriate action.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Provincial Treasurer referred in the budget to a 12-point programme in housing. Last year when the housing programme was announced, it was revealed, it was heralded in fact, as a broader

and bolder approach by the government to meeting the needs for public housing. Last year's programme, according to the hon. Provincial Treasurer's address on page 36, was to be of "an exploratory nature aimed at determining whether a broader, more flexible programme of government assistance is desirable."

I think, Mr. Speaker, the government could accept the need for a broader and more flexible programme of assistance to public housing and get on with the job.

In the budget presented for our consideration there is no provision for the acquisition of existing housing for public housing purposes. This was to be part of the programme, when it was announced last year. It was to be financed jointly by the federal and provincial governments provided that certain changes could be made in federal legislation. Last December 19, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development said that the federal legislation still required amendment. In the past year, apparently, nothing concrete has been done on this phase of the 12-point programme.

Another point raised last year had to do with the maintenance of housing. Studies were to be undertaken so that a "comprehensive programme" could be introduced within a year. In the current budget there is no allocation for the implementation of this part of the programme.

On page 37 of the budget address the hon. Provincial Treasurer says that during the past year, and I quote: "the normal public housing programme had been pursued with diligence."

There are then set out a number of projects with rather large sums like \$22 million attached. The last paragraph, under housing, says:

The total appropriation under our housing programme in the fiscal year '63-64 will be \$5.6 million of which \$4.3 million will be capital under the Dominion-provincial partnership agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I want to explore briefly just what this government has achieved under its "normal" housing programme in the past five years, by looking at the monies which it has appropriated for housing at the start of each year and then the amount it has spent at the end of the year.

For the fiscal years ending March 31, 1959-1963, inclusive, the government appropriated a total of \$29 million. It spent \$12 million. It left unexpended \$17 million. The record is worsening, not improving.

For example, in 1959 it appropriated \$5.5 million; of this amount it spent \$3.9 million and left unexpended \$1.5 million. In 1960, of the \$6.5 million appropriated, the government actually spent \$2.4 million and left unspent \$4 million. In 1961, \$65 million was appropriated; the government expenditures fell again this time to \$2.1 million leaving unexpended \$4.1 million.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: In 1962 of \$5.8 million appropriated, it spent—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: May I just say I am getting some questions thrown at me from your supporters? These questions are matters which could be raised during the estimates of the department concerned and then they would be answered in the normal course in the way you asked for it in the budget debate. This is a formal debate and there is no freedom of answer, back and forth.

I am only answering the questions your supporters have shouted across the floor at me.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now the hon. Prime Minister must not get so excited. He has constantly told us—

An hon. member: You had better calm those voices over there.

Mr. Wintermeyer: —that we can talk about anything we wanted on the budget debate.

"That is the one place," he says, "where you have free rein."

Do not talk about this particular thing in estimates, is the constant admonition but yet when we attempt to outline a programme of broad criticism comparable to the budget—the budget ran on for 60 pages; I assure you this does not run on for 60—and surely we have the same scope here to comment as there is in the budget introduction.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am not questioning his right to make these comments. But his supporters over there are yelling for answers and I am pointing out that the answers will be brought forth when these matters are considered in the estimates of the department concerned. That is my point, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: In 1961, of \$6.5 million appropriated the government expenditures fell again to \$2.1 million, leaving unexpended \$4.3 million.

In 1962 the figures were \$5.8 million appropriated; spent \$1.8 million; unspent \$4 million.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the government's "normal" housing programme consists of an announcement of a sizeable appropriation, followed by the spending of only a fraction of the money voted. The actual expenditures over the past five years have shown a steady decline. Surely this is a more accurate reflection of the government's real approach to the problem of housing.

I want to make some observations on the sales tax. When this government introduced the sales tax, it said that the tax was necessary to produce \$150 million in revenue. We in the official Opposition did not disagree with that view but we said the government had miscalculated in its estimate, that it would receive more revenue than anticipated and that the tax could be less onerous, collection could be simpler, more economical, and many nuisances would be eliminated if there was an exemption for smaller purchases.

The government, and the hon. Prime Minister in particular, took great exception to that view. It was claimed that we did not know what we were talking about, that the government figures were right, that the exemption level of \$25 which we had suggested would not work, that it would lead to split purchases, to perhaps tax dodging, and so on and on. So we challenged the government to present its figures to a committee of the Legislature.

There was a great battle of the experts and statistics were thrown about, but out of the confusion one fact emerged: the government calculations were admitted to be fallacious by the government's own experts. In view of this, and in view of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister that adjustments in the tax would be made after a breaking-in period—I think he referred to the break-in period of an automobile.

We on this side of the House looked forward with great anticipation to what this year's budget would have to say about the sales tax.

The tax supposedly had been carefully designed to produce \$150 million in revenue in the first year. Then the estimate was raised to \$160 million. The budget now reveals the actual revenue to have been \$174 million in the year now closing, and the forecast for next year is \$180 million.

Surely the government would now adjust the tax to eliminate the irritation to the taxpayer. Surely the small retail merchant could expect relief from the drudgery of keeping

pennies in a box and filling scribbblers with a running account of pennies. Surely the government would do something to adjust the tax and make it less irksome on small purchases.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer gave us the government's answer. The exemption has been raised from 17 cents to 21 cents. Mr. Speaker, a typical example of the think small attitude of this government.

Now, sir, I would like to turn to university education. The budget admits that there will be an "astounding increase" in university enrolment in the next seven years. It declares that in order to meet this increase, the province and the universities are co-operating in an extensive expansion programme.

Let us examine this programme and this co-operation. We shall find this government has a very curious idea of what co-operation means and we shall find out how much the government is doing for higher education.

The students entering university today were born 17 and 18 years ago. It was only necessary to examine the population statistics to see what the space requirements upon the universities would be and to plan accordingly. Yet virtually nothing was done. All appeals to this government during the past ten years to plan and prepare for the university boom fell on deaf ears.

The result was completely predictable. In Ontario last fall thousands of students were turned away from the universities because of lack of space. This is not my statement, but the statement of the executive of the Ontario Secondary Teachers' Federation.

News reports of that meeting also reported the registrar of the University of Toronto as saying there were 8,000 applications for the 3,800 spaces at the university. Surely this can only be described as tragic. Thousands of students completed their secondary schooling in the belief that if they obtained 60 per cent in grade 13 they would be eligible for university. Then they found out that this government's failure to plan and prepare for them had forced the universities to raise the ante. They found that 60 per cent was not good enough, that for most courses 65 per cent or better was suddenly and arbitrarily required.

This government broke faith with the thousands of students who did not make it to university last year because of the restrictions the universities were forced to apply. That is clear enough and it is also bad enough, sir, but it must also be said that this government shortchanged the people and the economy of Ontario as a whole.

Research studies by the Ontario College of Education show clearly that at least two out of three of the students in the 60 to 65 per cent bracket could have successfully completed university and thus would have been able to contribute their extra skills and knowledge to our society and to our economy.

Small wonder that this government was finally stirred into some kind of action. Where, it began to ask, had all these students come from?

An astounding increase, the budget now declares. Why astounding? The universities knew it was coming. The school teachers knew what was happening. We on this side of the House had warned the government repeatedly what was in store unless action was taken. Now the crisis is upon us and the government is astounded.

Let us see what the government has done and what it is doing. First, let me say that the government directed Dr. R. W. B. Jackson, head of the research department at the Ontario College of Education, to prepare a report on university space requirements for the next ten years.

Dr. Jackson came up with two sets of estimates. First, he assumed there would be no change in the proportion of secondary school graduates who now go on to university. That portion is currently 50 per cent. On this basis, Dr. Jackson estimated university space requirement at 35,100 for 1962-63, 54,500 for 1965-66 and 94,200 for 1971-72.

Secondly, Dr. Jackson worked out an estimate on the assumption that the proportion of secondary school students entering university will rise from 50 to 60 per cent in the 60's because of the increasing emphasis on the need for higher education. On this basis, Dr. Jackson estimated university space requirements at 57,900 in 1965, and 112,000 in 1971.

Dr. Jackson's report was prepared for the government advisory committee on university affairs, a group which is under the chairmanship of the Chief Justice of Ontario, but which likewise enjoys, as we all know, the influential membership of the member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Frost).

And what did the committee do with the Jackson report? Well, it tossed it into the lap of the universities. In effect, it asked the universities what they were going to do about it. Not a word was said about money, not a suggestion was made that this government had failed the universities during the 50's and was prepared to mend its ways. The government merely told the universities what they already knew. It simply turned the

Jackson report over to the universities with the implied criticism that it was time the universities did something.

Well, the universities of Ontario were a match for this government. They quickly came up with a report of their own. The presidents of the universities of Ontario appointed a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Dr. Claude Bissel of the University of Toronto and Dr. John Deutsch of Queen's University was asked to prepare the universities' answer.

The Deutsch report was submitted to the government's advisory board in May of last year and a final revision was submitted as recently as this month.

The Deutsch report examined and accepted Dr. Jackson's estimates of university space requirements. It noted indeed that all forecasts have erred on the conservative side, and Dr. Jackson's highest estimates would be, and I quote Dr. Deutsch's own words, "uncomfortably close to the truth."

The Deutsch report then made four recommendations. First, that high priority be given by the government to expanding facilities for graduate studies and to establishing a special fund to provide the professors and lecturers required to teach the influx of university students.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This has been enough.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now, we will go into that. They asked for \$6 million. You gave them \$3 million. You will have only one-half of the total number of professors that are going to be required in 1970.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: This was the second Deutsch request: that the government recognize that the greatest need existed for greatly expanded faculties in arts and science. The Deutsch report stated that this means not only the expansion of existing universities but also the creation of three new liberal arts colleges, one in Niagara, one east of Metropolitan Toronto and one to the west of Metropolitan Toronto.

Thirdly, that an additional faculty of medicine, an additional faculty of dentistry, and an additional faculty of pharmacy be established in Ontario at whatever university it is considered desirable.

Fourthly, and here I shall quote the committee's exact words: "The committee urges that the government assure the universities now of the necessary immediate and continuing financial support."

Now, let us examine what this government has done about these four recommendations.

On the first point, the need to provide teaching staff to handle increased university enrolment.

Now, this is very important, sir, and may I take the opportunity to explain it extemporaneously? Obviously, if our enrolment is to go from 35,000 to 95,000 in these next six or seven years this is a trebling not only of the number of students who want to get into university, but it will require a trebling of the numbers of professors that we require to teach those additional students.

So on the first point—the need to provide teaching staff to handle increased university enrolment—the Deutsch report said that \$6 million was required immediately and that this requirement would rise to \$12 million by 1965.

The government, according to the budget, is providing \$3 million. Only one-half of what the universities need right now. We may therefore conclude that they shall produce only one-half of the number of professors that will be required in 1965, let alone 1970, and we are going to have the same problem at the university doorsteps that we have had at the high school level in years gone by and before that at the elementary level.

The second and fourth recommendations both deal with the same issue, the expansion of our universities in Ontario, and I shall discuss them in a moment.

The third recommendation for additional faculties of medicine, dentistry and pharmacy has obviously fallen on deaf ears. Nothing has happened. There is no provision for it in the budget and obviously the universities themselves can do very little in this expensive area without government assistance.

Yet as far back as 1961 there were 300 applicants for 125 places in the first year of medicine at the University of Toronto, and there were 200 applicants for 100 places in dentistry.

Now let us turn to the all-important question of how the universities are going to expand and how much help they are going to get from this government.

The Deutsch report made no specific financial demand upon the government. It said only that the universities need assurance that their immediate requirements would be met and that a basis for continuing support would be established. In this regard the university suggests that the government declare its intentions on a three- to five-year

basis. They insisted on a long-term programme rather than an ad hoc or year-to-year programme.

In their individual annual submissions, sir, to this government, the universities of Ontario asked for \$97 million in order to prepare for 1965 enrolment of 54,500 students.

The budget now reveals that the government has refused to meet this requirement. Instead of \$97 million it will provide a little less than \$70 million. While it has increased its grants from last year by some \$24 million, and that is a fantastic amount of money, the simple fact is that it will fail to provide the space that is needed in 1965 for the youngsters who want to go into university.

It has provided the universities with less than half of the increase they need to meet the demand of more space. It therefore follows that the universities will not be able to accommodate the many thousands of students seeking admission in 1965.

I challenge the government to deny that this is the case. And I challenge the hon. Prime Minister to produce the Jackson report, I challenge him to produce the Deutsch report. And I challenge him to produce and table the submissions of the universities to the Ontario government's advisory committee.

The universities have not been extravagant in their submissions. Experience has indicated that university building costs range between \$7,000 and \$10,000 per student. This means a capital programme of at least \$136 million to accommodate an increase of 19,000 students expected by the fall of 1965. The universities have asked for nothing like this amount but the government still sees fit, according to the budget, to provide a capital contribution of about \$42 million or less than a half of what is actually required at this time.

And what of future requirements? The universities ask for a financing scheme which would permit them to know what provincial help they can expect for at least three years in advance. Surely that is not too much of any business man to expect? This is an entirely reasonable request. As matters stand now, the universities have no idea whatever of what help they will receive until the budget is brought down. They cannot plan, they cannot prepare. Programmes are held up and unnecessary delays are incurred. They cannot be certain that projects begun with this year's money will receive adequate financial support next year.

It is therefore only common sense that the government should put its financial assistance

to the universities upon a long-term basis and that a formula should be established to determine who gets what. Yet the budget makes it clear that this government has said no to this common sense and that the present highly discretionary, highly arbitrary and highly inadequate system is to continue, at least until this government is removed from office.

An hon. member: That will not be long now.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Let me assure this House and the people of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, that a Liberal government will handle things differently. We will take this matter out of politics and we will strip it of the secrecy which now surrounds it. A Liberal government will establish a university grants commission to plan and carry out an orderly, stable, long-range programme of growth and development of our university system.

The commission will provide ample scope for local initiative and diversity and it will report to the Legislature. The commission will prepare a five-year capital budget for provincial assistance to the universities and it will allocate grants according to an impartial formula to all universities who will know how much money they are to receive in the years ahead.

The policy of a Liberal government, Mr. Speaker, will be to plan the expansion of existing universities and the establishment of new universities so that students who qualify for university admission on high school graduation will be assured of a place in the university if they want one. We will also develop a programme of scholarships and loans and bursaries so that no student qualified for university will be denied the opportunity for lack of money.

Mr. Speaker, a Liberal government will not be satisfied with this government's policy that half a loaf is better than none. I know that recently the hon. Prime Minister told a press conference that 9.3 per cent of the young people between 18 and 21 in Ontario are attending university and that this percentage will increase by 1970 to 18.2.

Now this is very commendable. But I point out—the increase now from nine to 18. In New York state today 25 per cent, not nine, but 25 per cent, of the population in the 18 to 21 age group go to university—not to junior colleges, but to the complete comparable four-year course.

In other words, 25 per cent of the youngsters between 18 and 21 in the State

of New York attend universities comparable to our four-year university course. Nine per cent in Ontario! We hope to increase it to 18 by 1970. By 1975, New York hopes to increase theirs to 26. We learned that we were behind New York but I did not think that we had to be forever and forever more than ten years behind that state.

This government is apparently satisfied with that state of affairs. Mr. Speaker, we are not satisfied. We will take the steps necessary to ensure that all qualified young people in Ontario are guaranteed the higher education to which they are individually entitled, to which the community is entitled and to which our economy is entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that this is a stand-pat budget cast in the pattern of 1943. Everything about the budget confirms that judgment. It is the unimaginative product of this government.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is not satisfied with the budget. The Liberal Party is not satisfied that this budget meets the needs of the people of Ontario. The Liberal Party is not satisfied with a budget that establishes no priorities, gives no directions, exerts no provincial initiatives. The Liberal Party is not satisfied with the proposition that new programmes cannot be launched because their cost is a total addition to existing expenditures.

We do not look upon new programmes as simple additions to what we have. We approach the problems facing the people of Ontario with quite a different spirit and from quite a different point of view, sir.

We believe the task of government in Ontario is to recognize the real needs of the people, establish a set of priorities for meeting those needs and then going about meeting them. We do not believe in merely adding odds and ends to the status quo. We believe that fundamental reforms are needed and that only fundamental reforms will suffice. We believe that fundamental reforms are needed in the relationship of municipal and provincial governments.

We believe the responsibility for undertaking this reform rests with the provincial government. This reform must encompass a complete review of provincial and municipal responsibility and tax revenues. We are convinced that such a reformation in provincial-municipal relations can only succeed if the province and municipalities clearly understand their respective responsibilities and have the assurance of adequate revenue to discharge them.

We believe that a completely new approach must be made to highway construction, and maintenance and transportation generally. The highway programme should be divorced from the budget here in Ontario as such and should be financed separately and from current revenue, that is associated with highways and transportation. The Liberal government will negotiate with the municipalities, co-ordinate the county and township programmes and the provincial programme and the financing of all programmes should be done out of revenue currently associated with highways. I am convinced that there are substantial economies to be gained from this type of operation, in the planning of programmes and the use of equipment.

The Liberal Party believes there must be fundamental reform in the system of financing education. We believe that the province must determine how the money is to be raised and how the services of education, health and welfare are to be provided.

We believe that the most pressing demands on provincial governments are in the fields of education, health, welfare, transportation, municipal reform and tax reform. The Liberal Party believes the province has the inescapable duty to provide equality of educational opportunity in the rural as well as the urban areas, in the separate as well as in the public schools and in the provision of opportunity for university extension and education.

Along with making equality of opportunity a reality, the Liberal Party believes the provincial government has the responsibility to establish an orderly and equitable method of financing education. We have proposed the establishment of a foundation programme for financing education in Ontario to accomplish these various goals, sir. We believe that university development must be given a high priority, that a stable long-range plan for university development must be worked out to meet the influx of students, to train the necessary professors, to provide the kind of well-rounded educational system that is necessary if we are to establish a place among the progressive jurisdictions on this continent.

We believe that a medical care insurance programme must be given high priority. The Liberal Party is on record for the implementation of a plan of medical care insurance for the people of Ontario.

All of these things are important, all of them require fundamental changes in the attitude and the approach of provincial government. The present budget does not indicate that this government intends fundamental change.

Such a programme as I have outlined and described is essential. It has been too long delayed by the present government. It must be launched at once.

A Liberal government will give top priority to the immediate implementation of a pre-paid medical care insurance programme; a fundamental reform in school financing through the introduction of a foundation programme and the financing of university growth on a planned, long-term basis with the guidance and help of a university grants commission.

A Liberal government immediately will undertake a fundamental reallocation of municipal-provincial responsibilities in the field of education, health, welfare, justice and roads. This reorganization of responsibilities and functions of government will be accompanied by reorganization of the whole tax structure at the provincial and municipal levels of government.

To implement, sir—and I stress this with all the sincerity I have—to implement the priority programmes will be expensive. It will involve dollars—we too know it, we are not irresponsible—to effect reform of provincial-municipal responsibilities and the tax structure will take time.

Ideally, reorganization of the tax structure should precede the implementation of these new programmes. However, the priority programmes to which I made reference have been too long delayed by this government already and they cannot be postponed any longer. They must be introduced. The need is urgent; further delay is an abdication of responsibility.

Tinkering with existing revenues and expenditures is neither a responsible nor a long-term solution. He who says add a little tax here, take a little there, is just kidding and fooling himself. A fundamental revision is the only responsible course of action. Mr. Speaker, we intend to make this fundamental revision.

While the reorganization of provincial and municipal responsibilities and finances is being undertaken, the priority programmes will be launched. During the period of reorganization, expenditures will exceed revenues—we know that—as a result of the introduction of the three programmes to which I referred—the foundation programme, the university programme and the medical care programme. To finance this initial cost the Liberal government will borrow the required funds from the people of this province by way of savings bonds. And since these bonds are to finance the priority programmes in the period of

reorganization for responsibilities and revenues, their term will be short—four years.

This means that within the first term of a Liberal government the reorganization of provincial and municipal responsibilities in finances will be achieved and the cost of 'new programme will be put on a self-supporting basis.

As part of its programme of reorganization, a Liberal government will include a Glassco-type inquiry into the operations of the provincial government.

These things, Mr. Speaker, are the basic ingredients of the Liberal approach to provincial government responsibility for the policies, the planning, and the programmes that will revitalize Ontario. Because this budget does not cope with the real problem of the people of this province, we in the Liberal Party cannot endorse it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of ways and means, be amended by adding thereto the following words:

But this House regrets that the government has failed to establish priorities of expenditure that would meet the urgent needs of the people and halt the haphazard and undirected growth of its bureaucracy; and

This House regrets that the government has not paid heed to the many serious representations made to it on the subject of education and has not undertaken a fundamental reform in the method of financing education that will remove existing inequities and make equality of opportunity and equity of taxation a reality; and

This House regrets that the government has failed to implement a prepaid plan of medical care insurance; and

This House regrets that the government has failed to meet the minimum needs of our young people for higher education by failing to plan and to provide for an adequate and orderly growth of our universities and the facilities to train university staff; and

This House regrets that the government has failed to bring together the forces of labour and management to assist government to plan effectively for economic growth; and

This House regrets that the government has failed to undertake a basic reform in the structure of provincial and municipal government responsibilities and tax sources; and

This House regrets that the government has shown no decisive leadership in the solution of the many problems facing Ontario farmers, in particular the cost-price squeeze and the challenge which vertical integration poses to the existence of the family farm; and

Therefore, this House rejects the budget as presented and must advise your Honour that the government does not enjoy the confidence of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Wintermeyer moves the amendment—shall we take it as read?

Mr. Reaume: Oh no. Read it again.

Mr. Speaker: In reading this I might have to be excused. I have to start part way down on the page here.

Mr. MacDonald moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: 20th order, house in committee of supply. Mr. K. Brown in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TRAVEL AND PUBLICITY (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2205.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Before vote 2205 is carried, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, through you, sir, if his representative on the highway signs committee of The Department of Highways has ever suggested that perhaps some of the provincial highways might be named in a more attractive manner as far as tourists are concerned, with reference to the areas the highways serve? I am speaking particularly of the provincial highway that passes near the historic Indian country of this province. It has been suggested it could be called the "Iroquois Trail", with some advantage.

There are other highways, of course, in the province with rather prosaic designations such as 401; perhaps this government might see their way clear to giving them more attractive names, such as "Frost Freeway" or something like that. I was wondering if there was ever any suggestion from The Department of Travel and Publicity to The Department of Highways along these lines.

Hon. B. L. Cathcart (Minister of Travel and Publicity): The director of our development branch is the representative on the

highways signing committee, and I understand that these matters you have raised are under discussion by The Department of Highways committee. I do not think they have come to a ministerial level.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, before leaving this. During the last session when we had the opportunity to debate these estimates, I asked the hon. Minister if he could give me an estimate of the number of tourists coming into Ontario, yearly, for the years 1961 and 1962. The hon. Minister gave me the number of people who came into Ontario, estimated from the border checkpoints.

It seems to me somewhat unusual that a department that is responsible for tourist promotion would not have readily at hand the number of tourists, or at least the estimated number of tourists, who have come into this province yearly. I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to elaborate further on that, now that he has had a chance to check that matter.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The question is—I think he was asking about how many tourists there were. I gave you, I believe, the number of tourists at the border crossing-points for 1961 and 1962 regardless. I have the figures here: for 1960—16,731,456; for 1961—17,671,209; for 1962—18,499,488. These figures are gathered, of course, from DBS figures, not our own.

You do understand, of course, that we have no trace of the people who come in from our sister provinces; we have no trace of the people who come from New York state through the province of Quebec and into the province of Ontario. There was an increase last year of 828,279 over 1961.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Yes, that is precisely the question asked. Do I understand this number is the number of out-of-the-province people who come across the border? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right. This only applies to those from out of the province. You are now suggesting it might include our own people; transients; back-and-forth commuters?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am asking whether or not they are excluded.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Yes; they are excluded.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Then do we have any, or does the department have any, estimates of any type respecting the number of people

who might come to visit in Ontario from which our tourist industry would benefit? Or are we just without any information in respect to that matter? And has any effort been made to find out whether or not our tourist industry is benefiting continually each year, or what? Have we not done anything to find this information?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Those figures apply to those who come into our province for a period of 24 hours or longer.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, on this vote of 2205. If we are going to attract people to the province, I think that one of the questions we are going to have to answer is this matter of when we are going to finish 401. I know that you do not have charge of the department that builds roads but I should think that probably it might be in the interests of your job if maybe the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) and you and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) or whoever has anything to do with these things, might have a talk once in a while about the advantages of maybe finishing these roads.

Now at the border, I do not know whether you actually know what has happened there or not, but if you do not, for the past eight years or more one of the very important questions people are asking at the border: is this road, is 401 finished yet? Of course the obvious answer is every year that, no, it is not finished. We heard a year ago that they were going to finish it but they do not finish it and we do not know when it is going to be finished. I feel certain that if you keep on saying that this road is not going to be finished for a year—

An hon. member: We will finish it.

Mr. Reaume: —people are going to get sick and tired of that. The question is this: is there enough friendship within the boundary lines of the Ministers of the Crown over there that they might talk these problems over once in a while—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reaume: —because it indeed would be a crime and a shame, I think, and a hardship on the people of the province, if they were to leave you alone in the handling of a department.

Having made that statement I want to ask you this. I have had the opportunity of travelling around in various parts of the world. I do not know whether you have

or not, but I notice in other parts and places in the United States, and in one state especially right across the river from your home town, they take advantage, on their licence plates every year—and I do not know how many hundreds of thousands of cars are travelling all over—but they call that state "The Water Wonderland".

Now certainly with all the brains you can find within your department, and—

An hon. member: You could put 'Macaulay's Ontario', on it, MO.

Mr. Reaume: —and if you cannot find enough brains there you might call upon the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, Mr. Chairman. You might work out something whereby our licence plates, where hundreds of thousands of cars are travelling all over here and other places as well, might have an appropriate slogan advertising our province. But as was said on Friday, this department is as devoid of ideas as a dead fish is of life!

I was just wondering—I have given up hope. As a matter of fact I think that the only way that we can put an end to the whole problem—I think this department, and others too, unless we can take part in this wonderful famous 8 o'clock coffee morning programme that is on the air, and I am certain that this really advertises the province well—

An hon. member: You have heard it?

Mr. Reaume: I have heard it. Every morning I hear it at 8 o'clock and this is what you get: Mrs. Jones from Willowdale wants to ask the following question—

An hon. member: Oh, isn't that lovely!

Mr. Reaume: Now this is as phony as a \$4 bill. You cannot resurrect—

An hon. member: You are talking awfully wild.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Interjections by several hon. members.

Mr. Reaume: What we are talking about is this: we are trying to attract people to our province and so I am just wondering, these 8 o'clock coffee breaks that have some way of reaching into the space adjoining us, I am just wondering what the people over there think of us; I know what the people here think. When you hear this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Reaume: I think that when you are using the wavelengths, Mr. Chairman, that find their way into other parts of the world we must be very cautious indeed what we say and how we say it. I am merely stating this: how foolish does it really sound when you set up a question: 'Mrs. Smith asks the Premier the following question.' There is no question about the fact that the question was framed and the answer is also framed and so it has no good effect at all. I am trying to explain to you what I have heard on the opposite side of the line. They say how foolish it all sounds.

An hon. member: You are just jealous.

Mr. Reaume: I am not jealous about it. As a matter of fact, I hope you go on with these foolish things.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Reaume: But, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order! This has nothing to do with the estimates on tourist promotion at all. That is a paid political announcement.

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Chairman, in the attraction of tourists from other parts of the world we have got to have, I think, a programme and an imaginative one. All I am saying is this, that I do hope that any advertising that is done by the Premier or any member of the government, after all, they are speaking in the name of the people of the province, I do hope it is done in a sensible, sane way. I have heard it said on the opposite side of the border, people have said that this sounds so foolish. Mind you, this is a very serious thing when you are trying to attract people to our province—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reaume: All right. You have built up a feeling now in the minds and the hearts of American people that we over here are not very fond of them, and that was not something that was built up by people in Windsor or people on the border. I think it was fostered, it was born and fostered, and the father of this plan is a man known by the name of Diefenbaker who is your first cousin.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Let us get on the vote with which we are dealing. The hon. member is wandering all over the country. Let us be at least a little reasonable. The hon. member was not here Friday.

Mr. Reaume: I am here now, that is the important thing.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of trying to attract people from other lands to travel in our province. Now what I have said is this: there has been built up, and with lots of reason too, in the minds of the people of the United States especially, that we over here do not think very kindly of them. What is my hon. friend shaking his head about, has he got the palsy?

Mr. G. Lavergne (Russell): That must have been after your visits there.

Mr. Reaume: Now the unkind things that Ottawa has said about the people of the United States, I think it is nearly time that this province, the people in power in the province at least, ought to openly say, for the purpose of travel, for the purpose of attracting people here—that after all is what we are trying to do—this House ought to openly say that we do not agree with the things that were said about the people of America by the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Diefenbaker).

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Well, you will find out.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, do we get an answer from the hon. Minister concerning the question that the hon. member asks about the co-operation between departments? Because it is of vital importance to our area that The Department of Highways and The Department of Travel and Publicity co-operate to the utmost.

Back in 1960 I read an editorial to this House concerning the lack of co-operation and even today we continue to have that lack of co-operation.

The editorial is headed "How to deter tourists against return visits", and this specifically mentions The Department of Highways. Surely we are not going to be able to attract our Americans into Ontario and our local area unless The Department of Highways hurries up and completes that Highway 401 that has been promised now for about 16 years?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: In answer to the question, I think if the hon. member will refer to my talk before I was presenting the estimates that I covered that subject in detail. I would be the first to agree with you that this Department of Travel and Publicity does require the full co-operation of the other departments because our work is so inter-related.

Mr. Reaume: Is the department getting it?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, I covered it in the talk very carefully and we do receive the full co-operation of Highways, Lands and Forests, and other departments.

Mr. Reaume: That is not true.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, it is, my friend.

Mr. Reaume: It is not true, I can point out instances where it is not true.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would advise us with respect to another matter which was raised, and that is with respect to the matter of licence plates. Would the hon. Minister tell us what consideration has been given and whether or not it is likely in the near future that our licence plates might carry a slogan similar to that in many of the United States?

It seems to me that this is a very cheap way of advertising our province, perhaps one of the best ways to advertise our province abroad.

This matter was brought up on December 5, 1961. To refresh the hon. Minister's memory I should like to quote just a sentence from *Hansard* which I have in front of me. He said, "Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of thought given to it, and as a matter of fact I cannot help but agree with you that we should work out some kind of a deal which would not cost us too much."

I wonder if the hon. Minister would advise us what type of a deal we have been able to work out with The Department of Transport and what the slogan might be and when we might expect to see it on our licence plates, and how much it would cost.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The matter under discussion was referred to The Department of Transport and, not only that, we made inquiry of many people and many people responded with suggestions for a phrase or a word that we might use on the Ontario plates. In every case, or almost every case, where a suggestion was made it would be

too long. A lot of consideration was given to these recommendations and they were referred to The Department of Transport for their consideration. We still have not got the phrase on the Ontario plates.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): "Land of Hope".

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister agree we should have such a slogan?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am very much in favour of it. I think that we could well use a slogan on the Ontario licence plates. I am still of the same opinion that I was at the time the hon. member quoted me in *Hansard*.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Then I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us why he has not recommended and his department has not recommended—

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): The hon. member has spoken about four times. I would like to speak just once, just once.

Mr. Reaume: He said you are out of order.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell me why The Department of Travel and Publicity has not taken the responsibility on this very minute item and recommended something that would be satisfactory to The Department of Transport. Surely we do not have to depend on the public to do this? This is his responsibility.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I would not like the hon. members of the Opposition to feel that this is something that was raised in 1961, because I remember raising it about 1952 and no doubt somebody had raised it ten years ahead of that. It is a very popular subject. It is a good old dandy to bring up at every session because everybody is for it and we just do not seem to decide on the right slogan.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I have never seen such an eager group in my life. They are right out there pushing and that was a great lead-off speech. But to get back to the question here, one of the problems—and if anybody on the other side has an answer I wish he would pop up real fast and give it—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Change governments!

Mr. Cowling: I did not mean that kind of an answer. I mean one on the licence plates.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, on our licence plates we have a picture of the Crown, and I think everybody agrees that it is a fine symbol, the Crown on our licence plate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. Cowling: Will you shut up for a minute and then come up with the answers? If you can come up with a suggestion whereby we can have the slogan as well as the Crown, I think that will do the trick, but we cannot take the Crown off.

So I suggest that you think about that and give us an answer before the end of the session.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this particular estimate I think this is the appropriate place to see if the hon. Minister does have from the statistics that are available to him an answer to the question that we discussed on Friday, as to how much money was spent in the past year on accommodation apart from ski tows, T-bars, et cetera, and that \$2 million figure.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Between \$16 million and \$17 million for accommodation. The statement in which the \$2 million figure was used really applies to ski tows and those appliances and facilities that would be used as part of accommodation facilities.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let us not get accommodation in there, I think it confuses it.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: No, I think accommodation should not have been in there because it was a confusing word.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member for Brant, sir, was speaking allegorically and prosaically only when he suggested that a highway be called the "Frost Freeway". He would share with me, I am sure, the antipathy towards calling any of our public institutions, monuments or any other fixtures and edifices about the province after a living Tory. That, after all, is one of the things that distinguishes a Tory from a Liberal, because most members recall that there was scarcely a Liberal Prime Minister of Canada that ever accepted a knighthood when such things were given. Sir Wilfrid Laurier only had it foisted upon him because he went to the 60th anniversary

of Queen Victoria, and they named him in the morning before he had a chance to refuse it. All the rest of them, Brown, Macenzie and Blake, all refused them.

The vote says "Official Reception Centres". I do not know that a reception centre is different from an official reception centre, it might be that the word "official" adds something to it. I am sure we have not got one in northern Ontario, I am almost certain we do not have one in north-eastern Ontario, and I know that we have not got one in the Sudbury area.

I want to say that I recommend to the hon. Minister, and I say this most seriously, that he not establish one. Please do not establish one, for your own sake, in the Sudbury area. We are adequately served with two—no! more than that—but by six that are built and operated by the chamber of commerce. I want to save the hon. Minister the embarrassment that will fall if he were to establish one. I want to tell him why.

If he establishes a reception centre, somewhere around Sudbury, then a goodly number of the 28,000 tourists that visited our community last year might go to that reception centre and they might say, "What lies to the north?"

Then they would have to be told, "Well, there is the green verdure filled with fauna and redolent with magnificent flora." They would say, "Fine, we would like to go and see that."

Well, you can't go, and they would say, "Well, why can't we go?" Because there is no road to go. If they went to your reception centre and they said, "How do we get to Timmins?" they would have to be told they would have to travel by car 270 miles through North Bay up Highway 11, and back down in a south-westerly direction to Timmins. The distance from my community to Timmins as the crow flies, or the beaver swims, is only some 60 to 70-odd miles. And then the reception centre would have to tell them, you see—as we expect the official reception centres would tell the truth, since they are official they would tell the truth—they would have to say the government has been promising the building of that road since 1943, all of 20 years. Every so often they say "We will complete that road from your community to Timmins."

Then, to be absolutely truthful about it, they would also have to tell a goodly number of these 28,000 tourists that stop at my community, they would have to say that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) used to be the Minister of Lands and Forests

and for a long time he was the only Cabinet Minister for northern Ontario, that part of northern Ontario, in the government and he exercises a great deal of influence. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs persuades the government to build roads through Chapeau and Foleyet down to Thessalon, where there are more moose than people, you see, instead of building priority roads from two large metropoli—is that the way you say it, metropoli, pardon me.

All these things, these official reception centres, because they are official would have to tell the tourists, they would have to finally end up and say if you come to this, the nickel capital of the world, this great urban metropolis, the capital of the north, then you can go east or west or you can go south, but you cannot go north, you see.

There is no other place they can go. They could join you and then they would really go somewhere, I cannot say, because I am just as truthful as the official reception centres; but I am a little more polite, so I cannot tell you.

So that is the situation and until that is corrected—I do not suppose it will be corrected until we have another little contest at the polls, I have come to believe that and I have come to accept it as my fate and we will have to fix that up ourselves. So until that time I recommend to the hon. Minister that he not open one of these official reception centres in my community.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to convey these few thoughts to the hon. Minister.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich):
Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would say, that I was unable to be here last Friday when the debate was opened on this estimate. Nevertheless I want to say this. I have something I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister.

It is in regards to a brief submitted to the tourist committee of the Ontario Economic Council by the Windsor Chamber of Commerce, the Essex County Automobile Club and the Essex County Tourist Association. This was presented to the committee on September 20, 1962, in Chatham. Now I am not going to read the whole brief, but I do happen to know when you do set up these committees that they receive many reports and you yourself, sometimes, in the midst of all the briefs and all the reports that you have received, you have not the time to digest all these recommendations.

I certainly want to commend the groups

that did present this brief because it is a very good brief. They speak of the past history of these various organizations. I am just going to read a few of the recommendations which pertain to the area from which I come.

My hon. colleague in the House last Friday mentioned that in the city of Windsor enter the greatest number of American citizens that come to this province. I certainly back him up in that statement. Here are some of these recommendations—or some of the requests that the travellers ask the people in this field. Either it is the customs man, or it is at the tourist centre, or the chamber of commerce, or people connected with traffic.

There is a serious need for additional camping space in some areas, including Essex County. In one month this year there were nearly 1,000 inquiries made at one of the local tourist reception centres in Windsor for trailer and tenting facilities. A programme should be started whereby a small area, in attractive settings could be purchased when available to establish facilities. As previously mentioned small craft boating and touring traffic has become of major significance, therefore consideration should be given to the problem of establishing small boat marinas which can increase the movement of the American visitors into Ontario centres.

I may say, that today, there is greatly increased interest in boating. If the province can do something in promoting areas, municipalities to establish marinas, this would be quite an asset to this province and to the tourist industry.

Displays of Canadian and Ontario culture and products can also serve as an attraction and can be of economic value. It is necessary that an extensive educational programme be carried out to make more people realize how important this industry is to the province and the country and to encourage and develop interest by all people, to assist the visitors with interested help and advice.

It is felt by these groups that there should be a better understanding of how the economic council is able to work with communities. There is a vast storehouse of manpower and ideas; but it is essential that the economic council take steps to co-ordinate this effort and take possible action to sell the economic value of the tourist industry to all communities.

Toward this end, there should be a more united approach to the problems and a greater co-ordination of all departments whose policies affect this growing industry.

Tourist promotion and development is a

vital cog in our economy and very close co-ordination should be developed between the province and all communities so that a united attack can be made on the weaknesses in our system, and at the same time the strength can be brought out forcefully and with greater effectiveness.

These are just a few of the recommendations I want to bring out of this brief. But I do want to stress to the hon. Minister these points of more trailer camps and more marinas. This is something which is vitally needed. We in the county of Essex feel that way.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: As you know, that was a very constructive and helpful brief presented to the tourist committee of the economic council. They are considering all of the matters that have been presented to them and in turn will consider them with the economic council, because they are non-partisan and unbiased and out of their recommendations we hope we will be able to come up with new ideas which will help to promote the travel business.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, just one short observation.

I do not wish to be unduly persistent but I ask the hon. Minister: with respect to these tourists coming into the province, I think the figures which were given to me were somewhere in the vicinity of 16 million for 1960, somewhere in the vicinity of 17 million for 1961 and somewhere in the vicinity of 18 million for 1962. I wonder if the hon. Minister would perhaps relate those figures to the ones that he gave me last year, and I have page 209 of *Hansard* in front of me, when I asked him relatively the same question and he advised me as follows: "A year ago it was 4,320,705."

And then he goes on to say that for the first nine months of this year—speaking of 1961—it was 4,557,916. Obviously one of the figures is incorrect; would the hon. Minister advise us which one is incorrect?

My hon. friend says: "Was this cars or people?" My question was people, last year, and this was the answer that I received.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I have the figures in front of me in connection with the cars for 1960 and it may be that the figures the hon. member is using apply there. For 1960—4,780,416; 1961—5,048,917; and in 1962—5,285,568. The other figures that I gave the hon. member this afternoon apply to people. These figures are obtained again from DBS.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The other question I wished to ask was with respect to the new service facilities which are going to be operated on Highway 401. Last year I suggested to the hon. Minister that it might be possible to establish tourist information booths in those facilities as they were just being planned. At that time the hon. Minister told me that this matter was being considered between his department and The Department of Highways.

Would the hon. Minister now be able to tell us whether or not these information centres will be available, and on what basis?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The space is being provided by the companies themselves, and some of the equipment as well. We are presently working with the regional tourist councils. We are not suggesting that just one or two regions, that lie completely adjacent to the particular gasoline and restaurant service where the information space will be, should benefit, but rather that we take in a larger area and have four, five or six of the regions join in their efforts to pay for the staff which would supply the information to the travelling public.

We feel that we now have our own Ontario centres which of course are established to provide information across the province as a whole. These information bureaus, staffed by the regional tourist councils, would be able to bend their efforts towards the particular regions which are supplying the staff.

There are eight service centres under construction and we understand that, through the regions, there will be staffs supplied. We have our staffs from the head office working with the regional associations. We will also use our inspectors in the field, to be of assistance. We hope that the staff will be there probably around the first part of May. We have suggested that as an opening date for all eight.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I understand that the personnel will not be supplied by The Department of Travel and Publicity to staff these centres. Is that different from other reception centres?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Yes. Our Ontario centres are staffed and paid for by The Ontario Department of Travel and Publicity but, as I stated a moment ago, we feel that if these centres were staffed by the regional tourist associations, to which we pay grants, then they would be able to bend their efforts towards selling those particular regions of which they are representative.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: And then would all regions of Ontario be represented somewhere along this highway?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is what we hope, yes.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am sure that they would be gladly accepted if they wanted to come in. There are eight distributing points along Highway 401. I feel very strongly that a region 500 miles away could well use the services of an information centre along 401. As far as our Ontario centres are concerned, we ask our staff to be unbiased, to show no priority to any community; rather their answers hinge a great deal on the questions which are asked by the travelling public.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that a regional area which is contributing half of the cost itself would certainly be biased to their own regional area. I suggest to the hon. Minister that Highway 401 is peculiar in that once a person is on Highway 401, if he is travelling the entire route, he is subjected only to the service facilities that are on there. I hope, if something is being worked out on a regional basis, that other parts of Ontario will not be overlooked. I think there is a very grave danger that this could happen in the method which the hon. Minister has suggested will be worked out.

My original thought was that The Department of Travel and Publicity in their wisdom might establish their own centres there, so that this information would be related, as he suggests, on an unbiased basis. It seems to me that any tourist facilities or any facilities outside of those regional development areas certainly would not get any attention from the personnel in the booth because it just stands to reason that they would be biased.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Ontario literature will be available through those centres as well.

Mr. Troy: I have a question about the reception centre at Barrie. If a tourist comes to the reception centre and asks them: "How do I get to the Trans-Canada highway?" what would the answer be? I am serious.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: My staff has the answer to all the—

Mr. Troy: I am asking the hon. Minister what the answer would be. There are two Trans-Canada highways; what would they say? Would they answer: "There are two

Trans-Canada highways"? I am trying to get some information. You should understand that.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I think this is just a bit of nonsense, because you do know where the centre is located. You know that we have—do not shake your head—we have the best location we could possibly get because of the intersection of Highway 11 and Highway 27 with Highway 100.

Mr. Troy: It is no nonsense, sir. I am not interested in where the centre is. I am asking a simple question. If a tourist from the United States wanted to find what route to take for the Trans-Canada Highway, what would the answer be?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Our staff there would get out a map and draw on that map the proper routes to follow.

Mr. Troy: How many routes would they draw on the map?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I haven't the least idea.

Mr. Troy: Well, ask your staff.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago, one of the hon. members stressed the fact that there should be co-operation among the hon. members of the government to help our tourist industry. I have talked about this before in other sessions, but not under these estimates, and I feel there could be more co-operation between The Department of Travel and Publicity and The Department of Highways, as far as our system of having signs is concerned in this province.

I know in my own particular area that there are many tourists who get lost, because many of these tourist centres are very small in size, and there are dozens of them. The Department of Highways, or somebody, will not allow the municipalities to put up signs pointing out where these small places are.

I have a letter in my desk here now, which I just got this morning. I intended to give it to the hon. Minister of Highways tomorrow, Mr. Chairman. I am just going to read part of it. It is in connection with a large tourist centre, Sauble Beach. It says here someone—I will not mention his name:

Our provincial sign inspector is bothering us again. He is still harping about the sign on the post office at Hepworth, and he says we have to take the arrows off the signs in Southampton and Hepworth. I am sure these signs bother no one but him, and they help a lot of tourists find their way to our beach.

Now that statement is absolutely true, and while I appreciate the fact that probably among the regulations of The Department of Highways it says that signs can only be placed at certain intersections, nevertheless where we have a tourist area such as the Bruce Peninsula and the Sauble Beach area, I feel that The Department of Highways might co-operate with The Department of Travel and Publicity and allow some signs to be put up; allow some loosening of the regulations.

I have pointed this out before, and I am jealous of the Muskoka area as far as this goes. In that area, for some reason unknown to me, there are dozens of signs—hundreds of signs, my hon. friend says—giving different tourist localities, and these signs are simply not allowed in Bruce county or other counties in the southern part of Ontario.

I feel that co-operation could be shown by the two hon. Ministers here if they would get together, have a friendly little chat and allow a loosening of these regulations so that tourists can see where they are going to. We have thousands and thousands of them and some of them do not know where the area is. Maybe it is the first time they have come into that particular area, and they wish to go to Sauble Beach; there simply are not enough signs on the highways showing where these tourists localities are. I would be very pleased if the hon. Minister of Highways would answer that question.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member would probably be interested to hear this. While it might be appropriately asked under the estimates of The Department of Highways, nevertheless as it is related to tourism, I think you would be interested to learn that a number of weeks ago Mr. W. H. Cranston from Midland, who is the chairman of the committee on tourism of the economic council, at his request sat with myself and the superintendent of signs and the traffic engineer, and a full committee.

They submitted a number of recommendations they have picked up all across the province—from tourist outfitters and tourist establishments of all descriptions. These were gone over thoroughly and many of the recommendations they have made have already been implemented. The rest of them are under consideration.

The problem that you raised was proposed to us. It is being investigated. I am saying this to you because I want you to understand the extent to which we are co-operating with The Department of Travel and Publicity. This

thing is being looked into very thoroughly, and will continue to be looked into.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on vote 2205, to what extent does the department carry out the programme of selling the province to students while attending school?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is a pretty difficult question to answer. We do, where we have a request from the principal of the school or teachers. While it would be utterly impossible to supply the many demands that are made, where a principal or a school teacher writes in for a particular booklet, that they feel would be helpful in their teaching, we will send them a half a dozen, or a certain amount, so they can use it as part of their curriculum.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the hon. Minister then that possibly here is where he could conduct a contest for a slogan for our licence plates among the schools, and likewise possibly the idea of selling our province with an essay contest or something like that to students of the various levels up to grade 8? Some kind of prize—maybe a trip throughout the province of Ontario—to a youngster for submitting the best essay on the province? Likewise a similar type of prize for a student at the secondary school level.

Mr. Troy: With regard to these regional associations, how many of the associations have complained of the competition of the provincial parks? As you will readily understand, the tourist operators have spent great sums of money to develop their resorts and I know one in particular that has complained about the facilities practically at his door. I think we have had many of these.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: They complain to the associations to which they belong. We get the complaints from the association.

Mr. Troy: And what is always your reply to these complaints?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Again, I might say, and it has been mentioned repeatedly here, that there is a tourist committee of the economic council which has held some 20 meetings throughout the province and received briefs and verbal representations from associations, and individuals. They have studied and screened the recommendations that came before them as a result of their visits to different parts of the province. The hon. Minister of Highways has just explained that they have taken some directly to Highways. The committee sat with the hon.

Minister of Highways and his people, and presented their proposals or their requests that Highways deal with them. As the hon. Minister said, many of them have already been implemented and others are being given consideration.

Mr. Troy: So if we have complaints from the association, say in my area, we do not go to a Ministry. We go to some committee that has been appointed—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: No, you do not. We are still very much in business. This is in addition. The tourist committee will also present certain requests and recommendations to Lands and Forests or any other department of government. Then if those departments do not deal with them they would come back to us.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is this the department that would make recommendations concerning the establishing of parks on our natural waterways?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: All of those things have been presented to the tourist committee, but that kind of a recommendation, sir, would in turn be referred to Lands and Forests or the department that is responsible for it.

Mr. Newman: Does the department itself make recommendations? I could probably refer to maybe a "Blue Water Highway" connecting the cities of Windsor and Sarnia so that we could have a highway for our tourists extending all the way from Niagara Falls, following Lake Erie, going in through to Essex county, around Windsor, around Lake St. Clair, up into your area.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That has been presented and is before the tourist committee.

Mr. Newman: Has the hon. Minister's department made any suggestions like that?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am dealing with it locally; my riding is down there.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the hon. Minister then to suggest to the hon. Minister sitting two seats away from him that he take that into consideration?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I will be very happy to do it.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, this may not be a clear question, but undoubtedly one of the greatest oppositions to our tourist resort

operators, financial opposition, are the provincial parks. Now, all of us, of course, desire provincial parks, they are used and they have been a great success, but could the hon. Minister tell me, are they run economically? Could he tell me—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I think that with all due respect that should be—

Mr. Whicher: Well, I know it should be under Lands and Forests, I am not trying to take advantage of the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I would not know.

Mr. Whicher: The point is that I feel they should be, because they are in direct competition with our tourist operators.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: May I say that is another matter that is before the tourist committee? They will take it up with Lands and Forests directly as they did with the hon. Minister of Highways.

Mr. Whicher: Yes. Well, of course, the only thing here is that we have the hon. Minister's estimates now and we like to take these things up directly with him.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, that is quite correct but we do not build the parks.

Mr. Whicher: Well, there are so many committees, this government has got so many committees now that we do not know how many committees there are and who the members are.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: This is a very effective one. It works very well.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2205 agreed to.

Vote 2206 agreed to.

On vote 2207:

Mr. Belanger: Do I have the floor? Thank you very much.

Under vote 2207, the historical grant, may I ask has the historical branch of the society the power to make grants, and if so have they made any grants in 1962 and to whom?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, the grants are right in the estimates. The Ontario Historical Society got \$3,500; the Archaeological Society \$1,000—

Mr. Belanger: No, I understand that this is for your coming budget, but I am asking—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: —and, of course, to museums. I am sorry.

Mr. Belanger: This is for your budget for the coming year. I am asking if you made any grants in 1962 and to whom?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Oh, very definitely. There were total grants of \$37,995.17.

Mr. Belanger: That is just for museums?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: To 52 museums. These are all for museums. Some 52 of them received in total \$37,995.17, the Ontario Historical Society received \$3,500, and the Archaeological Society, \$1,000.

Mr. Belanger: That is entirely to museums. Were there no grants say to archaeologists or to the work of archaeology, or anything like that?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, I think last year we made a grant of some \$3,000—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I might say there were some grants for archaeological purposes made in The Department of Education, when we get to that.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister a question and perhaps through him to the hon. Prime Minister. I must say that I have some misgivings as to the archives branch being in The Department of Travel and Publicity. I do not want to say anything that is slighting of The Department of Travel and Publicity, but I think, on the surface of it, that the archives branch in this department is a misfit.

I was wondering if I may ask the hon. Minister whether his department, or broadly the government, is giving consideration to putting it in a more appropriate department. The very fact, for example, that archaeological grants are being given in The Department of Education seems to me proof of the fact that we have got the thing split here and that they should be united in one place, and I would think that the appropriate place would be The Department of Education.

The archives branch is by its nature digging into history, and is related to education and so on, much more than travel and publicity.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, we do considerable archaeological work for the simple reason that we are doing that kind of research in order to commemorate the historical

aspects of that particular dig, whether it is an Indian village or whatever it may be. That does come under our department.

I am wondering where the hon. member feels the department of archives should be placed, what other department is more allied with the work that they do? Our historical director was the assistant to Dr. Sprague of the archives. They work closely together and there is much in the way of information that he must acquire from archives in the research work which has enabled us to establish some 309 plaques.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am not saying that there is not some relationship, because clearly our past is one of the pegs on which we hang publicity to attract people to come here. But in the same way that this department has a relationship to Lands and Forests through parks, to Highways through highways, the nature of the department is that it is in relationship to everyone else and therefore it does not seem to me that that argument is necessarily a very strong one.

My basic point is that it seems to me that the division of archives, as it is called, basically should be in The Department of Education. Now, if it is producing something which would meet the particular need of the department, fine, but I submit to the hon. Minister, and to the government more broadly—because I recognize that this is not the hon. Minister's final decision, though he may have something to say about it—I think this is a misfit to have the division of archives in The Department of Travel and Publicity.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: With all due respect, I do not think the hon. member has produced a very good argument. The archivist for Ontario, Dr. Sprague, operates a department. He sits with the Deputy Ministers' council, he deals directly with the Minister and not with the personnel of The Department of Travel and Publicity, and it is a matter of the archivist of Ontario having a responsible Minister to report to the House for his work. He provides his own report with respect to the archives, and again I say that our work is tied in a great deal with the archivist of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, may I just qualify this one point, please? Is it the case that we are still continuing the tradition that the provincial archivist is a deputy minister, in the status of a deputy minister and reports directly to a Minister?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: So in effect the hon. Minister has two deputies.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, I do not refer all matters of The Department of Travel and Publicity to the archivist of Ontario. He has the status there in the department of archives, and he does report directly to me. We work together rather than it being necessary for him to go through the deputy or any other of the personnel, although he has access to them if he so desires.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me pursue this. Is it not the very nature of the division of the archives that he must have relationship with all departments? I mean, if he is doing a job.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: And all departments in touch with him.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. And it would seem to me that the hon. Minister has added further to my case. It is a bit of a mess to have the man who understandably is in this sort of unique, almost historic position, so to speak—in terms of keeping up with the history of the province—tucked away in The Department of Travel and Publicity. I do not want to derogate The Department of Travel and Publicity, but I do not think that is where the archives should be.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Chairman, prior to my time, it used to be in The Department of Education, and it was moved from there into The Department of Travel and Publicity, but this was done purely for administrative purposes. And it really is a question of where it will function best. The archivist has, I believe, a deputy minister status by statute, and this he maintains. But really as long as he is doing the job properly, which Minister he reports to, as long as it is a satisfactory arrangement, does not, as far as I can see, make a great deal of difference. Because, as the hon. member says, he is going to deal with every department in any event.

But I can assure the hon. member that the organization of this government—and I do not mean this in a facetious fashion—is under constant review to see that we have the best administrative set-up that we can have.

But this is purely administrative. There is no relationship, in other words, between the function of the archivist and the function of The Department of Travel and Publicity. For a man who is dealing with all departments of government he must perform for administrative purposes be in some department in

order that we can budget for him, for instance. And this is an administrative arrangement that seems to work quite satisfactorily.

Mr. Troy: Last year, representations were made to the hon. Minister about historical plaques in areas which are largely French-Canadian, at least where there is a large French-Canadian population, or areas linked with some French explorer like Champlain or Nicolet or French missionaries. What is now the attitude of the Ministry in that regard? I think one side of the plaque should be in French.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: May I just say in reply that at the moment on both sides of the plaque is an inscription in English.

Mr. Troy: That is why I asked the hon. Minister for information. What is he going to do about putting the other side in French? As the hon. Minister very well knows—and I hope that this department has a committee which is preparing now for the 1967 centennial—the first commercial establishment in Ontario was established on Lake Nipissing and it is the original Trans-Canada route. But the point is that there were plaques put up on the Champlain trail.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We are giving serious consideration to it and if the director can find a means by which French can be placed on one side of the plaque and English on the other, particularly through sections that the hon. member is talking about, it will be done.

Mr. Troy: If there is some area in Ontario that is to have a very prominent part, that one place in Ontario should be Lake Nipissing because that is where the first commercial establishment was. I just bring that to the attention of the hon. Minister.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, many of the historic sites which have been suitably marked by the department in the past are falling into disrepair because of some lack of interest along these lines. I wonder what the machinery is in the department, if any, for the acquisition of some of these sites, their development as tourist attractions and their proper operation? Is the department solely planting plaques or is there some machinery for the acquisition of the actual site?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We have never purchased. The plaquing is all done in co-operation with the municipalities or an historical society. We do not own the property

where the plaque is located. We have an arrangement with The Department of Highways whereby they maintain the plaques and I would be interested to learn of any of the Ontario historical plaques that are in bad repair because they are supposed to be weather-resistant.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say that the plaques themselves were not properly kept up, but the historic site itself is not kept up. Actually these sites are falling into great disrepair and surely it would be the job of The Department of Travel and Publicity to develop some of these as tourist attractions?

I would think that some sort of a plan based on matching grants with the municipality could be worked out in this regard. There are some of these development plans that are fostered privately and I understand that the department co-operates with the placing of a plaque under those circumstances as well. But certainly when the project takes on rather large proportions the government should also accept some responsibility for the actual development of these places, particularly if they have tourist and historic importance. I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on the possibility of that coming about in the future.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, I am certainly greatly interested to learn that some of these locations are not being cared for. This comes as rather a surprise to me because I understood that either an historical society, a municipality, highways, or some organization was responsible for the upkeep of the location of the plaque.

Mr. Nixon: I am probably not making myself properly clear in this regard but I am thinking of some locations where the burden of upkeep is becoming too heavy for the organizations concerned and that they have put a lot of effort and a lot of money into these developments. If they are going to proceed and become true tourist and historic attractions the government should assume some of the responsibility for their development or perhaps just maintenance.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I appreciate very much the suggestion of the hon. member. I can assure him it will be looked into.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I might ask the hon. Minister a question. How many cairns were placed around the counties last year? And how does the hon.

Minister decide where he puts a cairn or where he puts a plaque?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We establish only plaques. There were 41 established last year.

Mr. Spence: Just one?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Forty-one.

Mr. Spence: Forty-one.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Forty-one plaques.

Mr. Spence: And no cairns?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: No.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): What is the ruling on the placing of plaques on a site adjoining Highway 401? Is there a restriction, or could the historical board put a service road adjoining it? I am thinking primarily of one in honour of Admiral Vansittart, who is known to be the founder of the city of Woodstock. There has been some talk of placing a plaque in the area, but it adjoins 401. And that seems to be the stumbling block at the moment. Is there any clarification the hon. Minister could give me on it?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: An application is received by the historical branch and they do the research, present it to the advisory committee who in turn either recommend or do not recommend the establishment of a plaque.

When it gets to the point where it is felt that the plaque should be established, and there is sufficient historical significance to it, then we take steps to work it out with Highways or whatever other department of government or whatever other level of government might be concerned or connected with it. The department itself then looks into it and we have never failed to make arrangements whereby the plaque can be erected. We do not ourselves approve of it being in a place right adjacent to a highway, whether it be an existing one or a closed access road.

Mr. Innes: Well, the hon. Minister has not answered my question. Are any historical plaques at the moment placed along Highway 401?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: No.

Mr. Innes: In other words, if there is an historical site next or adjoining 401, it cannot be put there?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, I am sure if it was a location of historical significance, then

we would endeavour to find a means whereby people could get to that historical site. I am not in any way saying that it would be located adjacent to 401 as a traffic hazard.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister told us a moment ago that the government has no facilities at the present time to help with the maintenance of, let us say, a building which happens to be an historic site, even though it may be recognized as such by a plaque. Does the hon. Minister provide expert facilities whereby the municipality or the group concerned with developing the building, as it may be, can have expert advice as to how perhaps it should be furnished or redeveloped on the outside in the proper manner, so that it would be done as an historic site and not just as a rather cheap tourist attraction?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We do, through our historical branch, have available people who will go out and advise and assist. Of course very often these historical buildings can be converted into a museum and we have our museum advisor who is a specialist in that line. In that case he would attend and discuss the matter personally with them.

Mr. Nixon: Grants would be available if the building could be classed as a museum? Is this so?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Not necessarily. Even with an historical building our people would be glad to go out and assist.

Mr. Nixon: Are there special regulations concerning the money that might be made available if the site or the building is in a recognized park area; like the Niagara Park area or the St. Lawrence Development area?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: A museum is the only facility that we make grants to and we only make grants to the museum when it is owned by the municipality.

Mr. Nixon: I understand the jurisdiction of the Niagara Park area was extended to Stoney Creek so that certain grants might be made available. Is this correct? Would the hon. Minister instruct me in this?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, it is under the jurisdiction of the Niagara Parks Commission.

Mr. Nixon: That means that special monies are available?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Not through this department.

Mr. Nixon: What department, then, would that be?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The Niagara Parks Commission? It has never been under The Department of Travel and Publicity.

Mr. Nixon: Would we inquire about that through Lands and Forests?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The former Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has been chairman of it and still is.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I think I would have to find out what the hon. member is really asking. Is it where the money comes for some site at Stoney Creek? Is that what the hon. member is interested in?

Mr. Nixon: If I might take a moment, I understand the monies for development of historic sites has been made available in the Niagara Parks area for some reason that I do not understand. The park area was extended for jurisdictional reasons to the Stoney Creek area so that an historic site could be developed with some government money. I would think if it could be extended that far then perhaps the limit of extension might be further increased so that Pauline Johnson's birthplace could be included, that is what I am really interested in.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, quite a group of people who were interested in the historical nature of the Stoney Creek battlefield made very great representations to have the field enlarged a little and to have it made into a park that would be something that the people of the community could be proud of and that would remain as a memorial to that battle. The park did not qualify as a municipal park, it neither had the space for camping nor was there a desire to have a camping area in the park. And so it was decided that the Niagara Parks Commission would be asked if they would take over the part that had been a park—which then was under the control of the Daughters of the Empire, I think, together with the adjoining property. They, in turn, would improve the whole area.

In the meantime I should have said that the federal government made an offer of contributing \$25,000 toward the cost of the new area. So with these offers, and as a result of the appeal to the Niagara Parks Commission, it was taken over and improved with the understanding that this government would make a grant of the difference between the amount being contributed by the federal government and the cost of the property.

The property was costing \$55,000; the federal government was making a grant of \$25,000, and in the supplementary estimates is a grant of \$30,000 to the Niagara Parks Commission to pay for the cost of the land, which has been developed by them and is now a very lovely property, as you may have seen if you have visited it.

Mr. Nixon: And its effect is a very useful tourist attraction as well as an important historic site. I think that rather than doing this on an individual basis, although this is a very meritorious example, there should be an overall policy whereby if this department—if that is the decision—should have the ability to acquire and develop and even operate on a matching basis with the local municipality. Certainly as we approach our regional centres. This could be a very worthwhile project and one that should be seriously considered.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, might I just ask one further question? Is there no provision in this Legislature, before these grants are made, for us to discuss them or ask questions? The question was asked with respect to this particular matter as to which department we might discuss it under. Now if monies are being expended by this Legislature, which department is the correct department to discuss them? If it is under the Niagara Parks Commission, I see the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Daley) is here and I know he had a lot to do with that commission, perhaps he could tell us which is the proper department. We have not had an answer yet.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Some of these votes come under various departments where we have a commission—for example, the St. Lawrence Seaway and Upper Canada Village. That park, and the monies voted to it, and the management of the park and the commission itself, reports to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, and therefore in his estimates the amounts of money for that park are voted and can be discussed and so on.

We have a variety of parks which we operate. We are speaking at the moment about a park combined with an historical site as well. Some of these are large projects and would have to be treated individually, such as the reconstruction of Upper Canada Village which is both historical and a tourist attraction.

As these matters come to the attention of the government I think they have to be dealt with on an individual basis because each one

has entirely different circumstances surrounding it. But in every case, the money is voted somewhere in these estimates and the matter can be discussed during the estimates of the department concerned.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would we discuss them with respect to this particular vote?

Mr. Chairman: Three, under the supplementary estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests.

Vote 2207 agreed to.

On vote 2208:

Mr. Troy: On 2208. As you know in metropolitan areas and in many of our larger cities they are getting rid of slum areas because of the squalid quarters, dilapidated tenements, congested conditions. But the slum is not entirely a physical entity, it is also a slum culture.

Last year, you will find our League of Decency, which is supervised by the bishops of America, accused moving picture producers of an unprecedented departure from previous moral standards. All you have to do is scan the pages of daily newspapers in which movies are advertised. You see the angle shots, you see the pitch, the punch line, all these agencies to attract people who possibly should not be there.

Listen to the lurid pitch they have on the radio or TV to advertise the movies. The unfortunate part about it is, that they are appealing to a certain level of our nature. The moving pictures—what do they do? They glamorize adultery, they ridicule sanctity of marriage—in fact, they degrade the innate dignity of the individual. In many cases, and certainly to me, I find this government has all kinds of advertisements. We have advertisements on TV and the radio, and in the papers, “to live better electrically.” We have advertisements on safety, fire precautions. We say, “Youngster, don’t touch matches, you are going to be burned!” But, in a case where the soul of the youth is affected there is no leadership at all.

I am no puritan, nor do I carry a torch for prudery, but I certainly think the government should take some leadership. I don’t know what your censorship committee is doing. Last year I understand, the number of movies that were censored as objectionable jumped up very impressively.

This is what is said at the footnote of your government services publication under the heading “Motion picture”. The final paragraph is: “Consequently the Motion Picture

censorship enables adults to enjoy sophisticated films which are not distasteful to them.”

When you criticize some of these people, the retort is you have to be mature, or this is a different world. There is no change in moral values, as the Archbishop of Canterbury says. Adultery is adultery today just as it was 2,000 years ago. Adolescents see films that do nothing but harm them morally.

I do not know what age you consider an adolescent, but I notice 18-year-olds are allowed to see these films that are labelled with the shape of a key, with “restricted” in it. They are allowed to see them.

With adult films, a youngster can go in as long as he is accompanied by his parent or an adult. All the youngster has to do is ask an adult, “Will you take me in, here is the ticket money”, and he goes in; the adult is no relation to him at all.

Certainly I think the government ought to take some leadership in this regard too. As I said before, you preach safety, you say live better electrically, you have brainwashed the youngsters about electricity. So I think also you should do some advertising which would say, “Don’t go to this film, it is going to affect your soul and very nature.” I mentioned this before and I shall mention it as long as I am a member of this House, and conditions remain as they are.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, speaking on the same topic, I notice the theatres are open on a Sunday, and the motion pictures continue to not improve. I would say they still continue to emphasize a little more of the part of life I personally don’t think should be emphasized. Now a lot of these films today, are in the restricted category. Tomorrow, or a year from tomorrow, they will be shown on TV, and then the youngsters, regardless of age, will be able to see them. There is no censorship of any type—and I stand to be corrected, if I am wrong—concerning any of these films that are shown on television. I think it is time this department took a second look at the attitude towards films shown on television.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister the names of the people on this board of censors, and secondly, I would like to know when they were appointed. Will he answer both questions together?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I do not have the time they were appointed or the length of their service. I would be glad to get it for you and send it. I guess these are the total people.

There is a Maude Canning, who is a censor, a Miss Maude Canning.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I do not want to be presumptuous here at all, I have certain information, and you might correct me, my understanding is, she was appointed in 1935, would that be correct?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, I know she is due for retirement, this spring, any time now, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Do you want me to read my list? Mr. Silverthorn was appointed in 1934, the vice-chairman, Mr. MacPhee, was appointed fifteen years ago, Miss Canning 1935, Mr. Evans 20 years ago, Mr. Gaskin 14 years ago, and Mr. Knowles, 12 years ago. If that information is correct, Mr. Chairman, the question I make is this: is there any policy in respect to the department rotating these positions or appointing new people to the board? Certainly the opinions of a group become solidified after a period of time, and I would think one of the real benefits of the board of censors is to have a rotating panel.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That might well be given consideration but I have not thought of it because of the experience these people have gained, and—

Mr. Troy: It was brought up last year.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, we must have arrived at about the stage where there will be a rotation. I do know that Mr. Evans retired last year because he had arrived at a certain age. With great regret, I should say that Mr. Gaskin passed away just in the last day or two. He will be greatly missed because he served well on the censor board. Of course, as I said before, Miss Canning is due for retirement. This means there will be replacements. However, it is questionable whether it is necessary to have as large a board as we did originally because of the lesser number of films and the lesser amount of work. Many of these people who are in the employ of theatres branch are inspectors in the field, to inspect the projectionists and the theatres themselves.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention that on several occasions there are very fine movies being shown to children, which they enjoy, and there are some that are very educational. Invariably when they have completed that particular show there will be a preview of

a show for adult entertainment. As you know, generally the most choicest—well, I would say the choicest—the ones that would create the most interest to the public will be shown. This has been brought to my attention that it certainly is not in good taste to the youth of our community.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Nor is it permissible.

Mr. Innes: This is right; and it has been brought to my attention. I think that the board should look into it very, very seriously and make sure that those shows are censored.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I have two questions for the hon. Minister. The first one is: How much in the way of pay does a member of the board of censors receive per year? Secondly: How many movies have been censored during the past year?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: At any rate, Mr. Gaskin was drawing \$6,300; Miss Canning—\$5,250. It ranges in between \$3,360, up to \$4,000 and \$5,200 in the censor's category.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, do the members of the board work full time, or what do they actually do?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Oh, yes. They work full time.

Mr. Trotter: Do they start at a certain pay and work up over the years?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. Trotter: How many films did they censor last year?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Four hundred and seventy-eight films were examined; 344 were approved; 105 were approved for adult showings; 28 were restricted; and one still pending that has not received approval. So, 478 in all.

Mr. Trotter: Were there any films banned last year?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Just one pending.

Mr. Trotter: One pending.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: You do understand that in the censoring of the film very often there are sections clipped from it and then it receives approval for showing in a theatre either as a restricted, adult or straight showing. That is what the censorship is for.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask: What are the qualifications for a

person to be on this board? It seems to me that a person who is a censor has a very great responsibility. I admit there is a lot of misuse of movies, but at the same time censorship is a very dangerous field in which to be in and I would like to know what qualifications these people have, to be on a board of censors.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: They are under the supervision of Mr. Silverthorn who has been director of the theatres branch since its establishment. So he does have a great deal of experience and—

Mr. Trotter: I know, but he is not on the board of censors.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, he is the chairman of it.

Mr. Trotter: What are the qualifications of the people on the board?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: He is the fellow that in the final analysis decides whether that film can be approved by the censor board. They are not completely unrestricted in their censorship of the film.

Mr. Trotter: I know; he seems to censor the censors, but what do they—

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, any boss does.

Mr. Trotter: Well, what do the people on the board actually—what qualifications do they have to be on there? The hon. Minister still has not answered my question.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, I am at a loss to know how to answer it. Somebody asked me a question a moment ago about why these people should remain on the board for so many years until their retirement and would it not be better to rotate them—

Mr. Trotter: Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Have them on for so many years and then have new ones. It has not been the habit; and as it was pointed out many of them have been there 15 or 20 years.

Mr. Trotter: It sounds to me as if you are in a rut.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: You see, Mr. Silverthorn as the director is also the chairman of the censor board.

Mr. Trotter: Well, it seems to me that Mr. Silverthorn pretty well decides everything regardless if there is a board. What is the

point of paying these people, if you are paying these people to sit on the board? We do not know what their qualifications are, for one thing. My view is that this is a very dangerous field, censorship. I realize we must have it, because the movies go too far, but I think we should be very careful who sits on that board.

You go even further and say that Mr. Silverthorn censors the censors. In other words, he is really a one-man censor board.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: He is the chairman of the board.

Mr. Trotter: Which is even more dangerous.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I thought I heard that some of the salaries were in the \$3,000 bracket for these censors; is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: For censors, yes.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: And I also thought, I understood, that they were on a full-time basis. If that is so, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the hon. Minister does have a responsibility to tell this Legislature the qualifications that are expected.

These people determine whether or not these are suitable pictures to be shown to our youth, whether they are restricted or banned. This, then, becomes a matter of judgment on the part of the censors. I think the hon. member for Parkdale pointed out that this was a very serious matter, Mr. Chairman. Yet it seems that we are able to employ the people whose judgment has a profound effect on the entire population of Ontario for something in the \$3,000 to \$4,000 bracket.

I think it is a fair question to the hon. Minister to tell this Legislature just what qualifications are expected, because I know in other fields we have discussed the matter of getting adequate personnel and we have been led to believe that the matter of reimbursement was an important factor in getting qualified personnel. Just what are the qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The Civil Service Commission have the set qualifications for every civil servant that is employed by this government. I do not employ these people. I do not interview them. I may, if they want to come and see me, talk it over with them; but I have to send them through the Ontario Civil Service Commission. If they are qualified according to their arrangements then they

can properly apply for the position that is open. I have not got the qualifications in front of me.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Surely the hon. Minister in charge would know the qualifications that are required for this job which comes directly under his supervision?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: Well, I certainly call the Civil Service Commission and ask them what are the qualifications; but some of them are far over and above what I would require in the way of qualifications, I can tell you that.

Mr. Trotter: The hon. Minister still has not told us.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: What does the hon. member want to know?

Mr. Trotter: We want to know what are the qualifications for someone to sit on this board.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We have the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Trotter: The hon. Minister has a small group of people in this province deciding what films we are going to see and what we are not going to see. He can hardly tell us the names of the people who sit on that board. He now gets up and cannot even tell us the qualifications of the people who sit on the board. I think after all the years he has been in this office and this government has been over there, he should at least have a very good idea of who these people are who are telling us what we can see and what we cannot see. It is very important to the censorship in this province and in this country, and it is time that he got down to business and found out what was going on. It is typical of the administration.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I will be very glad to get the qualifications for the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I think the situation gets progressively worse. The hon. Minister now tells us that he leaves these qualifications up to the Civil Service Commission. Certainly this is a matter for which the government must bear responsibility directly.

They are setting up people who will tell us what we will look at and what we will not look at, and yet the hon. Minister who is in charge of the department does not even

know the qualifications and comes to this Legislature and tells the hon. members that this is a matter which is left to the Civil Service Commission. I say that it should not be, and that he is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: We have approved of the qualifications that the Civil Service Commission have before them.

An hon. member: What are they? What are the qualifications? Tell us.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: This is a matter of judgment now. It seems to me that if you are to assess the qualifications of these individuals who sit on the board you will want to know who they are, their background, and make some assessment as to what their judgment would be. It is impossible to say for a member of this board that he is going to have a Bachelor of Arts degree in such-and-such a course. What you would base your opinion on as to his ability would be the entire background of the individual.

In order to decide this I would think you would have to know who these people are, where they came from, their background, and then you would be able to express some opinion as to their judgment. I am quite sure we could supply you with a biography of each of these people and then you could make up your own minds as to whether you would think their judgment would be adequate to do this job. We will provide you with this biography.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I submit that perhaps we have been a little negligent in this. The hon. Minister has told this House that no films have been banned in the past year, and yet in the minds of many of the public there is a difference of opinion. I think this is the reason we are trying to establish whether or not these people are still qualified to do the job that they are being asked to do.

It seems to me, because of the fact that we have not been told anything about the qualifications, that this matter has not been reviewed by the appropriate department for a number of years. It seems to me had it been reviewed by the proper department, that the hon. Minister would have been able to give us a little bit more conclusive information than we have received this afternoon.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I notice in this government services sheet that you have occasionally laymen who assist the censorship board in deciding whether a film should be

banned or not. And as it says about these laymen, I suppose it is the same qualification as would apply to your board:

It is also worthy of note that these responsible laymen have evinced no prudish prejudices but have been very progressive in their views.

So I presume those are the qualifications—it does not say what progressive means, but I could imagine after being on the board and looking at some of the films that they have had to look at for 25 years they certainly must develop some sort of a prejudice, and I think in time that rather than become progressive they get regressive.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to find out if this is the department which grants licences, if this is the sub-branch that grants licences to moving picture theatres? Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. Singer: And the sub-branch grants licences to drive-in theatres?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: That is right.

Mr. Singer: Well now, what liaison does this department have, and Mr. Silverthorn have, with The Department of Highways insofar as granting licences to drive-in theatres?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: The licence granted to the drive-in theatre would only be granted after Highways has approved of the location of the drive-in theatre.

Mr. Singer: Well now, is the hon. Minister aware of a recent incident where a licence was granted and then a screen had to be removed and altered in position and there had to be some \$13,000—I think that was the figure—paid to the licensee because he had been put to a substantial expense apparently at the fault of the government because the government paid them some money? Can the hon. Minister tell us how that happened if the licence is issued only after The Department of Highways approves?

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: This was a matter for The Department of Highways. They had approved of it, as I understood, and the screen was there for showing but later the engineers of The Department of Highways decided that it was not properly located and asked for the change. But we would not have anything to do with that because our job is

really to license the theatre owner for the showing of films.

Mr. Singer: Well, the hon. Minister licenses the theatre owner for the showing of films. He gave this licence, and there was approval by The Department of Highways, and then something went wrong and there was a claim for damages which had to be settled. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there was a claim for damages. I think if the hon. member will wait until the estimates of The Department of Highways are presented, we may provide him with all the information in which he is interested.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want a clear undertaking from this hon. Minister whose estimates are before us, or from the hon. Minister of Highways, that either on these estimates or the Highways estimates this matter will be allowed to be discussed. I want it clearly understood that it is obvious now that the hon. Minister of this department cannot give us the information. And the word "may" was used by the hon. Minister of Highways and "may" is not good enough.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Chairman, the word "may" was not used in that sense. I do not have this information in my possession right now but it will be made available if the hon. member so desires.

Mr. Singer: At the time of the estimates of The Department of Highways?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. Let me say this, Mr. Chairman, if I may; I think I am correct in this. The hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity provides one licence but the permit for the location of the plant itself and its relationship to the highway, the distance from the highway, is the responsibility of the Minister of Highways. It is in connection with this permit that I think the hon. member is interested.

Mr. Singer: Well, this has been a bit of a *cause célèbre* and I would think the hon. Minister has some knowledge of it.

Hon. Mr. Cathcart: I am advised by our theatre people our licence was not issued until the screen was in the proper location.

Mr. Singer: Just so I will not get caught in between two departments—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2208 agreed to.

This completes the estimates of The Department of Travel and Publicity.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the financial critic for the New Democratic Party will speak on the

budget debate and we will proceed with some of the orders on the order papers. There are second readings and some bills I want to get into committee and then we will go on with the estimates of the hon. Provincial Secretary.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, I am sorry. May I make that motion that when this House adjourns it will stand adjourned until two o'clock in the afternoon, tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, February 13, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 13, 1963

Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	669
Children's Mental Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	669
Psychologists Registration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	669
Pesticides Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	669
Hospital Services Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	669
Private Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	669
Dental Technicians Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	669
Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. Bryden	672
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Boyer, agreed to	688
Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, continued, Mr. Yaremko	688
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	710

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1963

The House met at 2.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery and in the west gallery students from Dewson Street Public School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ADDICTION RESEARCH FOUNDATION ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CHILDREN'S MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Children's Mental Hospitals Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PSYCHOLOGISTS REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Psychologists Registration Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PESTICIDES ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Pesticides Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister care to give a brief explanation of the purposes of this bill?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The last bill, Mr. Speaker, is to hold the directors of a corporation personally liable for the payment of hospitalization insurance premiums which have been deducted from the wages of the corporation's employees but not submitted to the commission. This is in the case of corporations going into bankruptcy.

THE PRIVATE HOSPITALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Private Hospitals Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The purpose of these amendments is to give the commission better control over private hospitals than they have had in the past, to permit the hospital services commission to classify the hospitals in their proper sphere and to ascertain that the purchaser of a private hospital is considered a fit and proper person to operate a private hospital before the transaction is made. It also gives the commission the right and authority to provide for the withdrawal of a licence or the cancellation of a licence if in the opinion of the commission the hospital is not being operated according to minimal standards.

THE DENTAL TECHNICIANS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Dental Technicians Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to clear up a point that was questioned in law, that the governing board of the dental technicians have the right to hold real and personal property such as rental of office and laboratory space and also to provide for examination of persons applying for registration under the Act.

The last four bills will go to the committee.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, a day or two ago I was asked the following question by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald):

Last year following the report of the Langford committee problems relating to gas storage were referred for further study to the energy board. Has the energy board completed this study? If so, will this report be made public and an opportunity be provided for submissions and discussion before the standing committee on energy resources?

I am advised by the chairman with whom I have spoken that the board has not completed its studies but it is anticipated that in the course of the next two or three months the report will be completed and submitted, covering all matters which were referred to the board in April, 1962.

Since April, 1962 the board has held a number of hearings in the field with landowners and has held ten separate meetings with the gas and oil industry, including gas utilities, pipe line companies and the federation of agriculture. In the course of this study and investigation the board has received 17 briefs from interested persons, including gas utilities, pipe line companies, individual owners and the federation of agriculture. To supplement information obtained from sources in Ontario, the board visited a number of states in the United States in order to ascertain the latest gas storage developments and methods of dealing with storage payments and other related matters.

Later this month, on February 26 and 27 in fact, the board will sit in Sarnia as a board of arbitration to hear evidence and testimony with respect to the amount of payment to be made to landowners for residual gas in Dawn township pool No. 156. At a later date following this hearing, the board will hold a second hearing to receive representations regarding payments to be made to the landowners for the use of their land for the storage of natural gas.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that as of this date over 50 per cent of the

landowners, based on acreage, in the above-mentioned gas storage pool have signed agreements with the operating company for both payment of residual gas, that is to say, the native gas in the pool at the time the production ceased, as well as for storage rental. The agreed rates are two cents per thousand cubic feet for residual gas and \$7 per acre for storage rental.

I think the hon. member's question really also involved some discussion before the committee on energy resources and it has been the custom to have the chairman of the energy board there at that time and I think we can pursue it then.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I wish to deal with a question which was submitted to me by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer). His question is as follows: will the Minister of Labour assure this House that the influence of his department is being used to the full to assure a quick settlement in the Kapuskasing strike?

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course this question relates to the dispute at Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company, to which reference was made in the House on Monday of this week. May I say, sir, at this moment a chartered aircraft is on its way to Toronto carrying officials and officers of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union to a meeting which will take place in my office along with the appropriate representatives and officers of the company. The meeting is to take place the moment they arrive, I hope.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in calling this meeting is to bring them in direct negotiation aimed at terminating the grave and unhappy situation which prevails at Kapuskasing. I must say right now that at this stage I can only call these men to the bargaining table. In the final analysis, if this dispute is to be settled at the bargaining table, it can only be done by management and labour sitting down together in an atmosphere of common sense and co-operation and, further, with the intention of reaching a settlement. I am pleased to report to this House that both parties have willingly agreed to meet me this afternoon.

It will be obvious to everybody at this meeting that the continuance of this strike will bring hardship to every man, woman and child in the Kapuskasing-Long Lac area. It will also be obvious to both parties that they have a duty to settle this dispute immediately.

As for myself and The Department of Labour, we have been doing and will con-

tinue to do everything or anything in our power to facilitate the settlement of this dispute.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister of Labour a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: I am sure we all appreciate his efforts in trying to solve this. But has he given consideration to the potential danger involved in withdrawing from the community the leadership of the union, which may well be one of the necessary tempering forces in the situation, at a time when the police are going out to arrest some three or four hundred people, and the situation is exceedingly explosive?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, this matter was discussed with the responsible officials of the union this morning; and I would assume, and I do assume, that that would be a factor taken into account. It is of the utmost importance that efforts be made, for many reasons which are not before this House, to get these parties into direct negotiation. I simply say that in the realm of good business it does not need 10 or 15 people from either side to provide a responsible bargaining team.

Mr. MacDonald: But it does have to be the top leadership. And may I just say to the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It has to do with supplying people who are authorized to speak for the membership.

Mr. MacDonald: I might just say to the hon. Minister, so he will be fully aware of the fact, that the danger I am passing on to him now comes from the legal advisor of the union. He is exceedingly disturbed about the situation because the police are moving out, as of four o'clock this afternoon, with warrants to arrest 237 workers.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would like to comment on that. I think that whoever the legal advisor is to whom the hon. member refers he has a duty as a responsible lawyer and as an advisor to his client. If he had any such thoughts in his mind he should have reached me by telephone at once and directly.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, just so that what I said will not be lost and will be available for the record, may I say I shall communicate that to the lawyer immediately.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I think also that the very suggestion of the dangers which have been raised by the hon. member for York

South is hazardous in itself in being raised at this point in connection with my efforts right here. I tell him that.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this arose out of an answer to a question before the orders of the day. This is a very grave situation. I think we are all concerned with it, and for what it is worth I would like to put this question either to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) or to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts): In view of all of the people who have warrants issued for them, and the 19 people who are being charged with non-capital murder—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the members that in these questions and in supplementary questions arising from those questions, we are concerned with questions only. The member up to this point has been making a statement so I ask the member to ask his supplementary question.

Mr. Singer: Well, that is the question I am attempting to ask, Mr. Speaker. It may be that I am stretching the rules a bit, but it is not every day in this province that three people are killed and the police are seeking—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Singer: All right. My question is this—without any help from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, Mr. Speaker. My question is this: Are arrangements going to be made to provide reasonable legal defence for those people who are being arrested or who are being sought for arrest because of the very serious difficulties in which they find themselves?

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Well, Mr. Speaker, part of the answer to that has already arisen in the question before the orders of the day. It is quite apparent that there is legal counsel, not only available, but actively interested on behalf of the 237—

Mr. Singer: I am talking about the—

Hon. Mr. Cass: The hon. member included all of them.

—On behalf of the 237 for whom I am told on the floor of the House there are warrants out. With respect to the others I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that there will be procedure—I know there is, and I say to the

House there is—in due course, at the proper time, to provide these people with the necessary legal assistance if they are not in a position to provide it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, in rising for the fourth consecutive time to lead off for my party in this important debate, I would like first of all to extend my congratulations once again to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) on the competent, forthright, and business-like manner in which he presented the annual budget to this House. As he knows, and I think everyone else knows, I do not share his social, economic or political philosophy, but as I think he also knows, I have a great admiration and respect for his capacity and integrity; and I have no doubt that in that I am merely one of a very great multitude.

One would have thought that by now the hon. Provincial Treasurer would be bored to tears having to read the same old speech year after year, and I think a lesser man would have been.

But I will say for the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he never seems to lose his dignity, poise or geniality no matter how discouraging the circumstances may be under which he is labouring.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to extend my condolences to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) who unaccountably seems to have been demoted from his previous post of financial critic for the Liberal party. I must say that I do not quite understand the reasons for this demotion. As I recall it, the hon. member used to read the Liberal speech even more competently than his hon. leader (Mr. Wintermeyer) read it yesterday. It is true that occasionally he would stumble over a word, especially when the backroom boys slipped in a real tricky one, but at least it could be said for him that he never stumbled over entire paragraphs.

Before I turn to considering the budget presented to us by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I would like to make a few brief and, I hope, friendly and constructive comments about the Liberal speech as it was presented to us yesterday. As I heard it and as I checked reports on it, which are now avail-

able in the press, I came to the conclusion that the Liberals at Ottawa were not being as hypocritical as I at one time thought when they voted for a motion advocating debt-free money and other Social Credit nonsense.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): That was the day the NDP kept "Dief" in power.

Mr. Bryden: That was the day we refused to vote for debt-free money, the day the Liberals voted for debt-free money, so-called. I am beginning to think I was wrong when I assumed that they were hypocritical in doing that because, as I listened to the Liberal speech of yesterday, I have come to the conclusion that that is exactly the kind of nonsense they favour. We had presented to us in all seriousness by a responsible political leader in this province—

An hon. member: Does the hon. member not wish he had one?

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): We have one. We are proud of him, too.

Mr. Bryden: —a proposition that for a period of time—it would appear to be four years—a considerable amount of the services of this province should be financed by savings bonds with a four-year maturity. Now the context in which this was placed, as I understand it, was as follows: The hon. leader proposed that there should be a complete reallocation of responsibility as between the province and municipalities, and also a complete reorganization of the tax structure of the province and, I take it also, of the municipalities. This is a study that he, in the unlikely eventuality that he would ever head a government in this province, would undertake.

As he pointed out quite fairly, this would take a quite substantial period of time to complete. In the meantime, he proposed—I suppose he would continue to receive the tax revenues that are now coming in, but he would propose certain additional programmes and he proposed that those should be financed by savings bonds with a four-year maturity sold to the people of the province.

These savings bonds, he said, would be used to finance such programmes as a planned programme for university expansion. I would think that a bond issue might be appropriate for that sort of purpose. I think a bond issue with a four-year maturity would not quite be appropriate, but if it is a matter of capital expansion of facilities at the universities, then I should think that there is some sense in capital financing.

But then he also suggested that these same bonds should be used to finance such a thing as a new system of grants for education, which are clearly revenue items. Grants to school boards are paid out year by year; they are predictable, recurring expenditures. To suggest that that sort of thing should be financed by a bond issue, and a bond issue with a four-year maturity, moreover, is, to say the least, a very novel suggestion and in my opinion, a suggestion that is ridiculous to the point of irresponsibility.

It was also proposed that this bond issue should be used to finance, in the early stages, a medicare programme. Now you will realize, as I realize, Mr. Speaker, that it is very hard to know what the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) means when he says that, because he has had more medicare programmes in the last six months than one can keep up with.

I do not know exactly what his medicare programme is and I doubt very much if he knows. But, presumably, it is a programme that will involve some sort of expenditure of money and, furthermore, that expenditure would clearly be a predictable, recurring expenditure occurring year by year. To suggest that that should be financed by a bond issue is again, in my submission, ridiculous to the point of irresponsibility.

I put it to the hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that if he has, indeed, got a medicare programme, he will perpetuate a gross fraud on the people of this province unless he is prepared to come out and say, first, exactly what his medicare programme will cover, and how much it will cost on an annual basis, as far as it is humanly possible to predict these things; and second, exactly how he proposes to finance it. That, surely, is the basic requirement of responsibility in any situation. To use all sorts of weasel words in dealing with this matter is the height of irresponsibility.

The proposal which was placed before the Liberal policy conference of roughly a month ago was that the programme would be financed by a combination of premiums and what was delightfully described as a consumer tax—I think that was the word. Then it was said that the consumer tax was not a sales tax. This is getting into a very fine use of words, but if a consumer tax is not a sales tax, then I think the hon. leader of the Opposition has a responsibility to stand up and say what it is. I never heard of a consumer tax that was not a sales tax. It is a euphemism for sales tax. Perhaps the hon. leader of the Opposition thinks he can delude the people into thinking he is not going to

increase the sales tax, but that is exactly what he intends to do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Now he has further compounded the confusion by saying he is going to finance it by a bond issue. I would say that anything in the nature of a medicare programme should be established strictly on the basis of a fund into which specified revenues are paid to cover clearly anticipated costs. It should not, under any circumstances, be financed by borrowing, except, perhaps, in a case of some grave emergency where temporary borrowing may be needed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: You see, hyenas understand very little and this is very funny to them.

As far as the regular administration and financing of such a programme is concerned, and subject as we always have to be in this imperfect world to the possibility of an emergency, but subject only to that exception, a plan of this kind should be put on a solid financial basis with anticipated revenue going into a fund and being sufficient to cover anticipated expenditures.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Such as they have in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Bryden: Such as they have in Saskatchewan, exactly. That is the point. In Saskatchewan they do these things in a responsible manner.

Now then, the savings bond programme of the hon. leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, is, as I have said, to be for a four-year term. The reason he gave for having only a four-year maturity, which of course as we all know is a very short maturity for a bond issue, is that four years is the normal period in which a government holds office before it is required to go to the people again. I take it he anticipates that by the end of that four-year period—in fact I think this is what he said, in effect—his reorganization of the tax structure would be complete, and the various new programmes he envisaged would then be on a self-sustaining basis or on a basis through which they could be sustained out of ordinary revenue.

That is his proposal. It envisages, Mr. Speaker, that in the first year of the new era when we have revenues on a sound reorganized basis as the hon. Liberal leader described them, we will not only have as a charge on the public Treasury the expenditures for that year, but there will suddenly be

landed on the Treasury an accumulation of deficit expenditures for all the previous four years, because the bond issue will have matured on that date. So what is going to happen? Are the accumulated deficits going to be paid out of the revenues for that year, or what? The hon. leader of the Opposition was not clear.

I think there was a certain common sense, nevertheless, in his proposal that this bond issue should be related to the normal term of the government. Heaven knows, Mr. Speaker, if such a programme ever went into effect, if by any quirk of fate the hon. leader of the Opposition became the leader of the government in this province and was able to put that programme into effect, at the end of four years we would certainly have to call someone in to get us out of the mess that he got us into.

Mr. Singer: It is very nice of the hon. member to worry about what is going to happen at the end of our first term.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I usually try to avoid telling very old jokes, but I think in this particular situation I would be derelict in my duty if I did not once again tell the story of Christopher Columbus; when he set out he did not know where he was going, when he got there he did not know where he was, when he returned he did not know where he had been, and he did it all on borrowed money.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would point out at this stage that the budget debate is in its infancy—and every member will have a chance to speak. I am having difficulty realizing who is speaking at this time, so I would suggest that we recognize the speaker who has the floor and other speakers will have their opportunity later.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the one difference is that it did not take Christopher Columbus four years to do it, if I might say that confidentially—

Mr. Singer: Now to get down to the budget.

Mr. Bryden: Right! The hon. member should not get impatient.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Liberal leader referred to the necessity of reorganizing the tax structure of this province. That probably is necessary although I think sometimes it is much more easily said than done. I am not sure that we will do it by some gigantic effort, I suspect that it will be done better in the

good old British imperial way of making reforms as required and in relation to situations that exist. At any rate, reorganization and improvement of our tax structure is obviously always necessary and I would commend the suggestion of the hon. Liberal leader that it should be undertaken.

I must say, though, that the suggestion he made in his speech as to possible tax reforms gives me at least a cause for genuine alarm. I will agree that in this, as in everything, he is very vague. He goes around and around the circle, looking at an issue and never quite daring to move in on it. Still he did make a number of references to taxes that I think we should look at a little more carefully.

For one thing, he suggested—now he did not come right out and say it, but I think it is fair to say that he suggested—that the corporation tax should be reduced from 11 per cent to nine per cent, as far as the provincial levy is concerned. He certainly talked favourably about that sort of proposal and by implication criticized the government for not having undertaken that particular tax reform.

He also talked about a phrase that is becoming rather common nowadays, namely: “taxes related to services”. Now this is a very vague term. I wish the hon. leader of the Opposition would sometimes define his terms so we would know exactly what he is talking about, but if he is using it in the sense in which it is usually used and which I think it clearly means, then I think we should be fully aware of the implications of what he is driving at. We should not just allow him to get away with a nice little phrase that sounds innocent enough. The concept of taxes related to services is really just a form of soaking the poor.

Let us take a good simple example. Under that sort of philosophy of taxation a family making, shall we say, \$4,000 a year, with five children, would pay five times as much in education taxes as a family making \$20,000 a year with only one child. Now that is what it means, taxes related to services.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): It does not mean that at all.

Mr. Bryden: Well, if it does not mean that at all, it is high time you fellows got up and said what it does mean. But that is the normal meaning of the term, that you pay taxes in relation to the services you get. A family with five children at school gets five times as much educational service as a family with one child at school. This sort of concept is

now being put forward mainly by rich people, so that they can get the tax burden shifted from them to the poor.

I think we all have to be very much on our guard whenever the hon. Liberal leader talks about taxes. Let us remember that he was the fellow who introduced the idea of a sales tax. For a year and a half he stumped this province—and I have put it all on the record, I will not go into it again, but those who want to consult *Hansard* can find it all there on the record—he stumped this province advocating a sales tax for the province. He used weasel words again such as “education tax” and various other terms, but what he meant was the sales tax. Finally, he convinced the government and they brought in a three per cent sales tax. Then, suddenly, when he beheld the enormity of what he had done, he switched his position completely, and he voted for a motion we put on the order paper condemning the government for its sales tax and proposing alternative sources of revenue.

I must agree, Mr. Speaker, that he must have gone through hell while he made up his mind to vote for our amendment, because, as you will recall, sir, our amendment made him face up to the question of alternative sources of revenue. If he was against the sales tax, and he wanted to be against it, he was against the alternative sources of revenue too. He had an awful job making up his mind, but finally he did vote for our amendment. That is a matter of record.

Our position was set forth in our amendment. I commend it to you. It is the same now as it was then, and it was the same before the government brought in the tax. The position is set forth precisely in the amendment.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): We do not remember, you tell me.

Mr. Bryden: Then after this little episode in the House, the hon. Liberal leader switched his position once again. He decided that he wanted to be both for and against the sales tax at the same time. So he came out in favour of a proposition under which items such as, for example, costume jewellery would be exempt from the sales tax, but items such as building materials to go into people's homes would be subject to the sales tax.

That was the proposal he seriously put forward last year. His justification for putting it forward—I may say, in putting it forward he argued and I am not necessarily agreeing with his argument—but he argued that there

would be very little loss of revenue from his proposal. In other words, on his own submission, the burden on the people would be almost as heavy on his formula as under the government's formula. Apparently he was not concerned about the burden of taxes on the people or any unfairness of their incidence.

Mr. Sopha: You have heard about our budget.

Mr. Bryden: Sooner or later these fellows will run out of breath.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly grateful to the hon. gentleman on my right for giving me a chance periodically to get my breath.

As I was saying, with regard to the proposal of the hon. leader of the Opposition his concern with regard to the sales tax was with the pinpricks.

As long as people were protected from the pinpricks he did not care if somebody stuck a knife in them. He did not care how much money was extracted from them as long as they did not squeal very loud or at any rate, not very often. That is, apparently, his concern, with regard to the sales tax.

This I think, Mr. Speaker, is typical of the thinking of the Liberal party on all matters of taxation. Shift the burden from the rich to the poor.

Back fifty years and more there was a very great statesman in Britain who called himself a Liberal, although certainly he had nothing in his philosophy similar to that of the hon. gentleman to my right. He was Mr. Lloyd George. He introduced into his tax principles the concept of taxation according to the ability to pay, not according to services rendered or received.

I will say for this group, Mr. Speaker, subject to the modifications one always has to make in an imperfect world, that is the principle of taxation we believe in. We believe in a fair distribution of the cost of the services of the community. We believe that those who are most able to pay should pay the most.

That is the sort of principle that has been followed in the province of Saskatchewan as far as possible, within the limitations of a provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Sopha: That is why the sales tax is 6 per cent in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Whicher: Now we get the budget.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Bruce says: "Now we get the budget."

I assure him we do not get the budget from me; I thought we got it last Thursday from the hon. Provincial Treasurer but perhaps he was asleep then as he usually is.

I would like to turn to some comments on the budget because I would not like the hon. Provincial Treasurer to think I did not listen very carefully to what he said, and that I have not studied his budget statement since. I certainly would never be so discourteous to him as not to study his effort as carefully as I can.

Mr. Thomas: This is your effort, isn't it? No one wrote it for you?

Mr. Bryden: No, I am afraid I wrote most of this myself. It is clearly apparent that the Liberal spokesmen have not written theirs because they could not even read it.

For the past year or so, Mr. Speaker, Madison Avenue types in the employ of the Progressive-Conservative Party of Ontario have been grinding out a propaganda line that we now have in this province a new-look government, with new faces, new ideas and new energy.

One can agree with their admission that something new is sadly needed in Ontario, but the hollowness of their claim that they have found it in the present government was demonstrated by their recent efforts to drag the hoary old word "Tory" out of the mothballs and refurbish it with a new look. Their efforts have been signally unsuccessful. "Tory Night" in Toronto clearly marked the beginning of a very long night for the Tories in this area.

What is even more significant is the state of mind that would have produced this concept in the first place. It is quite clear that the present government and the Tory party in Ontario have given up their efforts to struggle out of the 19th century; they have slipped back into the 18th century—the period where moss-encrusted Toryism was in full flower.

This impression is confirmed by the budget, which is a Tory document if ever I saw one.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer, in his presentation, revealed a touching anxiety to convince the House and the public that actually the budget represents something new; but what is new about it? When one struggles through the avalanche of words to the few ideas buried beneath, one finds that the present government is in the same old rut that Conservative governments in this province have been in for the last 20 years. The

main difference between this budget and those of previous years is that it is bigger. Even that is nothing new.

A comparison of the budgets over the years reveals that they differ only in size. One could arrive at the budget of almost any year simply by taking the budget of the previous year and adjusting the figures upward. The same is true again this year.

To be fair, however, I should state that in this year's budget there are two variations from the budgets of a few years ago. First there are extended references to the MO programme—that Misguided Opportunism of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) who wants to run away from the modern trend towards expansion of world trade and to retreat to the self-defeating deflationary protectionism of the thirties.

The hon. Minister is not even consistent in this endeavour. Out of one side of his mouth he urges the people to reduce imports; out of the other side he is preaching the need for more exports. How it can be virtuous to export and sinful to import is a theological conundrum that I would not attempt to solve. The hippopotamus is a fitting symbol of the MO programme, for that animal is noted for its ugliness and stupidity.

The second variation in this year's budget actually made its first appearance last year. This is the frequent reference to planning, a word that hitherto had been quite foreign to the Tory vocabulary. So the government has been converted to planning. One could take heart from this remarkable phenomenon if the conversation represented anything more than lip service. But apart from a new-found familiarity with the word, what evidence of planning is there in the budget?

There isn't the slightest suggestion that the government is setting short-term, much less long-range, goals for either the economy as a whole or its own operations. There is no attempt whatever to forecast governmental requirements beyond the year, so that business and the community at large can adjust their own plans to the government's announced intentions. All we have is the same old patchwork quilt of expedients and devices to meet immediate emergencies without any attempt to view economic development and governmental activity within the framework of that development as a unified whole.

On page 24 of his budget statement, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Provincial Treasurer has referred to a plan which he said, and I am quoting: "was introduced by a 20-point

Ontario development programme headed by the establishment of the Ontario Economic Council." If we take the trouble to think back a year to the time when the so-called 20-point programme was announced, we will recall that it consisted mainly of a programme to set up committees to talk and study and ruminate. If the committees and the Ontario Economic Council have accomplished anything in the last year, and if they have reported their accomplishments to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, he should let the House and the public in on the secret. Planning does not consist of private little gabfests—or are they cocktail parties?—about which the public knows nothing.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer has claimed that one of the aims of the budget is to stimulate economic development and employment. It is far from clear, however, how this is to be done. Certainly there is no co-ordinated plan for the purpose. There are a few bits and pieces of unrelated policy, but what do they add up to? The hon. Minister of Economics and Development, apparently, will continue to go charging off in all directions on his white steed, and in addition there are some tax revisions. Now, that is all that I could see that had anything to do with economic development and employment.

No one would object to the proposed changes in The Succession Duty Act since they represent reforms that are long overdue, but they really have nothing to do with economic development. And as the hon. Provincial Treasurer stated himself, in his official press release, the changes in the retail sales Act are minor adjustments and mainly of an administrative character. The main change in the sales tax appears to be an appeal to the chocolate bar vote, or perhaps one should say to the two chocolate bar vote.

Unfortunately, the government has not seen fit to reduce the burden of this tax on the lower income groups. By doing so they could have given an important stimulus to demand and thus to production and employment. The government apparently is too short-sighted to recognize this basic economic fact. Therefore, the only tax changes that might conceivably have any effect on development and employment relate to the corporations tax.

Before examining these specific proposals in detail, I would like to make some general observations about reductions in corporations taxes as a method of stimulating growth and employment. For the past couple of years we have heard a great deal of propaganda from large corporations and their hirelings in the legal and accounting professions to the effect

that taxes on corporations ought to be reduced. Starting from the indisputable proposition that Canada is suffering from inadequate investment, this line of argument then proceeds to the quite fallacious claim that investment will be increased if corporations are permitted to retain more of their net earnings.

The hon. Liberal members of the House are particularly attracted by this fairy tale. Their solicitude for giant corporations is most touching, although greater solicitude for the fellow who is trying to bring up a family and buy a house on \$80 or \$90 a week might be more to the point. The hon. member for Sudbury, for example, Mr. Speaker, never fails to jump to his feet in protest whenever attention is called to the exorbitant profits and frequent anti-social behaviour of that great foreign monopoly, the International Nickel Company.

Mr. Speaker, the recently demoted financial critic, the hon. member for Bruce, has often put before this House the fatuous proposition that if a corporation enjoys a profit it has to give half of the net to government, but if it suffers a loss it has to bear the entire burden itself. Actually, as the rest of us know, a corporation suffering a loss in any year can charge that loss against profits in subsequent years, and if its losses are so great that it goes out of business it can, under the disgraceful bankruptcy laws of Canada, foist almost all of its losses on its creditors, who in turn charge them up against their profits.

In any case, this concern for the poor underprivileged corporations is badly misplaced. They have demonstrated that they are well able to take care of themselves. Overall profit figures for 1962 are not yet available, but preliminary indications are that this was probably a banner year.

To an important extent, recent high profits of corporations have been due to the devaluation of the dollar and the tariff surcharges of last spring and earlier. The devaluation of the dollar, of course, took place over a period of time culminating last spring when the tariff surcharges were also put into effect. These changes were designed to help the foreign exchange position of the country by giving producers a more favourable position in both the export and domestic markets. Whether they were the best devices to deal with the crisis in our balance of payments is a matter that does not need to be argued here.

What is of immediate interest is the fact that the corporations of Canada, most of them

foreign-controlled, blunted the effort of the government's measures by outrageous profiteering. Last spring the Canadian economy was faced with a desperate crisis, and this crisis continues and may very well flare up again, but the corporations about which our Liberal friends are so solicitous could not care less. Rather than co-operating with the government in whatever policies it might have, inadequate as they might be, to solve the crisis, they took advantage of the country's need, to make a few quick bucks for themselves.

For example, manufacturers in the cotton textile industry led by the giant Dominion Textiles, who have always been pampered pets of the Tory party, sent out notices to the trade on June 18 of last year announcing across-the-board increases in prices. It is significant that they selected June 18 as the date to send out this announcement.

We will all recall that that was the date of the last federal election. The textile firms were willing to scratch Mr. Diefenbaker's back to the extent of refraining from announcing their price increase during the election campaign. They were not, however, willing to wait even one day past the conclusion of the campaign. And when it came to helping the country by using devaluation and tariff surcharges to increase both foreign and domestic sales and thus increase production and employment, they were not willing to co-operate at all. It was much easier to increase prices.

This industry is now dominated by one giant. Ostensibly there are some other competitors but actually there is little real competition. Price lists for all firms are almost identical right up and down the line and price changes are usually announced simultaneously. It is time for the industry to be investigated under our anticombines legislation. Perhaps this will happen after the present federal government is turfed out of office in two months' time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: In regard to the *sotto voce* suggestions that the Liberals will take care of it, they were there for 27 years and did not take care of it, Mr. Speaker, so I doubt if the people will have much confidence in their claim that they will look after these things.

Many other instances —

An hon. member: What do you know?

Mr. Bryden: Many other instances of profiteering by industrial giants can be

gleaned from the financial pages of the *Toronto Globe and Mail* and other journals. For example, on August 14, 1962, the *Globe and Mail* reported that:

The devalued Canadian dollar combined with higher prices for nickel and a tax free three-year period for the Thompson, Manitoba, mine, gave the International Nickel Co. of Canada Ltd.—

Now I hope the hon. member for Sudbury will control himself for a moment; I am not going to say anything nasty about the International Nickel Company; I am just going to report facts.

Mr. Sopha: That will be a change.

Mr. Bryden: I continue:

The International Nickel Company of Canada Limited had a record profit in the first half of 1962.

Earnings of \$52,344,000 or \$1.77 a share were up by \$14,691,000 from the first half of 1961 when INCO had a net profit of \$37,653,000 or \$1.28 a share.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): How many men were employed?

Mr. Sopha: They sold part of their assets.

Mr. Bryden: That surely does not go into net profits.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I wish some of the hon. members would hire a few men before they talked. I do not think there is a man in the NDP group in this House who ever employed a man, or ran a business.

An hon. member: About 22,000 employed there.

Mr. Bryden: They had a big lay-off last fall after the highest profits they ever enjoyed in their history. They just throw the men out on the street, let them fend for themselves or be thrown on the community.

An hon. member: What do you want? Do you want to nationalize it?

An hon. member: Thrown on the unemployment insurance.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I would think that it is time that companies in this country, especially those making huge monopoly profits, should start to take some genuine responsibility for the people who provide service for them.

Mr. Sopha: Profit to you is sinful.

Mr. Bryden: They should not treat them as less important even than the machinery which they keep around and maintain. The workers are less than the machinery, they are expendable and can be thrown out at any time.

An hon. member: How true!

Mr. Bryden: Notwithstanding record profits!

Mr. Sopha: Are you charging that against INCO?

Mr. Bryden: I am charging that that is exactly what they did last fall. However, that is not the matter in which I am interested at this time.

I had hoped that the hon. member for Sudbury would be able to contain himself, but I guess it is too much to hope for whenever the hard facts are brought to the light of day with regard to the International Nickel Company.

Mr. Sopha: I want to be fair about it.

Mr. Bryden: More recently, on February 1 of this year, the *Globe and Mail* carried the following report:

The past year was the first since 1951 in which the value of the Canadian dollar was lower than that of the U.S. unit for the full 12 months.

As a result, investors are already finding that the 1962 annual reports of such firms [i.e. firms with predominantly U.S. markets] make unexpectedly good reading.

Prices of a wide range of commodities—from newsprint to gold—as well as some manufactured goods, are quoted in U.S. terms, despite their Canadian origin, since the customers are largely in the United States.

This means that as the Canadian dollar declined, the return to the Canadian exporter rose in direct proportion.

The added return is entirely profit—after income tax, that is—since it involves no added outlay in terms of equipment, raw materials, wages, selling expenses and the like.

Possibly typical of 1962 reports still to come is the recently published preliminary statement of Crown Zellerbach Canada Limited. On an increase of \$10,800,000 or 10 per cent in sales over 1961, last year's net profits rose by \$3,700,000 or 39.1 per cent.

The report then went on to mention that International Harvester Company of Canada

Limited enjoyed what was described as "a whopping 62.5 per cent jump in net profit, on a sales gain of 6.8 per cent."

With this amount of profiteering, major Canadian corporations should not need reductions in the corporation tax to give them money for investment purposes.

Actually, the problem is not that Canadian corporations lack funds for investment. Rather it is that they do not see any opportunities for profitable new investment.

They are already suffering from excess capacity. They can produce more than they can sell with their existing plant and equipment, and as long as that situation prevails they will not undertake any significant new investment, no matter how much money they have in their hands.

What is happening is that large companies are using the substantial funds available to them through retained earnings and depreciation allowances to extend their control further and further over the Canadian economy.

In an article entitled "The Giants Get Bigger" that appeared in the January, 1962 issue of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, it was reported that:

Canada's industrial production is slowly being concentrated into fewer and larger operations.

Through expansion of the more successful firms, mergers and growth in total demand—as well as inflation—the number of plants with annual production of \$1,000,000 or more increased from 1,442 in 1946 to 3,394 in 1959.

Even more significantly the proportion of total output produced in the big plants rose from 66.9 per cent in 1946 to 74.4 per cent in 1949; 79.7 per cent in 1955; and 81 per cent in 1959.

Eighty-one per cent of Canadian production now coming out of large operations.

To an extent, of course, this process is inevitable and even desirable. Under modern technology many production units have to be big to be efficient and Canada will not be able to compete effectively in the modern world if its industries are not efficient. To a degree, therefore, consolidation of productive units is to be encouraged, provided they are not allowed to gouge the domestic consumer behind the shelter of tariff walls.

To an important extent, however, the present concentration of industry in Canada is contributing little if anything to efficiency, and may even be detracting from efficiency.

Rather, it is an expression of lust for power by managers who are using corporation funds entrusted to them to extend their tentacles into as many sections of the economy as possible.

More and more companies are building empires for their managers by moving into areas quite unrelated to their original charters. Witness, for example, the following letter by Professor C. A. Ashley of the University of Toronto that appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of December 21, 1962. I am quoting Professor Ashley's letter in its entirety since it is quite brief.

An hon. member: Who is Professor Ashley?

Mr. Bryden: Professor Ashley, I suppose, is the outstanding authority in Canada on corporations.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: What business is he in? Did he learn it from practical experience?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Oh George, be quiet! You are out of your depth now.

Mr. Bryden: It is a pity that the hon. Minister has to make such a display of his ignorance by professing not to know Professor Ashley or know of him.

Here is the letter:

As a shareholder of a mining company, I am informed that the management proposes to amalgamate with a construction company. I gather that only the intervention of the Toronto Stock Exchange prevented this from taking place without the presentation of information to shareholders.

The Companies Act is too accommodating in its sections dealing with the objects of companies, but perhaps the time has come to test them in the courts, or revise them.

I make the shocking suggestion that if directors have on hand funds in excess of those required to carry out the objects for which the company was formed, these funds should be paid out to the shareholders, and that directors should not look around anxiously to find ways of keeping these funds under their control.

Continuing with my own words, the result of all this concentration about which I have been talking is that Canadian and Ontario industry is falling more and more under the control of a smaller and smaller group of powerful monopolists, who are really accountable to nobody. This makes for increasing

rigidity in our economy. Investment funds are often not available for new opportunities, because so large a portion of them are under the control of corporations that may be less interested in such opportunities than in extending their power by taking over existing enterprise.

A particularly unfortunate consequence of this process is that it has meant increasing American control of our economy. The retained earnings and depreciation allowance of Canadian subsidiaries of United States corporations have enabled them to buy out more and more Canadian companies. I would emphasize, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of buying-out of Canadian companies done by U.S.-controlled companies has been done with money earned in Canada by those subsidiaries. It does not represent foreign investment at all. They are using our money to buy us out.

This process was well advanced when the federal Liberal government was turned out of office in 1957. The present federal Prime Minister, when he was campaigning to defeat the then Liberal administration, promised that he would take steps to reverse this trend. Actually, it has continued apace under his administration, and we now have even more American control, and substantially more than we had when the Liberals were put out of office.

One does not have to be anti-American, or opposed to foreign investment to say that American control of our economy is one of the most important issues in Canada today. When American corporations control, as they do, more than half of our manufacturing, including almost all of the large concerns, and even larger percentages of other industries, it is time we began to consider where we are going, and even whether we are going to maintain any semblance of independence in this country.

A general reduction in corporation taxes as advocated by big business and the Liberal Party would have little or no effect in stimulating production and employment, but it would contribute mightily to the already well advanced trend towards monopolization of our industry and particularly to American control of that industry.

If we are really interested in increasing production and employment we should be looking to the causes of our difficulties. The basic cause is inadequate investment in new plant and equipment, and new capital equipment of every kind. This, however, does not arrive from any lack of investment funds in the hands of corporations. As I have already indicated, it arises from the fact that most

corporations can already produce more than they can sell.

There are two ways in which I suggest the current government can meet this problem, and I now talk of both the federal and provincial governments because, obviously, no one government by itself can adequately deal with this type of problem.

First, the governments could reduce taxes on lower income groups so they would be able to spend more money. More money, more spending, would create a greater demand for the products of industry, and they would provide greater incentive for industry to invest in new plant and equipment. Let us stimulate demand, let us put money into the pockets of people who can spend it. We can always count on it that the lower income groups will spend the money because they already have big backlogs of unfilled wants. Put money into their pockets so there is a demand for goods and then business will have an incentive to invest.

Secondly, the government could compensate for the lack of private investment by undertaking large-scale public investment. Unfortunately, the hon. Provincial Treasurer has not seen fit to adopt either of these devices in his current budget.

I will give him credit, however, for having resisted the strong pressure for a general reduction in corporation taxes. One of the main criticisms of the hon. Liberal leader yesterday was that the hon. Provincial Treasurer had not announced a general decrease in corporation taxes, but I would like to say that I commend him for having resisted what, undoubtedly, must have been very heavy pressure for such a reduction.

He has contented himself with adopting specific incentive measures in the corporation tax field. I will not deny that there is place for tax incentives, although I must say the particular incentive the hon. Provincial Treasurer has chosen, leaves much to be desired in my opinion.

Now, his proposal to increase allowance for scientific research will undoubtedly produce minor, though useful benefits, provided there is careful control to ensure the allowances apply only to genuine research and not to study methods of milking the public. Beyond that one very minor measure the measures proposed by the hon. Provincial Treasurer are of doubtful nature.

There is no justification whatever for his proposal to extend deductions for oil, gas and other mining companies. These are almost certain to result, in the main, in unmerited handouts to overstuffed American

corporations which certainly do not need any handouts, since they are right at the top of the profit list now.

His other two proposals are so vague that it is difficult to comment on them adequately. On the face of it, however, it would appear he is on the wrong track. The grant of tax credits—and I am now quoting him—"related firstly to increased employment, and secondly to increased production facilities," is a very blunt instrument that could produce many undesirable effects. A company that increased the employment of sweated labour could presumably claim benefits under this plan, although I doubt if even the present government would consider that to be desirable. Even less desirable, the plan could easily encourage the development of essentially uneconomic types of production that are propped up by tax concessions, just as uneconomic production has been propped up in this country in the past by tariff protection. This is on a par with the MO campaign of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, which seems to be concerned with promoting any kind of two-bit production whether it is economically viable or not.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Little jealous, aren't you? Jealousy will get you no place.

Mr. Thomas: Is that not awful coming from a responsible Minister, a statement like that?

Mr. Bryden: Canada is facing an increasingly tough competitive situation in the world. Our industry cannot survive even in the domestic market if it dissipates its energy in producing small quantities of everything under the sun. We have to select the fields of production where we can be most efficient and then concentrate our energies in those fields. The problem of selection is difficult, but it is a basic responsibility of government in co-operation with industry to face up to it. Regrettably, the present Ontario government does not even recognize the problem exists.

This brings me back to the question of planning. The government should be setting goals for the provincial economy. These goals should take into account not only the aggregate increases in output we want to achieve but also the kinds of production that are most likely to achieve them.

Having set its goal, the government should work closely with industry, labour and other interested groups in realizing them. What evidence, Mr. Speaker, is there in the present provincial budget that the government is even thinking in terms of goals, much less speaking about them? I would defy anyone

to show me one sentence that shows they are thinking along those lines at all, notwithstanding their frequent use of the word planning.

Within the framework of planning, tax incentives can be a useful, though by no means all-important, device in achieving agreed-upon goals, but, I believe that a tax incentive has a very much secondary role to play. Within a framework of genuine planning they can be useful in inducing people to act in a manner that will be in accordance with the plan, but I would suggest that the kinds of tax incentives that should be used should be much more selective and specific than those proposed by the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

I will give a few examples. One could discuss this, I suppose, for a long time and argue about various types of devices. But just to illustrate what I am talking about, I would like to give a few examples of the kind of incentives that I think could profitably be used within the framework of an overall trend.

First, they could be used in conjunction with other forms of encouragement to produce the kind of specialization that we urgently need.

We have just talked about the need for specialization and I think we have to do everything possible to encourage it, and I think tax incentives could be used in that area.

Second, they could help to level out seasonal production. This proposal was first put forward in this House two or three years ago by a private member on the government side, the hon. member for London South (Mr. White). But the government apparently does not listen to constructive suggestions even when they come from within its own ranks.

Third, I would suggest that tax incentives could be combined with direct assistance of various kinds to encourage decentralization of industry. The under-development of many areas of this province is a crying scandal and a condemnation of the present government.

And fourth, Mr. Speaker, I have suggested in this House before and I repeat, that corporation taxes should be increased on undistributed profits and decreased even to the vanishing point on distributed profits, that is, profits paid out to the shareholders. This will encourage corporations to disgorge their excess profits. It will thereby help to slow down the trend towards monopolization and American control of our economy. It will also

make for greater flexibility since investment decisions will be made by a much larger number of people.

If we can get some of these undistributed earnings out of the hands of the corporations into the hands of the shareholders then we will have a large number of people making investment decisions, and I would be amazed if the people opposite would not agree that is a good thing, it makes for much greater flexibility. Shareholders will make their decisions in relation to their judgment of what is profitable, rather than in relation to some struggle for power by a manager of the corporation.

Having said all this, I would emphasize again that tax incentives by themselves are of little value in encouraging production and employment. They are useful mainly as one of many instruments in an economic plan.

I will admit that planning cannot be fully effective if it is undertaken by a single province, even a province the size of Ontario. Federal leadership is desperately needed, and, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, at the present time we really do not even have a government at the federal level in Canada. Probably this situation will be rectified after April 8. In the meantime, the Ontario government should carry on by itself.

Manifestly, however, it is not prepared to carry on. It talks manfully about planning but the budget reveals that it has no plan. I would commend to it the following paragraphs taken from an address made on August 16, 1962, by R. M. Fowler. For the benefit of the hon. Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker, I will state that Mr. Fowler is the president of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association and the address from which I am quoting was given by him at the Mount Allison 1962 Summer Institute.

I am going to quote several paragraphs from Mr. Fowler because I think they are very much worthy of consideration. In fact, I have been contemplating going down to sign Mr. Fowler up in the New Democratic Party because what he has set before us here harmonizes entirely with the thinking of the New Democratic Party and it is quite at odds with the thinking of any other political party in Canada. However, here is what he said:

Until now we have had only two choices of economic models. One was the totalitarian model which, for us, was unthinkable. The other was the American model of individualistic and unrestrictedly competitive free enterprise. We have struggled to achieve the same level of affluence as

we see just across the border, and by the same methods and system.

I wonder if this pursuit of the American economic dream makes any real sense for Canada. At least, I wonder if there is any sense in our attempting to do it by the same exuberant and often wasteful methods that the United States can perhaps afford. After all, despite our relative wealth and great resources, we, too, are an undeveloped country. Our population is inadequate, our distances and, therefore, our costs are high, our climate adds costs ranging from more expensive buildings to withstand winter conditions to the largely unavoidable seasonal variations in employment. We probably cannot succeed by following the American model in achieving anything like their results. And if we do continue to adopt American techniques we will become an undistinguishable adjunct of the United States.

Europe now offers us a third choice of economic model. It is the choice of a free, but planned economy—

Notice the use of the words "planned economy", Mr. Speaker. It is curious, the development of semantics in this country. A few years ago businessmen would see red if you talked about planning, and I may say adherents of the Liberal and Conservative parties, when we dared talk about planning, immediately accused us of totalitarianism and many other evil things, but now they are all saying, "We believe in planning, all right, but we don't believe in a planned economy." Now, planning means a planned economy, and I am happy to see that Mr. Fowler is not so befuddled by words that he does not come right out and say it. He said we have the choice of a free, but planned economy:

To adapt it to Canada will require profound changes—

profound changes:

—in our economic system, our attitudes and our laws. We must, first of all, accept the fact that economic planning to help guide the economy towards a more rapid rate of growth is a respectable and desirable enterprise in which to be engaged. And does not in any sense run counter to our democratic or parliamentary system. We must enlist in the planning, the co-operation of government, labour and business as the Europeans have done. And we will probably have to throw off the tyranny of words and phrases, such as 'government interference', 'undue limitation of competition which is the right of everyone', and perhaps the darling of them all, 'free en-

terprise'—although I hasten to add, not 'private enterprise'.

A very important distinction which has been made in the programme of the New Democratic Party but not in any other programmes that I have noticed.

Something like the European economic model, appropriately adapted to Canada, may offer the best chance of restoring rapid economic growth in this country. It may also give us the best chance of achieving a distinctive national identity.

In the same Telstar broadcast with which I began, an American speaker quoted Abraham Lincoln. The words apply to Canada today as she faces a rapidly changing world: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present—so we must think anew."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to one or two specific subjects which are dealt with in the budget, but I would like to deal with them in a somewhat more intensive way.

Earlier in my remarks I suggested that one important way to compensate for inadequate private investment at the present time is through large-scale public investment. The budget, of course, envisages a considerable amount of public investment, mainly in highways. But it is little more than a continuation of programmes that have been carried on for years. What we need is a bold, new approach to this whole subject. We have not even begun to meet the requirements of our province and municipalities for social capital. Always, in the past, these requirements have been near the bottom of the priority list. Social capital has usually been provided only when we have been faced with real emergencies and rarely because it was desirable in itself. It is time we started to catch up on the large backlog of need for such capital.

In doing so we would not only serve valuable social purposes, but we would also give a real stimulus to our economy, and in particular we would cut into the hard core of employment that now plagues us. It is manifestly impossible for me to try to enumerate here the long list of projects that need doing in this province and the municipalities. I think, however, it is appropriate at this time to take note of one project that is particularly urgent, and that is the Metropolitan Toronto subway system.

Mr. Speaker, in case anyone may think that I was precipitated into making these particular remarks by an editorial that appeared in yesterday's Toronto *Daily Star*, I would like

to read into the record a short letter that I sent off to the *Star* last night.

In an editorial of February 12—The Silence at Queen's Park—you allege that Toronto MPPs on both government and Opposition sides 'seem meekly to accept' the fact that 'the provincial government still does not contribute a nickel to subway construction costs in this area'. I will not purport to speak for others, but I will state categorically that your charge is completely unfounded as applied to myself.

I first raised the question of provincial subsidization of the Toronto subway even before I was elected to the Legislature, during the election campaign of 1959. Since then I have dealt with it repeatedly both inside and outside the Legislature, and I placed a resolution on the subject on the order paper in the 1960-61 session.

I have also tried to raise the matter in its broader context of a co-ordinated transportation policy for Metro Toronto, with proper sharing of costs by all levels of government. I placed a resolution on that subject on the order paper in the 1961-62 session.

Before your latest editorial appeared, I had already prepared material for use in my speech in the budget debate on February 13, urging the government to pay grants for subway construction on exactly the same basis as now applies to expressway construction.

I will concede that, to date, I have been as unsuccessful as you in penetrating the obstinacy of the provincial government on this important issue. This, however, has not been due to any lack of effort or 'meek acceptance' of the government's untenable position.

An hon. member: Did they print it?

Mr. Bryden: I just sent it last night but I have no doubt they will print it. I believe the *Toronto Daily Star*, like other newspapers, is always interested in clearing up misunderstandings and in correcting injustices. It certainly was most unfair for them to imply that every single member of this House from the Toronto area had failed to advocate and fight for subsidies for the Toronto subway. Speaking for myself I have been working on that for a very long time.

Every year since I have been a member of this House, Mr. Speaker, the city of Toronto has requested the government to subsidize subway construction on the same basis as it subsidizes the construction of roads and expressways, and every year their request has

been greeted with stony silence. Once again the request has come forward this year, under cover of a letter from the city clerk dated February 6, 1963, which was sent to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and all local MPPs.

Is this request again to be ignored or rejected out of hand? If so, the government stands condemned for its failure to face up to the challenges of the modern world. Truly, the word "Tory" is a fitting description of it.

Everybody knows that transportation has become a problem of major proportions in Metro Toronto. The municipality simply cannot handle it by itself. It needs assistance—substance assistance—from the province.

Moreover, it is in the province's own interests to give that assistance. Metro Toronto is its biggest single source of revenue. If development in this area continues to be choked by inadequate transportation, provincial revenues are bound to suffer and we will all be poorer in the long run.

The provincial government now provides 50 per cent of the cost of construction of expressways and other arterial roads, but it pays nothing for rapid transit. Almost every recognized expert agrees that, though there is a need for both expressways and rapid transit in proper balance, the latter is by far the more efficient way of providing mass transportation in a metropolitan area.

Present government policy inevitably gives undue emphasis to expressway construction, which should be regarded as ancillary rather than as the major means of solving Toronto's transportation problem. This is a most short-sighted policy that will cost the government money in the long run. If the municipality is thereby induced to give preference to expressways over rapid transit, the total charge on the provincial Treasury over the years will be much larger than it ought to be and the transportation system in Toronto will be much less efficient than it ought to be.

A couple of years ago, when faced with an overwhelming demand that could not be ignored, the government made one small concession. I use the word "small" advisedly, Mr. Speaker. It agreed to make a loan of \$60 million—a loan, that is, and not a grant—to help speed up construction of the east-west subway. Since then it has followed its customary practice of announcing the same loan several times, so as to create the illusion that it is actually doing something. But, in fact, it is only a loan and not a very big one at that in relation to the magnitude of the task being undertaken.

If the government had faced up to the realities of the situation several years ago and had placed construction of rapid transit on the same footing as expressway construction, the east-west subway in Toronto could now be completed and in operation. The municipality could now be moving on to other projects that are long overdue, such as the extension of both the east-west and north-south lines and the construction of new lines so as to form a fully integrated transportation system.

If this had happened, assessment in the city of Toronto proper would now be increasing instead of declining, and the city's serious financial problems would be alleviated.

Those of us who sit on the Opposition side for Toronto and Metro constituencies have to suffer under a most undesirable practice that has grown up over the past number of years, Mr. Speaker. Periodically we read in the press that the Toronto or Metro Toronto MPPs, as the case may be, have met and assented to government inaction and lack of vision with regard to some urgent problem in this area. Only recently there was such an announcement, to the effect that the Toronto MPPs had gone along with the customary negative attitude of the government towards certain proposals put forward by Mayor Summerville.

Now, without going into the merits of Mayor Summerville's proposals, I would like to make it clear that I, as one MPP in the city of Toronto, was not a party to the decision announced in the press. I did not even hear of the meeting that took place until after I had read of its negative results. I doubt very much if the hon. members for Bracondale (Mr. Gould), Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson) or Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) heard of it either. Now, I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, by what special form of Tory arrogance do the Progressive-Conservative members in this area presume to speak for all the members in the area?

A year or so ago an advance announcement was carried by both press and radio of a meeting of Metro Toronto MPPs which was to be held to consider a matter of vital concern to the area. I immediately announced that, since I was a Metro MPP, I considered it my duty to attend this meeting.

It was then announced that the meeting was not really to be a meeting of MPPs in the area. Rather it was to be a caucus of the Conservative members. This modification, I would point out, was not contained in the original announcement; it was added

only after it became known that I was coming along to the meeting to inject some life into the wake. I did, in fact, go along, and I received, shall we say, a somewhat rude reception.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): You were lucky to get out.

Mr. Bryden: I was able to get out. It was a rather rude reception. They sat there all afternoon and did nothing. That much I know, even though they threw me out. I presume that is what all these meetings are like, although this was the only one I even got close to.

Of course, on this occasion the press was looking over the transoms, and listening at the door, and everything else, so we had fuller reports on this one than most of them.

Mr. Sopha: Was it in the liquor commissioner's office?

Mr. Bryden: No, it was held just along the hall there. If the Tory members for this area want to have periodic meetings at which they tamely acquiesce in the government's refusal to give justice to this area, let them do so. But let them also have the courtesy to make it clear that they are not speaking for all MPPs in the area. Rather they are giving expression to Tory "negative-ism" and inertia, with which I for one would not care to be associated under any circumstances.

It would be better if for once they would speak up for the area they have the honour to represent. I am not suggesting any special privileges for Toronto or Metro Toronto, but I think it is high time the present policy of discrimination against this area came to an end. Nowhere is this discrimination more apparent than in the government's refusal to subsidize rapid transit on the same basis as highways.

I would appeal to private members from this area on the government side to take advantage of what may very well be their last opportunity to stand up in this House during this session and put the case for the Toronto subway squarely before this obdurate government. The logic of the case is unassailable. I feel that they, the Toronto members, are convinced of the justice of this case. Therefore, why should they not be men instead of mice, and speak their minds?

Mr. Speaker, in the concluding portion of my remarks I would like to deal briefly with another important area of public investment that has long been neglected in this province.

I refer to housing. Year after year the government has announced great plans it has had in mind in the housing field, and year after year next to nothing has ever come of them.

The government has been content to create an illusion of activity by announcing the same plans and projects over and over again, and then proceeding with them on only a very limited basis, or not at all. "Housing by headlines" was the designation I applied to this process last year, and in doing that I was quoting a comment made several years ago by Controller William Dennison of Toronto when he was a member of this House. The comment, Mr. Speaker, is as applicable today as when Dennison first made it.

Last year the government announced a 12-point programme which it describes as a "bold new approach to housing". This in itself is nothing new, as the government has been announcing bold new approaches to housing and housing programmes with varying numbers of points for as long as anybody can remember, and nothing ever came of them.

We were assured, however, that this time things would be different. Why? Because the new 12-point programme was to be entrusted to the energetic hon. Minister of Economics and Development and he would make the welkin ring.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he made the welkin ring all right, but that is a pretty poor substitute for housing. He has deluged us with announcements, and public relations blurbs, and productions such as the pamphlet entitled "The New Plan", a flossy effort that is strong on eye appeal and short on content.

So, at last, Mr. Speaker, the sad story of continuing inadequacy comes out in the hon. Provincial Treasurer's budget statement of last Thursday.

Last year this House voted a little over \$1 million on current account and \$5.6 million on capital account for housing, making a total of somewhat less than \$7 million. Considering the size of the housing problem this is a pitifully small amount out of a budget of more than \$1 billion.

But now it appears that not even this inadequate amount was actually spent. The tables attached to the budget statement are not sufficiently detailed to indicate how much was spent on housing on current account, or how much is being spent in the current fiscal year. But in any case the current account side is the less significant item. In the all-important capital account, table A-4 of the budget statement indicates that on the basis of nine months actual and three months fore-

cast only \$1,945,000 will be spent in the current fiscal year out of the \$5.6 million voted by the Legislature to the government in the last session.

In other words, about one-third of the inadequate amount of money voted will actually be spent. From this I think it can reasonably be concluded that the government's bold new housing programme is running on two cylinders.

The hon. Minister has contented himself with carrying on the technique perfected by the former Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost), of announcing the same thing over and over again. He has nibbled away at the fringes of the problem instead of getting on with the job.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer was able to refer to only two specific developments in this field in the current fiscal year. The first was the subsidization of the landlords of 114 rental units under the so-called rent certificate plan. This is certainly a plan to subsidize landlords. Why does not the hon. Minister let them bring their rents down instead of subsidizing them so they can keep them up? This was one thing—114 rental units have been made available so far this year under the rent certificate plan.

The second development referred to by the hon. Provincial Treasurer was the grant of \$5 million to reduce rentals in the Moss Park project where rents would otherwise be too high because of the federal government's insistence that this and other new projects should be limited dividend rather than low rental projects.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer, of course, has talked at some length about what the government will be doing in the coming year. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development has done the same at even greater length, Mr. Speaker. The list of projects is not actually very impressive even if it is carried out in full, which, on the basis of the government's past record, is a matter of considerable doubt. At least one of the projects, the Thistle town project, has been announced by this government every year for about ten years. It now has been announced again, naturally in terms of the total amount of money that will be spent over a long period of years. This creates the illusion, of course, that the money is to be spent this year, even though only a small fraction of that amount will be spent in the coming year.

Last year, I provided figures to the House showing that year after year in the past the government has spent less, usually very much

less, on housing than the amount voted to it. Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition produced similar figures yesterday. As I indicated a few moments ago, the budget statement shows that exactly the same thing is happening again during the current fiscal year.

The only conclusion one can draw from this is that the government is not serious enough about housing to take the trouble even to work out reasonably accurate estimates of what its requirements are likely to be in each fiscal year as it comes up. It pulls any old figure out of the hat so that it will have something to present to the House, and then it proceeds in its usual bumbling way to do very little about anything. It is interesting to note that the figure that it has pulled out of the hat for the coming fiscal year is even smaller than the one for the current year. The amount to be voted for capital expenditure for 1963-1964 is only \$4.3 million or only 75 per cent of the \$5.6 million voted for this year. It is hard to believe that the government plans to slow down on housing or that it is even possible for it to go any slower than at present without going backwards, but that seems to be what the figures indicate.

There is a tremendous need for low-rental housing, slum clearance, urban redevelopment and renewal, and yet the government is simply playing with the problem. Its little game means tragedy and misery for thousands of residents of the province and it helps to perpetuate the blight and decay that disgrace all of our cities.

Mr. Speaker, I could present to this House, and I am sure other hon. members could, many cases of real hardship for citizens of this province because of inadequacy in housing conditions. In fact a group of clergymen conducted a survey just a few months ago and brought to light many cases of real hardship in the city of Toronto. When I asked the hon. Minister of Economics and Development what he planned to do about this situation, he did what he always does: he got up and announced a whole lot more projects with much gobbledygook, but actually did nothing about the problem.

I would like to mention just one case—and I will not take a particularly harrowing case, I will take one I think is more or less typical of a great many with which I have to deal—of what is happening because of our lack of housing facilities. In this particular case it is lack of sufficient facilities for senior citizens. It is the case of a lady who lives in my constituency, who applied on October 23,

1960, for a senior citizens' apartment in the city. That is more than two years ago.

She lives at the present time—she does not have any immediate family left in this area, or at any rate, I do not know of any, but I have not gone into all the details of her personal life since it is none of my business. But there is a family in my constituency which has been kind enough to rent her a room at a reasonable rent and she is able to live there. But obviously that sort of arrangement has its drawbacks, both for the family who is renting the accommodation and for the old lady herself. In her particular case it has the further drawback that the house is on the side of a hill and she happens to suffer from a heart condition, so that she is rarely able to get out. She cannot very often take the hill because of her health.

Now then, she applied for a senior citizen's apartment, which would be an ideal solution for her. For about two years she heard nothing at all. Then it was proposed to her that some time during this year, perhaps about summer time of this year, 1963, she would be able to get into an apartment for a single senior citizen out in Scarborough.

This really does not meet her requirements because she has to report regularly to the hospital for check-ups because of her heart condition. She reports to the East General Hospital and if she goes out to Scarborough she will be in a two car fare area and two car tickets are a lot for a person on her income. She does not feel she can afford it.

Furthermore, the rental for this apartment, since it is under one of these limited dividend projects, is \$47 a month. The old age pension is \$65 a month and she gets a welfare supplement of \$20 a month, I think it is, making a total income for her of \$85 a month. Manifestly, she cannot pay a rent of \$47 a month out of an income of \$85 a month. That is more than half her total income, and her total income is very small. So the offer that has been made to her is really quite unsuitable. She said she is interested just to keep it open, it has not been specifically offered to her yet, it has just been offered as something in the future. But there she is, really, unable to get suitable and adequate accommodation for which she can afford to pay.

I took this case up with the commissioner of housing and welfare of Metro Toronto, a man who is very co-operative and very anxious to help people who are in need. I try to bother him as little as possible, but it seemed to me that this lady had a very strong case and I put it to him. Why, I asked, can you

not put her into one of the projects right within the city limits, which are low-rental projects? The rents are lower, and she would not have the problem of extra car fare.

He put before me facts that one could not escape from: that as far as the projects within the city are concerned, they have a waiting list from here to the middle of kingdom come, and in addition there is practically no chance of a person who is single or widowed getting into any of them.

Why? Because in projects of that kind the mortality rate is naturally fairly high. When there is a couple living in a suite for a couple and one of them dies, then surely they cannot throw the other one out on the street. The surviving member of that couple is put into a single person's unit. The commissioner said that all such units are taken up in that way and it is totally impossible for a single person from outside to get into one of the Toronto units.

I must say I was left without an argument. Within the limited terms of reference under which he had to operate I certainly could not suggest that he should do anything different from what he is doing.

But why Mr. Speaker, should the commissioner of welfare and housing and other similar officials in other municipalities have to operate within that disgracefully limited kind of term of reference? Why should they be restricted in that way? Why should they have to turn down perfectly worthy cases of this kind? They have had to turn them down and they are turning them down by the hundreds because this government has preferred to talk about housing rather than doing something about it.

The New Democratic Party, in the provincial programme it adopted last October, proposed that over a period of years the province should build up a capital fund of \$100 million for housing and redevelopment in all its ramifications. To the extent that this fund is used for purposes which qualify for federal assistance, it could be multiplied by four, making a total fund of less than \$400 million, no doubt, but considerably more than \$100 million.

This, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of dynamic approach that is needed to lick the housing and redevelopment problem in this province. Toronto and other Ontario cities are lagging far behind comparable U.S. cities in redevelopment mainly because of lack of leadership by the higher levels of government.

No doubt the faint-hearted Tories opposite will ask where \$100 million will come from

even over a period of years. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that it will be an investment that will pay for itself many times over, not only in terms of human happiness and well-being, but also in increased assessment and wealth-producing capacity in our cities.

In any case, since most of it will be invested in revenue-producing assets, it will not result in any significant increase in the net debt of the province. The money invested will be paid back in time by revenues from the assets in which it is invested.

That is good planning, good sense and good business. It will make for a good community and a good society. Why should we let the faint hearts hold us back any longer?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to say that I wish very much to move an amendment to the rather unimaginative amendment presented to the House yesterday. I would like to inject some real life into it. But as you know, Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House do not permit me to do that.

I have studied the amendment and I have noted that in contrast with the speech which preceded it, it does not include any Social Credit nonsense or gobbledygook, it is inherently an expression, a rather lame expression but an expression of no confidence in the government. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that this group is prepared to support any expression of no confidence in the government opposite.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not listen to that, you will learn something.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Twentieth order, House in committee of supply. Mr. H. J. Price in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1701:

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Chairman, I cannot ascribe motives to the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) with respect to the remarks he made when these estimates were being last considered, but

certainly I think that the by-product of his remarks must have pleased him exceedingly. A by-product, Mr. Chairman, of headlines in the newspapers of what I call nasty, loaded words, such words as "illegal," "collusion," "illegal proceedings," "shady," "illegal proceedings," "shady practices." I can practically see him as he is now doing gloating over those words—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I am not gloating. I am just ready to get back into the battle.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I entered this House prepared to devote my life and my career to establishing programmes for the benefit of the people of this province.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): It is about time you started.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I tell you that I was not prepared for either academically or by experience to mud-slinging and smearing.

Mr. MacDonald: You should have listened to your side of the House, you would hear it all the time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have never done it, but I will tell you I will do my best to meet the smears that you have cast, that appear in these papers.

Mr. MacDonald: We have been called "swine" and everything by your side. Why do you not sit down?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Under our system of democracy, we who enter this Legislature are given, indeed endowed, with certain privileges, the privileges to voice and be repeated and the privileges to be heard. That is why these words appear, because under our democratic institutions you have the right, you are elevated. But I tell you that our system elevates certain men who do not deserve to get out of that proverbial gutter.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear. We are looking at some of them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member made remarks on racing. The granting of orders of revivor of corporate powers is a very highly technical procedure in The Department of the Provincial Secretary. It is therefore necessary that I explain in some detail the technical proceedings involved.

The word "charter", Mr. Chairman, in respect of racing associations and other types of associations is misunderstood by many

people in that they think that it is like a licence. It is not. It is a document evidencing the existence of a body corporate, that is a legal person in which people have interests like any other corporation. Loblaw's operates under a charter, the Toronto *Telegram* operates under a charter, Eaton's—all of these corporations operate under Ontario charters.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): They do not. They do not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They certainly do.

Mr. Sopha: They do not. They are under letters patent.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Letters patent and charters are the same thing.

Mr. Sopha: They are not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member can do us a big favour by not giving us any misinformation.

Mr. Sopha: They are not. You never speak of a social club operating under letters patent.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You certainly do.

Mr. Sopha: They operate under a charter.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I issue letters patent.

Mr. Sopha: Nonsense! You do not even know the law.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You do not even—you do not take the time out to read the law.

Mr. Sopha: I know the law.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You were reading the law the other day and you had the words in front of you and could not understand them.

Mr. Sopha: Indeed! You are one of Her Majesty's counsel.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, and you graduated from Osgoode Hall, too, and to me it has been a wonder ever since that you did.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I did not graduate from Osgoode Hall; I am a graduate of the University of Toronto law school.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: So am I. And it is a good law school.

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not deal with the issue?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will get to the issue.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, control of the shares of these racing associations means control associations just like the control of the shares of any other corporation means control of that corporation.

Many racing associations which were very often associated with towns and villages, and of which there were a goodly number before the turn of the century, discontinued activities a long time ago because of lack of interest and certain restrictions on activities. Accordingly, the powers of these corporations were forfeited under the former Companies Act, for under that Act it was provided that if a corporation—and that includes a racing corporation—did not use its corporate powers for two consecutive years such powers were automatically forfeited. And I stress, Mr. Chairman, for the knowledge of the hon. members of the House that the forfeiture was only of the corporate powers, not of the corporate existence; that is, the corporation still remained alive but without the right to exercise its powers.

I was trying to think of a comparison to explain to the hon. members of the House and the nearest I can get is that it is comparable to a man who has been incapacitated by a stroke. He is alive but completely disabled from doing anything such as talking, walking and the like.

Mr. Sopha: Who wrote that nonsense?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I did, and it's not nonsense.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: What you have just read us is legal nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: All you have to do is read the Act. I suggest to the hon. member that he take the next three minutes and read some of these sections.

Now the shares of such a corporation, Mr. Chairman, which is still alive and in existence as a legal body would still be outstanding and they could be held either by the original people or by others who had subsequently acquired them by inheritance or other legal transfer. These shares can be transferred from one person to another, they go from father to son, from one to an heir at law the same as any other shares of any other corporation.

A corporation which had racing as one of its objects could not, however, return to doing so—because of its corporate powers

having been forfeited—unless and until an order was obtained from the Provincial Secretary reviving not the existence of the corporation, but the corporate powers of this corporation. And section 325 of The Corporations Act provides; that where the powers of a corporation have been forfeited automatically by the former Companies Act the Lieutenant-Governor, who acts through the Provincial Secretary, on the application of the corporation, may by order, on such terms and conditions as he sees fit to impose, revive the corporate powers.

Mr. MacDonald: What are those terms?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Apart from this section, neither The Corporations Act nor the regulations thereunder set out any other requirements that must be complied with before the Provincial Secretary may make an order reviving corporate powers. The requirements are that a corporation apply therefor and pay the prescribed fee.

The policy of the department, however, is that before it will make an order of revivor the application therefor must be authorized by a resolution passed at a meeting of the shareholders duly called for that purpose, that is requirement not by the statute but by the department.

Under The Corporations Act in order to call any meeting of shareholders a corporation must give not less than ten days' individual notice to every shareholder of record to his last address as shown on the books of the corporation setting out the time and place for the holding of the meeting and the general nature of the business to be transacted at the meeting.

In addition, the department requires that the corporation file all arrears of annual returns to date and pay the filing fee therefor. The department also requires the payment to the Treasury Department of all arrears of corporation taxes.

On October 27, 1961, the Provincial Secretary, by orders under section 325 of The Corporations Act, revived the corporate powers of certain corporations. Mr. Chairman, the interesting thing about the Department of the Provincial Secretary is that almost every action, every legal action, taken by him is public information. I am interested in the way the hon. member for York South comes into this House and says he is going to document something. That is he has got documents he is going to do something with, for the benefit of the hon. members. Every order issued by the Provincial Secretary is published in the *Ontario Gazette* which I trust every

hon. member of this House reads, and especially the hon. members of the Opposition. They will see that for every corporation whose powers were revived the order was published in the *Ontario Gazette* as required by The Corporations Act. Then you can go down to the first floor and you can get a public file, and in that public file you can see every document in relationship to the applications under The Corporations Act. They are open to every member of the public. You can see the documents filed, you can see the names of the people involved in all of them. It is an open book, Mr. Chairman.

On October 27, the corporate powers of these were revived:

The Grimsby Driving Park and Athletic Association Limited.

The Grimsby Recreation Company Limited.

The Osnabrook Racing and Driving Association Limited.

The Ottawa Valley Driving Club Limited.

The Renfrew Trotting and Driving Association Limited.

The Tillsonburg Driving Park Association Limited.

The Williamston Driving Park Association.

Before these orders were made it was established by the department, as I said the other day, Mr. Chairman, by affidavit evidence and otherwise, that all the requirements, both of the statute and of the departmental policy set out above had been complied with. The deputy minister and the director of companies checked the final processing of these applications to ensure that the legal departmental requirements had been meticulously complied with, and discussed the same with me in detail.

Section 325 to which I referred provides that the Provincial Secretary may impose conditions in reviving the corporate powers of a corporation. Before the above revivors were made, in order to make provision that a racing charter would be made available to local organizations—and I pause here for a moment, Mr. Chairman. The hon. members opposite, the hon. members in the Opposition for a number of years brought pressure to bear on this government to introduce night harness racing.

I remember that the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes) made an impassioned plea on behalf of the people of the province. He did and he was listened to. His words were wise and they were acceptable. What was the

concern of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher)? That hon. member's concern was that there be no monopoly, that the present organization generally referred to as the Ontario Jockey Club which had more than half of the racing charters outstanding in the province of Ontario under its control should not get a monopoly. That was the hon. member's concern. He wanted no more extension of this monopoly. And I tell you that he was assured by the Provincial Treasurer that no such monopoly would attain.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): What happened to the American gangsters?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the remarks at that time were made that the situation would be dealt with when the situation was clarified. The situation became clarified and then it was dealt with. But as to the hon. members, I recall, their concern was not only for race tracks but they were also concerned with fall fair associations. Now this is one of the conditions I imposed: Before the revivors were made in order to make provision that a racing charter would be made available to local organizations that conduct racing meets, the department required the Renfrew Trotting and Driving Association Limited to file an undertaking that the said company would make available its charter for the conduct of race meetings in eastern Ontario at a nominal fee of \$15 per racing day. I tell you that when I imposed that condition I thought to myself: "How much autocratic power are you taking onto yourself?" I speak to the lawyer-members in this House and opposite—if you came with an application on behalf of a client and I said: "Fine, I will do this, but the province is going to take away some of your interest, because we are going to make you use those interests—which are private interests—for the general public interest."

How would you react? But I determined that was a condition that should be met in order to assure that there be these charters available for racing at fall fairs across this province of Ontario. That was one of the conditions that was imposed.

It is my understanding that these charters that were revived, Mr. Chairman, were to be used for racing days in relationship to the Ottawa Valley.

On September 4, 1962, the Provincial Secretary made orders reviving the corporate powers of the following corporations:

The Almonte Park Driving Association Limited.

The Amherstburg Driving Park Association Limited.

The Clinton Driving Park Association Limited.

The Deseronto Driving Park Association Limited.

The Picton Driving Park Association Limited.

The Preston Driving Park Association Limited.

The Stratford Athletic Company Limited.

Now in addition to requiring each of these corporations to comply with the statutory and departmental requirements set out above—because we were reviewing these continuously—the department required each corporation to give ten days' notice of its application to the department in a newspaper published at the place where the head office of the corporation was situated. The notice in some cases they had to repeat because they published it in the wrong newspapers. This notice was of course in addition to ten days' individual notice of the meeting of the shareholders that was to be given to every shareholder of record. The reason for requiring newspaper notice in addition to individual notice to shareholders was that in many of these cases the records of the corporation are far from complete and that is obvious from an examination of the files. Accordingly the corporation might not be able to determine with certainty that its records did in fact show the correct names and addresses of each of its shareholders.

As these corporations which were incorporated were of a local nature, to carry out local undertakings, the department was of the view that if there were any persons who were shareholders of the company and because their names and present addresses did not appear on the records of the corporation, they did not receive individual notice of a meeting, a notice published in a local newspaper would bring the matter to their attention.

Mr. Chairman, I took also another position. I took the position that although the interests held in these associations were private interests—interests as in any corporation, they were interests as in the case I would assume for the hon. member for Bruce who operates his dairy company under a limited company wherein he owns the shares, so those are privately held shares, and these are exactly the same—I took one step further though. I took a step in view of the fact that these corporations had been incorporated from a

local point of view, that the other purpose of publishing newspaper notices would be general notice not only to the shareholders but to the people in the area, and if they had any objection they could bring it to my attention.

The only objection I ever had in all of these transactions came in respect of Chesley, I forget the name—The Chesley Driving Park. The hon. member for Bruce brought it to my attention indirectly. I think that the local people up there did not want either a revivor or moving out of the area and I told the applicant that I would not take any step whatsoever in that regard, and no step in the Chesley matter has been taken to this date. That is the only case where any community ever made representations to me in respect of revivors.

The other thing I interject, Mr. Chairman, is that because these are private interests that all we do is revive the corporate powers of these associations, and if there are any interests outstanding, if anybody has shares in those associations, they are still outstanding today. It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that these were to be for the Windsor area. As a condition of reviving the corporate powers of these seven corporations the department also required and obtained an undertaking from The Clinton Driving Park Association Limited with respect to Western Ontario, similar to the one from the Renfrew Trotting and Driving Association. I took a line north from Toronto, and east from that line was to be covered by the extra charter I referred to earlier. I impose this same obligation on these applicants of the Clinton Driving Park Association with respect to western Ontario.

On September 12, 1962, an order was made reviving the corporate powers—and this has been public knowledge as all of it has been printed in the *Ontario Gazette*, which every hon. member of this House I assume gets free of charge and, I assume reads—of the Brussels Driving Park Association Limited. On October 5, 1962, an order was made reviving the corporate powers of the Stratford Exhibition and Athletic Company Limited. In each of these two cases, before the order was made, it was established to the department by affidavit and other evidence that the statutory and departmental requirements set out above had been complied with.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask a question? How many charters did you revive in this connection? Secondly, were all these charters issued before March 20, 1912?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A total of 21 have been revived. I believe all were issued prior to 1912. The statutory departmental requirements set out above had been complied with. These included not only the requirement of the department that not less than ten days' individual notice of meeting be given to every shareholder of record but also that ten days' notice of the application be given in a newspaper published at a place where each of the corporations had its head office. On December 5, 1962, the Provincial Secretary made orders reviving corporate powers of the following corporations:

The Blackstone Hunt Club Limited.

The Hamilton Trotting and Racing Association Limited.

The Mayfair Turf Club Limited.

The Penetanguishene Driving and Athletic Park.

Incidentally, these first two, Brussels and Stratford are, I believe, to be used in conjunction with the London association on London fairgrounds. I am not familiar with the area. To continue:

The Blackstone Hunt Club Limited.

The Hamilton Trotting and Racing Association Limited.

The Mayfair Turf Club Limited.

The Penetanguishene Driving and Athletic Park Limited.

The Preston Springs Racing Association.

In each case, before the order was made, it was established by the department, by affidavit evidence and otherwise, that the statutory and departmental requirements set out above had been complied with.

Mr. Chairman, every application for revivor, with the exception of the Chesley was granted, regardless from whom they came.

Mr. Chairman, I did not know a single individual, to my knowledge, that participated in these applications, outside of knowing, by reputation, the hon. Earl Rowe. Not a single person was known to me. There are a very large number of people involved, when you examine each one of these applications. There are people who are the descendants of the original members. I say without qualification, everyone who applied got it; regardless of who or what they were.

I never questioned for a moment. My concern was that the application be carried out in accordance with the statute and departmental practice. Many of the applicants chafed under the restrictions and what

they thought was delay. But we made them go through the procedures as set down until every "i" had been dotted and every "t" had been crossed from the department's point of view.

Mr. Chairman, I also bring the attention of the hon. members of the House to this: it is the Provincial Secretary's office that revives the corporate powers. We deal with the corporate structures of these associations as we deal with all corporations. It is the Racing Commission that finally allocates the number of days to be used in conjunction with race tracks.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you again that every one of these some 21 applications, orders for revivor, every application that had been applied for, had been granted. Notice had been published in the *Ontario Gazette* and the corporate file downstairs is open to public inspection and the names of all the people who applied, all the people involved, the solicitors, as of the date of those records, are on record there and can be looked at.

Now, **Mr. Chairman,** I am going to have to examine in some detail the remarks of the hon. member for York South and I tell you if I am a professional in a certain line, there is a man who is a professional with the use of what I call dirty, nasty, loaded words.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, deal with the substance of it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am going to deal with them, and as part of the substance very nasty words. He does not call a man a thief, but by the time he gets through using words, there is not a person in the House that does not believe the man is one. He has the greatest talent for this I have ever seen in public life of any man. I tell you if he is prepared to come into Bellwoods riding to fight on that campaign he is perfectly welcome to. I will deal with your remarks in this House. It comes in a "solidly documented form." Oh, by golly this is something he is really pulling from under the rug.

All he has to do is look in the *Ontario Gazette*, and look in the office downstairs. All of this information is known to everybody in the province of Ontario. I have discussed this procedure with several members of the press in the past year and a half, and with members of the radio, at some length, and in some detail.

Mr. Chairman, the use of words is a very neat—and I want the hon. members to listen to this, **Mr. Chairman**—a very neat technique. There is a very neat technique in deception. I tell you, this must take a lot of practice.

Of course, he has had it. The hon. member was quoting the *Ottawa Citizen*, referring to some remarks attributed to Magistrate Bigelow. Now listen to this Mr. Chairman, you would be surprised at the difference a word makes. This is what the hon. member for York South said:

The conditions upon which such an order might be issued would include proof that the stockholders in the particular club or association still existed and that those stockholders had agreed to have the corporate body revived.

Now, is there any member of this House, who, when he heard this remark, did not believe that the people who got the letters patent, the charter originally, had to be alive? He said "the stockholders". One little word, because what Magistrate Bigelow really said was exactly the same with the exception of one word. He said:

The conditions upon which such an order might be issued would include proof that stockholders in the particular club or association still existed.

Mr. MacDonald: The stockholders. I am quoting from *Hansard*, and you can find it on page 21 of—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is what he said. You said the stockholders. That is right. You said you were quoting the *Ottawa Citizen*. You misquoted it, it was a deception. Yes, a comma sometimes is important. You led the House to think that "the stockholders," the original stockholders, had to be alive. They do not have to be alive, it could be any stockholders. There are corporations that go back 250 years in this country, and in the United States. None of the original stockholders are alive but the corporation still continues, interests being passed on from generation to generation. You deliberately left that word out, and it is a very important word. You are a great one at building mountains out of molehills.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, is it parliamentary to point—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One misquotation, and one very important thing.

Now, the hon. member went into the question of the Grimsby Recreation Company Limited. Mr. Chairman, I have to go into some detail, he mixes up these nasty, dirty words, it is difficult to—

Mr. MacDonald: Go ahead and deal with it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will deal with the issues and I am dealing with the hon. member too.

Mr. Chairman, I will give you the details of the Grimsby Recreation Company Limited, because it was one of the associations into which the hon. member went.

The Grimsby Recreation Company Limited was incorporated under The Ontario Companies Act by letters patent dated November 14, 1911.

The original applicants who by virtue thereof became the first shareholders and the first directors of the company were James Orlan Livingston, William Franklin Randolph, James Murray Lawrie, Frederick James Shephard and Norman Richard Sutherland. These names appear in the application for incorporation on file in the department, which application also includes a memorandum of agreement and stock book, signed by each of these persons and dated October 31, 1911.

In this story book Mr. Livingston subscribed for \$500 worth of shares, or in other words five shares as the shares were \$100 each; Mr. Randolph subscribed for \$200; Mr. Lawrie for \$200; Mr. Sutherland for \$300 and Mr. Shephard for \$200.

Mr. Chairman, when the letters patent were issued, these five persons automatically became shareholders of the company, holding the number of shares for which they had agreed to subscribe. By virtue of the statute, they became shareholders even though in fact no share certificates may ever have been issued to them.

I was interested in *Hansard*, as corrected by the hon. member. The words were, he said:

And I have information now, and I have every reason to believe that it is accurate that there were no share certificates distributed at all.

The words, "and I have information now" were stricken out. They are edited out of *Hansard*. I would like to know what information he has that no share certificates were issued.

But, Mr. Chairman, the point is this, that it does not make any difference.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But you see what happens if you use that tone of voice and say, "You know, there were no shares issued." It does not make a darn bit of difference whether they were or they were not, those

people still became shareholders in the corporation. The hon. member was trying to weave a big air of mystery, "no shares were issued." What difference does it make that no shares were issued?

Mr. MacDonald: There is nothing to pass on after some of these people died.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There is always an interest to pass on. I hope all the hon. members interested in harness racing will bear with me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member—I say that he made a big issue, he was talking about the fact that letters were sent to three gentlemen getting on in years, about the filing of annual returns. And this is the great point made in the session last year—the great conspiracy, the great collusion. Mr. Chairman, he said:

Now, the first question—I want to put this to the hon. Minister—is, can he give any explanation as to why out of the blue from this department a letter comes to a very elderly gentleman which said in effect—

As if there were some plot. I am sure the hon. members of this House thought there must have been something there, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MacDonald: It has taken the hon. Minister ten months to explain it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You know, Mr. Chairman, it is amazing the way the hon. members of the Opposition behave. I am dealing with it. The hon. member watches every expression on my face, I cannot even sit on a thumb tack without him noticing.

Mr. Chairman, this "plot" and—I suggest to you this is the very basis of the hon. member's remarks for some "collusion", which is the charge, an irresponsible charge.

Mr. Chairman, under the laws of this province corporations are required to file annual returns. They are required to file annual returns whether the corporate powers have been forfeited or not. If they are existing, if they are alive, as I say to you that these corporations were, they must continue to file annual returns.

Now we are aware that in the province of Ontario there are a great many dormant corporations and the department set out quite a number of years ago—and I will detail this at greater length on another occasion—to cancel for failure to file annual returns. That is one of the powers that the Provincial Secretary has, to cancel for failure to file annual returns.

Mr. MacDonald: Why did the hon. Provincial Secretary not cancel them long ago then?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the department set out on a policy of weeding out all these dormant charters and cancelling them. The department was working backwards dealing with the present corporations on the files and then dealing with those that have been transferred to the inactive files. Mr. Chairman, in the last 12 years, there have been some 20,000 corporations cancelled for failure to file annual returns. One third of those, some 7,000, have been cancelled in the last two years.

Mr. Chairman, on or about October 25, 1929, the file of the above corporation, that is the Grimsby Recreation Company Limited, was transferred to the dormant files for failure to file annual returns under the file number transfer TC8660.

For the past several years it has been the practice of the cancellation office to cancel dormant charters where the files have been merely transferred to inactive records, but where the corporate existence had not been terminated. The processing of these files is being carried out in certain numerical series.

On or about the first week of December, 1960, following the established practice, the cancellation office was pulling dormant corporations for cancellation purposes, in the transfer series 6000 to 9500 series containing the file number TC8660, namely, the file of The Grimsby Recreation Company Limited. In other words, this particular charter was not drawn purposely or given any preference over the others, but in the usual course of office routine the corporation was pulled for cancellation purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me here the departmental record, the proof copy of the notice of default to appear in the *Ontario Gazette*, which was finally gazetted on March 25, 1961, where are listed the corporations. The notice reads as follows:

Pursuant to Section 326(2) of The Corporations Act, notice is hereby given that the undermentioned corporations incorporated by letters patent are in default for a period of three years in filing their annual returns under The Corporations Information Act or a predecessor thereof.

The dates of incorporation and years of default in filing annual returns are as follows:

And then here are listed alphabetically the corporations involved with the file numbers, all of which are between this series that I

referred to—6000 to 9500—which were being dealt with by the department at that time. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House to file this, because I will not read it in detail. (See Appendix.) It will show all the dates of these corporations. It ranges from A-1 Investments Limited incorporated on March 26, 1912 for the dates of incorporation are all listed down here. It is a clear indication we were dealing with corporations at that time.

One of the corporations, one of what I would imagine to be at least a hundred if not more, was the Grimsby Recreation Company Limited. It was being dealt with in the process of cancellation exactly the same as every other corporation which we were dealing with at that time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under the statute—I am glad to see the hon. member for Sudbury is finally getting around to reading the statute—under the statute—

Mr. Sopha: What section are you referring to?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Section 326(2) of The Corporations Act. Under the section a notice of default must be sent by registered mail to each director of record in the office of the Provincial Secretary to his last address shown on the records of the department before the cancellation of the charter is instituted.

Mr. Sopha: That is not what the section says.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On March 15, 1961, registered letters giving notice of default were forwarded to the last known directors of record, namely:

J. M. Lawrie, Grimsby, Ontario

W. F. Randall, Grimsby, Ontario.

J. A. Livingston, Grimsby, Ontario

and to the corporation in care of G. B. Conachie, Barrister, Grimsby, Ontario. Subsequently, as I said, on March 25, 1961, the notice of default was published in the *Ontario Gazette* in compliance with the provisions of Section 326(2) of The Corporations Act.

Mr. Chairman, this tremendous "collusion" was part of the normal procedure and the hon. member for Sudbury does not like the fact that I go into detail. This is what you call real documentation because I am wiping out the very basis of those charges in this House last year.

Mr. Sopha: Now, just a moment, we have not got that list in front of us. How far does that list go, is it alphabetical?

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe it is like the 1400 pages you took to the Roach commission.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, from A to W.

Mr. Sopha: What is the date?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The date is March 25, 1961.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you. I will cross examine you in a moment.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the letter. The letter required is the procedure that is set out in the Act and regardless whether it is a corporation in default for three years, say since 1958, to be dealt with now or one in default all those years, The Corporations Act requires the same notice to be given. One of the fundamental principles is that you do not wipe out something without giving notice. And that is something which the other side, the Opposition, never can understand: that if you are going to do something to somebody the very least you can do is give him notice of that. The Corporations Act requires that and it was carried out. That is the notice and "can he give any explanation as to why out of the blue"—"out of the blue"—those sinister words—and it was a part of normal procedure required by the Act.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now, after dealing with Mr. Livingston, who I assume—I do not know I do not check into these things—was the son of the original, the hon. member for York South said this: "All of the original directors, all of the original shareholders are dead."

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South made that statement in this House. Again, as if it had some significance, he made the statement that they are all dead. I ask him, who is Mr. Lawrie? Who is Mr. Lawrie who received the notice, who is the Mr. Lawrie that signed on the back of all the returns?

Mr. MacDonald: Was Mr. Lawrie at the meeting?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now you got up and led this House to believe—

Mr. MacDonald: James Lawrie is dead. Was he one of the men—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Now, just a minute, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South deceived this House by saying that the

shareholder was dead, now I tell you—did you or did you not say he was dead? I give the hon. member an opportunity to say.

Mr. MacDonald: Is Lawrie dead?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Is Lawrie dead?

Mr. MacDonald: Was he there at the original—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Answer my question.

Mr. MacDonald: I will answer your question if you will clarify a point. Are you saying this James Lawrie was one of the original incorporators?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am asking you who the James Lawrie is.

Mr. MacDonald: I am asking you.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You said he was dead, you should know.

Mr. MacDonald: I will tell you this, he was not one of the original incorporators.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: In fact I think James Lawrie was the youngest of the group and he was not one of the original incorporators; furthermore no meeting was held, that you are talking about and you accepted an affidavit that it was held. No meeting was held and you are hiding behind this false affidavit.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member referred to—

An hon. member: How long is this speech?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Long enough to satisfy the House and the public.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, you did not satisfy the Roach Commission.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Do you want me to make a speech on the Roach Commission? I yield the floor to you.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I will deal with that at the appropriate time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: So will I. **Mr. Chairman,** the hon. member said this: Early in April of 1961—as I quoted the records and I am quoting him; and it is to be found when he refers to last April, he said this:

For those who want to refresh their mind on the whole fascinating detail of this thing—

He can pick words:

Take notice that a meeting of shareholders of the Grimsby Driving Park and Athletic Association shall be held at 26 Ontario Street, Grimsby, Ontario, on Saturday, the 15th day of April, 1961, at the hour of 10.30 o'clock.

May I repeat, **Mr. Chairman,** there was no shareholder alive, they had all died!

How do you know there were no shareholders of this company alive? How do you know?

Mr. MacDonald: Because some investigation has been made.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The original shareholders do not have to be alive, and that is what you lead this House to believe.

Mr. MacDonald: Have you evidence of legal transfer of shares?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is not the responsibility of the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. MacDonald: Have you evidence of legal transfer of the shares?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is not the responsibility of the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. MacDonald: Is it not! You accept a false statement that there was a legal transfer; do you accept false statements?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: **Mr. Chairman,** the hon. member gets up and starts saying things about 'false statements'; he will have to get up and prove that they are false.

Mr. MacDonald: **Mr. Chairman,** a few moments ago the Provincial Secretary got up and said that there must be a legal transfer. I am asking him, has he any evidence as to the legal transfer of the shares from the original holders to those who allegedly met?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: **Mr. Chairman,** the law is that there can be a legal transfer from father to son and unto the seventh generation and it is not the responsibility of the Provincial Secretary to check the chain of transmission of share certificates. There are 70,000 corporations—

Mr. MacDonald: This is even more loose and shady than I thought then.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There are 70,000 corporations in the province of Ontario. There are hundreds of millions of shares being transferred, transmitted every year. Do you expect the Provincial Secretary, would this

House expect the Provincial Secretary, to check them all? If you do, vote several millions of dollars for an investigative staff and we will take over all the registry offices, all the surrogate court offices of this province to check into these things.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, do not wink at affidavits, because you are falsifying the situation then.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: You are getting anxious. Do not get too anxious.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not getting anxious.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: So, Mr. Chairman, I am quoting the hon. member. And on the draft I have, which he corrected, he said; "Mr. MacDonald: So this meeting was held." Okay, Mr. Chairman, the meeting was held.

Mr. MacDonald: Which meeting?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The meeting of the 15th day of April, 1961.

Mr. MacDonald: In the Grimsby case?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am quoting you—the Grimsby Driving Park and Athletic Association.

Mr. MacDonald: Where are you quoting from?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am quoting from a transcript of *Hansard*.

Mr. MacDonald: Last spring or yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yesterday, the day before, whatever it is; the day before: "So this meeting was held," and about 15 lines later, he says: "Mr. Chairman, no such meeting was held."

You say on one page it was held and on another page you said it was not held.

Mr. MacDonald: According to the affidavit in your file, which you have accepted, it was held but I state it was not held.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, no. But that is not what you say in *Hansard*; that is not what you said in the House.

Mr. MacDonald: That is right. There was no meeting held. That is the fact I want to get across to you.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Grimsby Park file shows—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is public record, available to anybody in the House.

An hon. member: We have all looked at these many times.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, yesterday I was reprimanded for taking them out of the Public Office. Have you the right to do it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am the Minister in charge.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, you have the right and nobody else has? Is that right? You can take them out and nobody else?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am the Minister in charge and a member of the department is watching me.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right? You mean to say a member of the Legislature cannot take them out and you can? Two sets of laws in this House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Copies were made of these files.

Mr. MacDonald: Then why don't you get copies of it made so that the file can be left for other people who might want to see it?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The copies were made for you.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They were busy making copies—a copy of everything that was—

Mr. MacDonald: Done for somebody else who wants it, because lots of other people are interested.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They were so busy making copies for you that they did not have time to make copies for the Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, in relation to the Grimsby Recreation Company Limited, there is an affidavit on file signed by Raymond Bury, referring to the meeting of the Grimsby Recreation Company Limited and I read the affidavit, Mr. Chairman:

I, Raymond Bury of the city of Toronto, in the county of York, esquire, make oath and say that:

1. I am the vice-president of the Grimsby Recreation Company Limited and as such have a knowledge of the matters herein deposed to.

2. At a meeting of the directors of the said company held at the town of Grimsby on the 4th day of April, 1961, the special resolution, a certified copy of which is hereto annexed and marked as exhibit A was duly passed.

3. The said special resolution was confirmed by at least two-thirds of the votes cast at a general meeting of the shareholders of the said company held in the town of Grimsby on the 15th day of April, 1961, duly called for that purpose. A certified copy of an abstract from the meetings from such meeting of the shareholders is annexed hereto and marked as exhibit B.

4. Notice calling the said meeting of the shareholders was mailed to all the shareholders of record of the said company on the 4th day of April, 1961, pursuant to The Corporations Act since the by-laws of the company cannot be located.

5. Annexed hereto and marked as exhibit C is a true and correct copy of the said notice.

Mr. MacDonald: Who is that signed by?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Raymond Bury.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to inform the hon. Minister that one of the people who allegedly was at that meeting says that there was no meeting held. In other words, the affidavit is a false affidavit.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, there is the affidavit. In the course of a year the Provincial Secretary's department deals with 10,000 applications of one kind or another, in which there is affidavit evidence. Last year, at least the year immediately preceding 1961, the department processed 90,000 documents. Mr. Chairman, it is not required by law or anywhere that the Provincial Secretary check into the accuracy of every affidavit, or any affidavit, that is filed in the department.

Mr. MacDonald: Even when the hon. Minister is informed that it is false?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have never been informed that this affidavit has been false.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am informing the hon. Minister now.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member has evidence which is contrary to the facts stated in this affidavit, he is at liberty, the same as any other citizen of this province, to go and prefer charges in respect to this individual.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): What is the responsibility of the hon. Provincial Secretary?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have no knowledge that they are false, except what the hon. member for York South says, and I will not take his word for it. I will not take it.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister had taken my word for it a year ago, he would not be investigating it now; but he would have found out.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the words were used that these gentlemen had been "deposed". Deposed—what a harsh word. Can you imagine these three elderly gentlemen being deposed? Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Secretary is not required to check into the transmission of shares from one individual to another.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister said that.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes. And the hon. member for York Centre knows, if the share has not been properly transferred from A to B, if B has not got legal title to it in a legal form, who is still the owner, and going to be the beneficiary.

Mr. Singer: Surely the hon. Minister has a responsibility when there is a complaint made to investigate, and he did not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There has never been a complaint. There has never been a complaint made to this department at any time.

Mr. MacDonald: I have made complaints in this House time and again, and if it suits the political purpose of the hon. Minister he will not look at it. That is the problem he is now facing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, now we are back to another herring.

Mr. MacDonald: Now he refuses to investigate—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am clearing up all this nonsense, all these charges, that the hon. member has talked about.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is not clearing them up, because—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): What proof has the hon. member that they are false?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: At least the hon. Prime Minister is open minded, but the hon. Provincial Treasurer is not interested in doing anything about it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Just a moment, I have never had any information—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister has been told and he has refused to consider it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have been told how and when? I have never been told that. The hon. member was talking about "collusion" and "like a bolt out of the blue." And I checked into that.

Mr. Chairman, the original applicants and directors automatically became shareholders and directors of the company and continued until they died and were replaced by other shareholders or directors. There is nothing on any record to indicate that they were ever replaced as directors; and so, by virtue of the Act, they continued to be directors so long as the company continued legally in existence.

With respect to the original shareholders who were dead at the time the notice was sent, I would point out again that the shares are personal property. When a shareholder dies his shares automatically go to his next of kin, either pursuant to the terms of his will or pursuant to the law of intestate succession in Ontario. The shares that were originally held by the original shareholders at the time descended to their next of kin who could, by operation of the law, be entitled to be shareholders of the company.

It would seem from the records of this Grimsby Recreation that at least one of the shareholders was alive at the time. The hon. member went on to say: "Clearly this was illegal from the word go". Mr. Chairman, there was nothing done by the department which was illegal in any way, shape or form, to my knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go back—I referred to the first seven charters which were revived in respect of the Ottawa Valley. And the hon. member for York South brought the Mayor, Charlotte Whitton, into the picture. He said that Charlotte Whitton was screaming from the rooftops in her inimitable fashion about it for months. What was she screaming about? She did not want a race track. Everybody else wanted it. But the hon. member would have the House believe that she was screaming about some of these procedures that he was referring to, that some meeting—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, no!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is exactly what the hon. member led this House to believe by the use of his words.

Mr. MacDonald: She was screaming before they had built it, before they had the authority for the public finance, before they had taken the options on the land. They were going to create a lot of problems; that is what she was screaming about.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, it is a practice very often done, that before you commit yourself to multimillion dollar expenditures you would attend to all the legalities involved.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. Minister mean you get the racing days before you build the race track?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South quoted at length from an article by Don O'Hearn, one of the distinguished members of the press gallery. The hon. member for Sudbury is not a press clipper, but some of us are. In fact, you have to do it sometimes in your own defence because when a pressclipper gets up to quote press clippings, you have to be careful what he is quoting from and that he quotes the truth.

The hon. member deliberately left out very significant portions of the record, and I am going to fill in the gaps. I will fill in the gaps, Mr. Chairman.

"Queen's Park Roundup"—*Hamilton Spectator*, September 12, 1962. That was the article that the hon. member for York South quoted. He picks and chooses the nasty words, the insinuations, Mr. Chairman, the very heading of this article is "Is reviving of race charters legal, even if haphazard?" Is that heading correct?

Mr. MacDonald: I did not put the heading in.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He does not put a lot of headings in, but the people read them. This is a sub-heading: "According to law—"; and this, Mr. Chairman, is the significant part of the omission. I say an omission can be a deliberate deception—as much as a misstatement, Mr. Chairman.

I will read it: "Strange as it may seem, this is all in accordance with the law." This is not a heading, this is part of the story. "When these old companies went out of busi-

ness, they did not die as such, but their formal corporate powers went dormant."

I suggest to you that he may qualify himself to be admitted to the bar; he understands the law a lot better than hon. members of the Opposition here do. Legally the shareholders continued as a company, but without the formal authority to do business. To get this authority, they have to apply to the Provincial Secretary to "revive" them. He can do that at his discretion, when they have brought themselves in good standing through filing old returns.

Usually he grants the revival; and apparently this is "a common practice for companies generally, not only for old racing companies. It is not irregular, no matter how haphazard it may be. The law does not require any proof of ownership at all."

That is the part, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member deliberately omitted, because it states the facts of the case. I have answered enough. You never answer any of mine, and I answer enough of your questions.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member referred in his speech, at some point he used the word delicacy, but then I can see what his description of delicacy is. He quoted that it is the rather shocking proposition that the man who used these questionable procedures to get these old charters, with all of his influence within the Tory party, should have since been appointed to the high office in the province of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe, and I suggest to you, that the hon. member for York South owes an apology to members of this House for deliberately and wilfully misleading them time after time because he knew the statements he was making were not in accordance with the law, and I say he owes an apology to the Lieutenant-Governor elect of this province, until he has proved, or at least until there has been proved in a court of law where evidence rules apply that there was something done, improper or illegally.

In order to explain to the hon. members of this House, in detail, what has transpired it would be necessary to read in detail almost every one of the 21 charters in respect in which the orders of revivor were made. The hon. member for York South is a great one for using the words Tory influence. He will, out of 21 charters, out of any number of people involved, find men known to the hon. members opposite, men probably known to other hon. members of this House. None are known to me, I believe, except, as I say, except by reputation, the Hon. Mr. Rowe. I

never asked their politics. Every application that was presented was revived.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) referred to the practice—he pointed out properly that it was not illegal, but it was haphazard. I am a lawyer, trained in the law, trained to attend to technical details. One of Her Majesty's counsel, an honour which I wear with pride. I say to this House, that this procedure is not to my liking; it is a procedure set out under The Corporations Act of the province of Ontario. I went, I think, almost beyond the powers delegated to a Minister to begin imposing my personal will and the will of the department on top of applicants.

And I can say that I hope, if I ever exceed those bounds, that hon. members of the House and hon. members opposite and the lawyers' profession will pull me to a halt.

In these cases the distinguished members of The Department of the Provincial Secretary who took the statutes and the application, worked—and I use the word 'meticulously'. The discussions that took place to ensure that they were in accordance with the law were many. They spent hours explaining to me the intricacies and the ins and outs of this very technical law.

I suggest to you that for this procedure, haphazard, is a very kind word. Loose may be a kind word, but it was perfectly legal. It was perfectly proper and in accordance with the statute that this House passed. During discussions, late last summer, it was decided that because of these procedures, and my dissatisfaction with them, they would be discontinued. Since citizens had made investments and had gone to time and trouble—and since the powers of revivor were there, since they were embarked upon their course—I dealt with all the applications which were before me.

I took the position, when those applications were dealt with, that this was going to be the end of revivors of corporate powers. But I make this public announcement, I serve notice on everybody in the province of Ontario, it may be unfortunate, because there may be some people who will suffer by having their interest extinguished, because, Mr. Chairman, the bolt out of the blue, that the hon. member referred to, a cancellation by failure to file a return has happened in the last few years. Racing charters have been cancelled before anybody took an interest in them. But, that procedure in respect of racing associations will not be used again. With the experience—

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Are you changing the Act?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The House has given the Minister extreme powers, which I determine to use in the interests of the people of this province.

Mr. Chairman, our experience in the revivors of these corporate powers has led us to impose restrictions over and above those which were set up in the statute. Because of our experience, Mr. Chairman, we intend to put those to good use in revivors in respect of other types of corporations. The public of Ontario must know, so that in the future if a racing association is to be incorporated, it will have to be incorporated either by Act of the Legislature, or by Act of the Parliament of Canada.

The race tracks are built, Mr. Chairman. That is the important thing. I spoke to the hon. member for Oxford who was very instrumental in his persuasive powers. He said we were years overdue, that harness racing, that the horse breeding of this province was being very seriously injured. I am sure he will agree with me that the scene has changed. The horse breeders of this province are probably in a better position than they have ever been in the province of Ontario; and those horse breeders are small farmers up and down the rural parts of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Also the hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. Janes)—I know he is a man who has a great deal of experience—and the hon. member for Bruce were concerned about monopolies, Mr. Chairman. There is no monopoly. By reviving the corporate powers of 21 corporations there are plenty of racing days for people in this province of Ontario, to be granted at the discretion of the racing commission and to be used not in pockets but separated all over. I say to the hon. members from the Windsor area: The race track in the Windsor area has made the people so happy. When Charlotte Whitton did not want hers down at Ottawa I am surprised they did not send a telegram down to her and say: "Shoot the race track down to Windsor. We have got hundreds of thousands of American visitors who come over and leave tourist dollars."

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): I never said a word about this.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I know. You are all in favour, I know.

Mr. Belanger: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, methods to supply racing days have to be made, but—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No. The hon. member will have his opportunity later.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to detail for the hon. members of this House the technical intricacies involved in respect to corporations, in this particular instance, racing associations.

I close with this—and I tell you that the members of the NDP very often make high and lofty quotations. The hon. member for Woodbine quoted Lincoln. I tell you to quote and to live by are two different things.

Mr. Chairman, I looked this up the other day because I heard it once and I wanted something to go by. I say this: If I were to read, much less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can, and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me will not amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, ten angels swearing I was right would make no difference.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House—I presume that I have it because the hon. member for Sudbury is interested—to table this. I will have a photostat copy made and table this document because it is the only document of record that is in the department.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I must say that this is one of the most incredible speeches that I have ever heard given in this House. The hon. Minister has spent well over an hour attempting to defend the indefensible, and in his concluding remarks he concedes that he is now going to eliminate the procedure and tacitly admits it is indefensible.

This is the significant point. After defending everything that has been going on behind this façade of legality he has now said—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am waiting for the hon. member to prove the illegality.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, have I got the floor now or is he going to continue to bounce up?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have picked up some bad habits from the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. He concludes by making a very pertinent point—and let me say this: For once he has anticipated me because this was going to be the conclusion of my comments today—that this procedure of reviving these ancient legal creatures should be eliminated. Let me try to come to the defence of the position I have made in this House before and the attack that the hon. Minister has made on it today. Before I do though, Mr. Chairman, just let me consider another point.

The hon. Minister has made some insinuations with regard to my remarks in reference to Earl Rowe. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that what I put on the record on Monday was exclusively a quotation from Don O'Hearn. The references to Earl Rowe were Don O'Hearn's references.

Before I am finished today I am going to the records to document it and to indicate that Mr. O'Hearn's conclusions were correct. But what I said Monday—notwithstanding the blistering comments of the hon. Minister at the present time—were straight quotations from Mr. O'Hearn. Incidentally, since the hon. Minister has praised Mr. O'Hearn for his comments on this, perhaps I can put into the record another brief comment of Mr. O'Hearn with reference to this.

Two days after the one that we have both quoted and referred to in the House, Mr. O'Hearn wrote an article that was carried in the *Kingston Whig-Standard*. It started out as follows:

If the government has any political sense at all it will try to do something to clear up the absolutely ludicrous situation regarding racing dates in Ontario. Last fall and winter you will recall there was what amounted to a political scandal over the new Rideau Raceway near Ottawa.

Now, the hon. Minister gets up, if I may interrupt, and says Mr. O'Hearn claims it was all legal. Mr. O'Hearn also says while it was legal, its irregularities and its shadiness was such as to assume the proportions of a scandal. And then he continues thus:

Last year in the case of Rideau the federal PC member for Renfrew, James Baskin, ended up controlling the companies controlling these charters. This gave them 84 days of racing, plus another 14 which were set aside for use in country fairs.

Now another and even more prominent Conservative, Hon. Earl Rowe, federal member for Dufferin-Simcoe, former

Cabinet Minister and one-time party leader in Ontario, has come with another handful of charters. He has seven of them which he is using to get racing dates for a new harness track with which he is connected in Windsor. There may be nothing at all irregular in the revival of these charters. This is the only way the new race tracks can be opened.

May I interject here, Mr. Chairman; in this connection Mr. O'Hearn is in error, because there is another way in which you can open race tracks and that is straight and above-board, come to the House of Commons or the Legislature to have a private bill passed.

Both the government and probably the public want more tracks but it is hard to imagine anything with a more political bad smell to it, a smell which is made all the more disagreeable by the fact that the Ontario Racing Commission which controls the allocation of all racing dates in the province sits always behind closed doors and has shown a disposition in the past to be a kangaroo court. You can say without hesitation—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Balderdash!

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, this is the man the hon. Minister was praising a moment ago. You mean he was praising him a moment ago and now it is balderdash, eh?

You can say without hesitation that the racing commission is the most undemocratic institution in Ontario government. It is absolutely shocking. This manner of granting dates shames all law. If the Prime Minister does not have the sense to clear it up, one would say he probably does not have the sense to be leader of the province.

Rather a harsh conclusion, but since you were praising Mr. O'Hearn for his perspicacity and his knowledge of the law I thought maybe I should put his views on record.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Read what he says about you.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I know it. This is what creates spice in his column. It is the leaven in the loaf, if he did not have me to attack. However, that is par for the course. I was just drawing attention to some of his comments with reference to you.

Mr. Chairman, I want to try to come to grips with what I think is the nub of this. Let me start in reference to this bolt-from-the-blue letter that arrived for the elderly

gentleman, Mr. Livingston. The hon. Minister now says that this was part of what he described as "the usual procedure of office routine" in coming to grips with these dormant charters.

I have no reason to disagree with him; I have no reason to disbelieve him. But, Mr. Chairman, I draw to your attention this remarkable coincidence—that within a matter of days from the time that he received this letter—the result of usual procedure of office routine, some 60 years after the company had gone dormant—strange as it may seem, James Baskin and Donald McNeil arrived on his doorstep to persuade him that he should hand over these charters.

Now, I used the word collusion a little earlier, and I repeat it. It is possible that this is a coincidence, but if it is just a coincidence, Mr. Chairman, it means that in exactly the week after this letter went out—one week, in 60 years, because the company had been dormant for 60 years—these two men arrived; a Tory MP and his lawyer arrived to get the old gentleman to hand it over. I leave this to the House to decide whether or not this was all a coincidence. One week in 60 years.

Now, there is a second point I want to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister makes his defence—he did it yesterday and he did it again today—that he has affidavits on the files which indicate everything was done legally. I forget his terminology—he refers to "statutory requirements", and "departmental regulations", I think these were the two terms he repeated many, many times. These have all been lived up to and there are affidavits there to say they were lived up to, and, therefore, he says, no matter how much people draw his attention to the fact there is something wrong; that some of the affidavits may be false; he has no obligation.

My argument yesterday to the hon. Prime Minister and to the hon. Minister was if there is that much smoke, surely even this Minister would think there was a little fire, and should look into it, because there have been not only articles referring to this as having a heavy political smell, but there have been many comments in addition to what has been said in the House and the Legislature, and it has taken this hon. Minister ten months to come in here and give what he thinks is an explanation. He would not have come in at all, if we had not assaulted him once again because he was sitting there, stubbornly refusing to come to grips with us.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that he has got up in this House today and announced the reviving of corporations is going to end because we have been pounding at him. Of course it is the case. Do you think he would do anything if it was not pounded into him? The record is as clear as crystal on that score.

Now, I repeat once again, what I have said, and the hon. Minister disputes it, that this letter that I quoted into *Hansard* at 2113 last year, a letter of Donald McNeil in which he states:

this is to advise you that the shareholders of the above company, held a shareholders' meeting, on April 15, 1961, electing the following directors and officers,

and they name the three directors. I repeat Mr. Chairman, there was no meeting; there were no shareholders. One of the gentlemen had been visited and has been interviewed by a very competent lawyer since, and he knows of no shares certificate; he knows of no bequest from his father. Incidentally, his father has been dead for many years.

In the course of his remarks, the hon. Minister made a very significant comment. He referred to the "legal transfer" of shares. This is the important point, the legal transfer of these original shares. What evidence has he on these files that there has been anything approximating a legal transfer of these shares from the original stockholders?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The department does not require it.

Mr. MacDonald: All right, Mr. Chairman, if the department does not require it, then its procedures are so full of holes that I am not surprised that this hon. Minister has come in today and abolished them. Because what it simply means is that a group of people can go in and become self-appointed directors, pick up a charter with which they have had no association at all, create the legal façade of sending out letters and advertising in the paper to people who are all dead. No wonder Don O'Hearn called it a comic opera. Now let me illustrate this by going back to deal with one or two of the companies that have been revived by Earl Rowe. This is in substantiation of what Don O'Hearn has said. For example, I have in my hand here a photostatic copy of the annual return—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Provided by the department.

Mr. MacDonald: Correct, correct. After the hon. Minister had badgered the department into—or asked the department that I should

return the file to the Public Office where it must stay, and the next day he brings it into the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the Clinton Riding Park Association, and the annual returns for March 31st, 1961. The interesting thing about it, Mr. Chairman is this; that they spell out that company was formed in October 29th, 1877, and listed as directors are W. E. Rowe, William Rowe, Margaret Hughes, Rex Hughes. Further down on the return it says there was an annual meeting held on March 7th, 1961, presumably to authorize this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious from an analysis of the file there was no meeting held on March 7, at all. They did not even go through the normal procedures of calling a shareholders' meeting. These people were the self-appointed directors. The interesting proof of it is, if you continue through the file, that you will find March 31, 1962, a year later when the return was filed, they typed in the names of the people who were the self-appointed directors the year before, and they X'ed them all out. The X's on the typewriter are used to cancel it out, and they entered the word "unknown."

Significantly enough, this was filed in May or June for the year ended March 31st, 1962, so what happened was that the people who were the self-appointed directors in 1961 had abolished themselves in 1962 because they found their self-appointment was so clearly illegal it did not even attempt to conform with the law.

Now, this, Mr. Chairman, is what I refer to as illegalities. I do not know how any sensible person can read through these files and see this kind of thing and not say that something should be done about it. I do not know how any hon. Minister can accept affidavits and returns when you have this kind of a situation, and then come into the House and say all the regulations have got to be lived up to. What happened is these people went into Clinton and picked up a charter and appointed themselves directors with a phony meeting that did not exist.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, you cannot go in and pick up a charter. You have to buy or acquire the shares, and if they have not got the shares then those people still own those shares.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay. So they did not buy any shares. I do not know where they got them from because there was certainly no legal transaction that transferred the original shares to these directors.

However, having gone through this façade of appointing themselves, and then unappointing themselves a year later they did then begin to conform with the law. A notice of the general meeting of the shareholders was called for April, 1962. This meeting was held and at this meeting they appointed, W. Earl Rowe the chairman, the director was William Rowe, the secretary-treasurer was Lennox Rowe. Subsequently when they had a meeting, when they thought of reviving the charter, there is an application of the Clinton Driving Park Association submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor in which they review all the events of those intervening months, and it is interesting just to read what they say here. This is signed by W. Earl Rowe again, and Lennox Rowe and it is witnessed by David Harley who is a young lawyer in the firm of Borden, Elliot, Kelly and Palmer.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Are they all in it?

Mr. MacDonald: No, I did not say they were.

Your applicant was incorporated under an Act respecting the incorporation of the joint stock companies by letters patent, dated the 29th day of October, 1877.

2). The signatures hereto are the President and the Secretary of the said corporation.

3). Your applicant ceased business operations during a period of three consecutive years, and pursuant to the terms of its incorporation lost its corporate powers and in doing so has suffered loss and serious inconvenience.

What happened, of course, Mr. Chairman, was that it lapsed for 60 years. Here you have the legal phraseology and façade.

4). This default of the corporation is due to inadvertence in the neglect of the directors or officers of the corporation

Comic opera—they were all dead for many a year, and there have been sixty years of complete inactivity.

Your applicant is not in default in filing its annual returns under The Companies Information Act, or a predecessor of that Act, or The Corporations Information Act.

6). All of the defaults of the corporation to the date of the dissolution have been remedied.

7). On the 23rd day of May, 1962, a special resolution was passed by the directors of your applicant authorizing an

application to Your Honour providing for an order revising the powers of the company.

8). On the 4th day of September, 1962 the said special resolution was confirmed by unanimous vote cast at a general meeting of the shareholders of your applicant, duly called for this purpose.

Now the interesting thing here, Mr. Chairman, is that back in April they went through the motions of calling a meeting of shareholders; nobody turned up because they were all dead. In fact, there is actually an affidavit here which swears that they wrote letters and they put them in the post office at such and such an hour and Her Majesty's post office carried them out. Where, to the graveyard? The shareholders were all dead. Why proceed in this comic opera? This is just fulfilling the so-called requirements of the law and it is ludicrous.

In fact, on one occasion, as the hon. Minister quite rightly said, they did not advertise appropriately in the local papers, so the department forced them to advertise again. Now I suppose there is this possibility, that some of the original shareholders had passed on their shares to their sons or their grandsons and they might have read the ad. But if you read—and I will come to it in a moment—you will find that the original shareholders signed a petition indicating each one of them put in \$10 or \$15 or \$20; but there were no share certificates distributed. I am certain all the heirs have long since forgotten that their grandfather or their father put in \$10 to become a shareholder in a company—this is straight comic opera, sending out letters, and advertising in the papers to the dead.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the dead do not appear, then the self-appointed directors of the year before appoint themselves, and they are presumably legal.

How ludicrous can you get? And the hon. Minister wants to defend this. This is what happened.

What makes it even more ludicrous is that you will find here a statement by David Harley saying that he witnesses that W. Earl Rowe and Lennox Rowe, president and the secretary-treasurer respectively of the above-mentioned company, signed the petition for an order reviving the corporate powers. They are going through the motions of something that is all just comic opera.

Then—and this is the important point, Mr. Chairman—after all of this nonsensical procedure in violation of the law, with falsifica-

tions of meetings that were not held, let me read this:

We, W. Earl Rowe and Lennox Rowe, both of Newton Robinson in the county of Simcoe, the president and secretary-treasurer respectively of the Clinton Park Riding Association, make oath and say that:

1. We have knowledge of the matters herein deposed and

2. To the best of our knowledge and belief the statements in the annexed publication are true in substance and in fact.

Signed by W. Earl Rowe and Lennox Rowe, sworn before me in the city of Toronto in the county of York this 4th day of September, 1962.

It is certified by W. F. Robertson, Commissioner of Oaths.

I will say no more. That speaks for itself.

Mr. Chairman, let me proceed to show you some of the other things that happened in another of the charters—this legal façade, this comic opera.

Here for example, when the Amherstburg Driving Park Association gave a notice of its first meeting, when the self-appointed directors were picked up from the dead of yesteryear. It is dated at Toronto, Ontario, the 2nd day of April, 1962 and it is signed by Rex Hughes, who describes himself as the shareholders' representative.

Rex Hughes is one of Earl Rowe's coterie. I think he assists him, works with him, manages and looks after his horses. I think he lives in Arthur. This man becomes a self-appointed representative of the shareholders, who are all dead. He signs a document saying he is "the shareholders' representative." Anything can happen under this sort of a procedure. No wonder the hon. Minister has come in and said he is going to abolish it.

When I talked this over with a lawyer this morning—a lawyer who is very familiar with this whole procedure—he said: "Well, now let's be careful here because there may be a by-law which makes it legal for this company to have somebody become the shareholders' representative and speak on their behalf." So I was very interested as we looked through the files to find some six months later, a statement signed by Lennox Rowe in which he says:

I am the secretary of Amherstburg Driving Park Association Limited. The whereabouts of the company's by-laws being unknown, a search is being conducted for the said by-laws and particularly for by-

laws relating to the holding of corporate meetings. The aforementioned search has not resulted in the location of the company's said by-laws and it is therefore concluded that the said by-laws have been lost.

So it was impossible for this member of Mr. W. Earl Rowe's group to have appointed himself as the representative of the shareholders.

I could go on and on and on here. And the hon. Minister gets up and tries to defend this kind of thing. The most intelligent thing that he did was to conclude at the end of his speech that this kind of nonsense has to end. The only thing wrong is that it should have ended years ago. The only thing wrong is that it took the hon. Minister a year, and he had to be badgered into action. And now he gets up and tries to conduct one of his character assassinations about us on the other side of the House—about things we have said.

Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. Minister has wiped all this out I am not going to go into as much detail as I had planned, but there are one or two other little nuggets here at which I think we should take a look. To show that they knew at least what should be done in the department—these poor civil servants—I wonder how they made a decision as to when the law has to be lived up to and when it does not have to be lived up to. This must have been an awfully difficult task, because the law is not being lived up to half the time, with phony meetings being held.

Here is one that went out over the signature of Samuel Levine, director of companies, on January 28, 1962, in which it is pointed out:

With reference to the seven remaining applications I note that in some of them the letters patent provide for the giving of notice of meetings for publication in the local newspapers, at least ten days before the meeting. This provision appears in four cases, but not in the remaining three. With respect to the other four, while the notice may not be invalid by reason of subsection 2 of section 79 of the Act, it is felt to remove any doubt there should be filed in these four cases, as well as the other three cases, an affidavit by an officer of each of the companies to the effect that written waivers of the notice of meetings have been obtained from all of the shareholders on record in each of the companies.

All the shareholders are dead. How did they get the waiver? Will the hon. Minister rise to his feet now and tell me how this section

of the Act was lived up to? Does he want to defend that?

An hon. member: He is played out.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not wonder he is played out. However, this is the most interesting thing of all, Mr. Chairman. Finally, the orders of revivor for all of these seven companies were passed and accepted by the hon. Minister on September 4, 1962; this was a Friday. On the following Monday—this is very fast work for any government department, the decision is made on Friday and the letter goes out on Monday—a form letter went out on Monday, September 7 over the signature of R. J. Cudney, deputy Provincial Secretary, saying:

Re: The Almonte Driving Park Association Limited. I transmit herewith receipt of which please acknowledge the order reviving the corporate powers of the said company.

The interesting thing here, Mr. Chairman, is that on the very day on which they were receiving notice in this quick fashion that the corporate powers had been revived, the Ontario Racing Commission was meeting and stringing these seven charters together and granting the racing days for the Windsor Raceways for the year 1963.

Last year, I pointed out how, by remarkable coincidence—no Tory influence in this, of course—the remarkable coincidence that the racing commission, just by accident happened to be meeting on the Monday and the order for revivor just happened to have been authorized on the previous Friday—

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Synchronization.

Mr. MacDonald: Magnificent synchronization—magnificent!

Mr. Troy: On the same net, all right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We do it all the time.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, the documentation is very convincing. Notwithstanding the pontifications and the self-righteousness of the hon. Minister, I do not withdraw a single word I said. This is comic opera. It is shady behind the façade of affidavits involving illegalities; and this hon. Minister has refused to ferret out the illegalities. The only thing that can be said in his defence is that he has abolished the whole procedure so that he does not have to do it any more. I am glad of that because it would have been impossible.

[Anything that I said last spring and anything that I said yesterday I repeat and I defend; and I stand back of it here, notwithstanding the political speech of the hon. Minister, because this kind of procedure is in effect circumventing the Criminal Code.

May I say, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that back in 1906 the Criminal Code was amended to make it possible for any association or club that got a charter from a provincial government to have the right to parimutuel betting. The result was that in the years immediately after 1906 there was a great proliferation of these clubs all over the country. Certainly we are discovering that there were in the province of Ontario a great many of them. The result was that, in 1912, the Criminal Code was amended to say that from that point forward the only way you could get racing charters with the lucrative parimutuel betting rights was that you should go to the House of Commons, or to the provincial Legislature and have a private bill passed. And I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that that is the correct way to do it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Or have a charter.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Or have a charter.

Mr. MacDonald: Or dig up one of these old charters. Yes.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, but have one.

An hon. member: You cannot dig one up any more.

Mr. MacDonald: Or if you had one before?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, yes, if you had a charter yourself that you had had for years and perhaps had legal proof of the fact that you inherited it from your father or something—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would point out that the Criminal Code did not ban the right completely. It left the right for these charters to have parimutuel—

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. I agree that it left the rights. This is the alternative: You either get one of these old charters and breathe life into it again, or else you go in a straightforward fashion to the Legislature or the House of Commons.

James Baskin's comment last spring was that he did not want to appear to be seeking

a favour by going and having a private bill passed by the House of Commons or the Ontario Legislature; so instead of not going and asking a favour in that fashion he went through all of this comic opera procedure. Once again I will let the House and the public decide which was the most straightforward approach.

I will say this to the hon. Minister—perhaps he will be rather interested since he says there is no Tory influence in it—that the people who have been involved in these two cases that I dealt with—the Rideau-Carlton Raceway and this one now—had been Tories, almost completely. The odd exception was Mr. Fasken, who was a Liberal associated with Peel riding, a man connected with Northgate, and who came into the Rideau-Carlton Raceway after its reorganization. The others were men like H. J. MacFarland; James Baskin; Warren Armstrong, a campaign organizer for Donald Fleming, who was secretary of the energy board while he was building the original foundations of this whole company and then resigned his position on the energy board to go into this.

Now, in this latter case: W. Earle Rowe assisted legally by the firm of Willis to begin with; and then when Mr. Willis was appointed a Senator, they changed to another firm, by mere chance the Borden firm. It is a Tory compact. I will tell the hon. Minister something else, and it may save him an awful lot of grief.

One of the men involved, and I have already named him, in an exuberant moment said that he has a whole handful of these charters, and that he was going to have them ready for friends to be used whenever they needed to revive charters to start to build race tracks—a whole handful of them! I was going to ask the hon. Minister, but now there is no need for it, to table in this House how many of these old charters are sitting around in his files. They should all be available to this Tory and could be dispensed to other Tories. But I do not need to ask the hon. Minister, now that he has wiped it all out. He defends the indefensible and then he wipes it all out. I commend him for that at least.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I never thought that I would live to see the day, but I am never surprised at anything in the nuclear age any more, that an hon. member of the Legislature would get up in this House, the high court of Parliament, the highest court in the land—historically it occupies that position—and bring to the attention of the Ministry

that an affidavit was false. A very serious allegation.

In bringing such an allegation he is staking his honour as a member of the House on that assertion. In making a serious charge of that nature he is presumably saying that he will stake his reputation on the veracity of that assertion; and having done that, having brought lawbreaking of the worst kind to the attention of the Ministry, then to have an hon. Minister of the Crown get up and assert with gall that if that hon. member who brought that charge and made that assertion wants to go before a justice and lay an information he is at liberty to do so.

I would think, perhaps to be not too pro-saic, that when such an offence is alleged by an hon. member of this House that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) would leap from his seat and tell the law enforcement officers to institute an immediate investigation.

Mr. MacDonald: Not when it was a façade—

Mr. Sopha: Indeed. Indeed. We are entitled to expect nothing less than this—the inculcation of respect for the law, the bringing to justice of people who offend it. But the front row sits and they listen to an hon. Minister behind them spit out the words: “The hon. member can go and lay an information”. I say by way of interpolation, Mr. Chairman, that if the Bank of Montreal is robbed, or if a murder is committed on your street, then presumably a citizen may go and lay an information. That is the ridiculous conclusion or the lengths to which it would go.

So, on behalf of my hon. colleagues here, I say that we challenge the front bench, or the second bench, those that have the confidence of the Lieutenant-Governor, to do what is right, to do what is necessary to enforce the law. Immediately go and institute an investigation.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: There will be no help by the comments from the hon. Minister of Mines. There will be no respect for the law bred by the little mealy-mouthed phrases that he interpolates.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: I do not pretend to be such a big shot with the flow of meaningless phrases that the hon. member for Sudbury constantly uses.

Mr. Sopha: Now, having left that, I would like to know, on the facts—I have a question to ask, I have a couple to ask.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Oh, you are so clever.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes. Who is it in the department that solicitor McNeil had been using? It is quite apparent. The inference, displayed in the facts as adduced by the hon. member for York South, is that Mr. McNeil used his position as an employee of the hon. Provincial Secretary's department to make himself privy to this information. It is quite apparent on the facts that after he left the employ of the department he returned within the confines of the department and used that information for his personal gain; used it as a servant of others. That, Mr. Chairman, is quite apparent.

Who in the department is allowing McNeil to do this type of thing? Has any investigation been commenced to ascertain how it is that Mr. McNeil can get within the department and look at these papers when, as the hon. member for York South points out, we cannot go down and get those papers and take one of them away? I tried it. I have tried it and you are watched as if you are a member of the NKVD when you go in there and look at those papers.

But it is more than that. It is more than that. The whole procedure of granting charters and letters patent in this province is wrong. The hon. member for York South has focused attention on one part of it, the racing charters. Just at that point I want to ask this question.

May I be told, if I ask as politely as I can—I am not always polite, I do not pretend to be, a gentleman is a man who is never rude unintentionally—were any representations made to any department of the federal government from this government or any department of this government about these charters, the charters involved in the Rideau Raceway and the charters involved in the new Windsor Racetrack? Were any representations—that is my simple question—of any kind made to the federal government about these charters which were to be used in the founding of a race track at Ottawa and the founding of a race track at Windsor? I ask that question politely and I would like to have the answer tomorrow, if I could have it answered “yes” or “no” on that score.

I had better explain the reason. The reason is that the Criminal Code prohibits pari-mutuel betting on any charter granted after March 20, 1912, except as the hon. member for York South points out, except where the right to race horses is granted by an Act of the House of Commons or of any provincial Legislature. But on any charter granted after

that date, March 20, 1912, no parimutuel betting will be permitted.

I say the whole procedure of granting letters patent is wrong. My hon. friend from York South focused on the horse race charters. I could stand before this House for perhaps two or three hours and outline the abuses connected with the granting of letters patent in general, but suffice it to say this: It is well known in this province that many people who are pretty careless about their responsibilities to their creditors will move from charter to charter, from letters patent to letters patent, and will incorporate company after company. You see, when the credit of one company is used up, they will incorporate another one.

Does the Provincial Secretary's branch ever look at the names of the people who apply for letters patent and look into the question of whether their credit is still good? The answer is no; they do not. They do not. An individual may incorporate as many as 20 companies.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Does the hon. member as a lawyer act for—

Mr. Sopha: I do not incorporate these companies. I do not, as a lawyer, act for people of this type, but I see it going on all the time. I see innocent people being mulcted and being defrauded because these individuals will hide behind the corporate veil; they will hide behind the corporate disguise. And the person who does business with them, cannot tell who it is by looking at the name of the company.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I move that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof it do stand adjourned until 2 of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Tomorrow we will proceed with the second readings on the order paper, and the estimates of the Provincial Secretary. If we complete those in time we will proceed to the estimates of the Attorney-General.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, is there likely to be a night session tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, there will be no night session tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.07 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

Reference by hon. J. Yaremko, Provincial Secretary on page 696

NOTICE

To the under-mentioned Corporations, the directors thereof and all others whom it may concern.

PURSUANT to Section 326(2) of The Corporations Act, notice is hereby given that the under-mentioned Corporations incorporated by Letters Patent are in default for a period of three years in filing their Annual Returns under The Corporations Information Act or a predecessor thereof. The Corporations, their dates of incorporation and the years in default in filing Annual Returns are as follows:

Name of Corporation	Date of Incorporation	The years in default in filing annual returns
TC-8624—A.I. Investments, Limited	Mar. 26, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8596—Abductor Davits, Limited	May 2, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8461—American Eagle Mining Co., Limited	Mar. 2, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8640—Anglo-Ontario Land Company, Limited	June 4, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8519—The Asbestos and Rubber Goods Company, Limited	April 1, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8615—Automobile Co-operative Society, Limited	May 11, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8605—Ayr Fishing Club, Limited	May 29, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8582—Baker Motor Vehicle Company of Canada, Limited	April, 18, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8458—The Balmoral Land & Development Company, Limited	Feb. 27, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8587—Barretts Dairy Company, Limited	May 8, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8648—The Bayview Boulevard Limited	June 6, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8601—The Big Four Brick Company, Limited	May 14, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8625—The Blyth Flax Company, Limited	June 18, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8614—Boniveen Realty Company, Limited	May 10, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8558—The Border City Athletic Association, Limited	April 12, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8580—The Brechin Ridge Realty Company, Limited	May 9, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8594—The British Empire Land Company of Canada, Limited	April 18, 1912	1912 and 1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8610—Buffalo-Ontario Lead Company, Limited	May 20, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8669—Burleigh Ranching Company, Limited	July 23, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8521—The Butt Improvement Company, Limited	Feb. 29, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8494—Canada Amalgamated Nickel and Copper Company, Limited	Mar. 15, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8689—Canada Moving Pictures, Limited	July 9, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8520—Canada Veteran Gold Mines, Limited	Mar. 25, 1912	1919 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8555—The Canadian Dust Proof Weather Strip Company, Limited	April 22, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8636—The Canadian Frost and Winchester Company, Limited	June 11, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8573—Canadian Mining Exchange, Limited	April 30, 1912	1919 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8545—Canadian Neel Armstrong, Limited	Mar. 9, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8552—The Canadian St. Marys Company of Chatham, Limited	April 11, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8659—Canadian Tonitaves Company, Limited	June 27, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8522—Canadian Vending Machine Company, Limited	Mar. 4, 1912	1912 and 1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8676—Central Garage & Supply Company, Limited	July 25, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8678—The Chatham Land Company, Limited	July 24, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8628—The Chatham Theatre Company, Limited	June 20, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-6068—The Cosmopolitan Club, Limited	June 19, 1906	1919 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8681—The Coyne Lumbering Company, Limited	July 22, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8623—Crawford's, Limited	April 29, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8622—Deer Lake Gold and Silver Mines, Limited	June 18, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8638—The Dixie Brick Company, Limited	May 31, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8524—The Doric Portland Cement Company, Limited	April 9, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8585—The Doty Marine Engine and Boiler Company Limited	May 1, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
Dunford Elk Shoes, Limited	April 1, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8535—Eastern Securities, Limited	April 4, 1912	1912 and 1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8574—Electric Company of Canada, Limited	Mar. 5, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8627—Geo. A. Evans, Limited	June 18, 1912	1915 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8651—Exclusive Estates, Limited	July 2, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8626—The Farmers Co-operative Co. of Blezard Valley, Ont., Limited	June 5, 1912	1912 and 1915 to 1960 inclusive

Name of Corporation	Date of Incorporation	The years in default in filing annual returns
TC-8561—The Farmers Co-operative Society of St. Charles, Limited	April 9, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
The John Forsyth Company, Limited	Nov. 16, 1910	1910 and 1915 to 1920 and 1922 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8657—The Galt Securities Company, Limited	July 2, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8639—Glen Mawr Girls School of Toronto, Limited	June 1, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8548—E. A. Greene Company, Limited	April 12, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8526—Greenfield Conduit Company, Limited	Mar. 1, 1912	1915 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8660—The Grimsby Recreation Company, Limited	Nov. 14, 1911	1911 to 1960 inclusive
The Hedley Shaw Milling Company, Limited	May 11, 1901	1917 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8538—The Highway Improvement Company, Limited	Mar. 8, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8620—Home Land Company, Limited	May 5, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8463—Hotel Kingston, Limited	Feb. 20, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8647—The Ideal Mat Company, Limited	June 22, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8567—The Imperial Export Company, Limited	Oct. 9, 1908	1908 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8560—Inter-Cities Land Company, Limited	April 2, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8591—The Inter-Cities Quarries Company, Limited	May 6, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
International Evolverment Corporation Limited	Jan. 10, 1957	1957 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8686—Interprovincial Concrete Construction Company, Limited	July 5, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8572—Irving Electrical Supply Company, Limited	April 24, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8534—The Jackson Car Company of Ontario, Limited	Mar. 20, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8671—The Kline Manufacturing Company, Limited	July 8, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8532—Laudon Works, Limited	April 16, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8597—Ledger Realty, Limited	May 2, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8540—L. C. Le Voi Company, Limited	April 4, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8570—The Longway Supply Company, Limited	April 24, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8688—The Macnamara Co., Limited	July 8, 1912	1916 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8549—Marks and Price, Limited	April 12, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8514—Marshall-Davis, Limited	Mar. 28, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8621—L. R. McCrae Limited	June 5, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8680—J. C. McNabb & Co., Limited	July 27, 1912	1919 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8518—Merchandise Warehouse, Limited	Mar. 19, 1912	1912 and 1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8644—P. M. Millman and Company, Limited	May 27, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8600—Mitchell Crusher Manufacturing Company, Limited	May 9, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8649—The Moira River Mining Company, Limited	June 29, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8517—B. W. Moore Co., Limited	Mar. 16, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8679—Morwoods, Limited	July 17, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8554—National Auto Body Company, Limited	April 22, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8683—National Cigar Company, Limited	July 2, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8675—National Land & Investments, Limited	July 16, 1912	1912 and 1917 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8650—National Underwriters, Limited	July 4, 1912	1913 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8409—The New Ontario Timber and Trading Company, Limited	Aug. 28, 1911	1929 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8557—Northern Canada Prospecting Company, Limited	April 22, 1912	1912 and 1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8634—The Ontario Oxy-Acetylene Devices and Machine Company, Limited	May 29, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8629—Open Book Rest Company of Canada, Limited	June 11, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8652—Ottawa Pattern and Foundry Company, Limited	June 22, 1912	1912 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8542—Outing Knitted Wear, Limited	April 4, 1912	1914 to 1960 inclusive
TC-8391—W. M. Stewart Drug Co., Limited	Oct. 17, 1910	1929 to 1960 inclusive

R. J. CUDNEY,
Deputy Provincial Secretary.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Third report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Morrow	715
Public Service Act, 1961-62, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, first reading	715
Statement re learner drivers and driver examination centres, Mr. Auld	718
Drainage Act, 1962-1963, bill intituled, Mr. Spooner, second reading	719
County Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	720
General Sessions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	720
Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	720
Public Officers Fees Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	720
Voters Lists Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	720
Division Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	720
Registry Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	720
Junior Farmer Establishment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	720
Estimates, Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, continued	
Mr. Yaremko	723
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	757

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1963

The House met at 2.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Elmvale District High School, Elmvale; Bishop Townsend Public School, London; and the Registered Nursing Assistants, Toronto. In the west gallery, Gravenhurst High School, Gravenhurst, and Parklawn Public School, Etobicoke.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. H. Morrow from the standing committee on private bills presented the committee's third report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Waterloo.

Bill No. Pr20, An Act respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of the city of Ottawa.

Bill No. Pr31, An Act respecting the county of Dufferin.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the township of Bruce.

Bill No. Pr23, An Act respecting the township of Scarborough.

Bill No. Pr29, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, 1961-62

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Service Act, 1961-62.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): **Mr. Speaker**, for the purpose of making sure that this bill is understood, I would like to make a little fuller explanation than is customary on the first reading of the bill.

This is important legislation to extend The Public Service Act passed last year in two very important areas. One, section 3 of the bill defines the rights and privileges of Crown employees in regard to municipal election and political activity. Section 6 of the bill contains provisions to establish a joint council and a civil service arbitration board to consider and determine matters in regard to working conditions and terms of employment.

The other provisions of the bill sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 are necessary to meet administrative requirements of the public service.

It is important to note that it is our wish to enact these provisions by legislation rather than by informal agreements or by regulations. We feel that it is proper that the Legislature review the outright prohibitions against political activity contained in the Garrow resolution and enact new legislation to meet the requirements of our modern society, recognizing that we have today a mature and responsible public service.

The same holds true for the provisions in regard to a joint council to debate and negotiate matters concerning the terms of employment of public service. In addition the provision for a civil service arbitration board provides an excellent method to resolve any disputes that cannot be settled within the council.

This legislation underlines our belief that employees of the government have the right, and indeed the duty, to play a full part in our political and democratic institutions and that they enjoy the right to form an association and to negotiate on matters concerning their terms of employment.

The rights and duties of citizenship are not shed when a person becomes a civil servant and it will be noted that in the bill it is only when a Crown employee reaches the rank of a deputy minister, or other high position, that he is restricted in regard to his activity on behalf of any party organization.

It is important that the higher public service be impartial and objective to provide continuity of government administration, thus respecting the professionalism and high standards of conduct that have been everywhere identified with the Ontario public service. It is not our intention to take the restrictions provided for deputy ministers and other Crown employees below the level of branch heads or operating heads of major institutions, so that there remains available to participate in our local government institutions, provincial and federal party activities, persons of high technical and professional competence and administrative ability.

We realize that the public service will use the generous provisions of this bill with discretion and with fairness, for our country is founded upon the understanding that each of us accept full responsibility to behave in a proper manner toward each other and to support our free and democratic institutions to the best of our abilities. With the extension of government activity into so many fields, the problem has grown acute, not only in this province, but elsewhere, in regard to the scope of permitted activity of public service employees. In the early days, civil service was small in number and restricted in function. The problem caused by sterilizing such persons from local government and party activity at the provincial or federal level has never been faced before by any Legislature since the 1890's and it is proper that we face the matter squarely and bring forward new and progressive legislation to meet the situation. A resolution of the problem by this House will mean a great deal to other jurisdictions facing the problem of the extent of political freedom that should be allowed to government service employees. I would like to repeat here that the political freedoms provided in this bill require a mature public service based upon the merit principle with each employee free to follow the dictates of his own conscience.

It is my intention to explain each of these sections fully on second reading of the bill. This will give the hon. members of the House an opportunity to examine the legislation and to join in the support of these progressive revisions.

Section 1 of the bill uses the expression of "Crown employees" for the first time. This is defined to include all employees of the Crown or any agency of the Crown in Ontario with the exception of the employees of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission, the workmen's compensation board or the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission. These

agencies have considerable autonomy within the provisions of their particular statutes with sufficient powers to determine matters in regard to the provisions of this bill. The definition of "Crown employee" becomes most useful to us in the provisions of section 3 and section 5.

Section 2 of the bill provides for a longer period of reappointment for persons in the unclassified service. This will permit the reappointment for more than a year of a person who has completed the probationary period of one year in the unclassified service. He is then protected by a grievance procedure in regard to dismissal and in regard to his working conditions and terms of employment.

Section 3 of the bill deals with the matter of political activity and I shall explain this more fully later.

Section 4 of the bill provides for a period of suspension pending an investigation which is to be prescribed in the regulations. The present Act contains provision for a period of not "exceeding two weeks" and there have been cases in which this length of suspension has not been long enough. It is necessary to appreciate that the suspension in this subsection is only for a period of investigation and is not a penalty since pay is only temporarily withheld pending results of the inquiry. The penalty section is section 15(2) of The Public Service Act. This is not amended.

Section 5 of the bill extends the provisions of the present Public Service Act to the recovery of debts to all Crown employees rather than its restriction to public servants as at present. This is in keeping with the policy of the government to place Crown employees in the same relationship to the general public as other employees. It is necessary that we have such a section in order to give the Provincial Treasurer the authority to deduct from the salary of a debtor sufficient money to either repay the debt in full or in part over a reasonable period, when such period is required.

Section 6 of the bill deals with the joint council and the civil service arbitration board and I will treat this important matter separately.

Section 7 of the bill provides the authority necessary to enact regulations as required in the various sections of the bill. The need for these regulations becomes apparent on a study of the provisions for such sections as 3 and 6.

Section 3 of the bill contains provisions in regard to local government candidacy and support, political activity at the provincial

and federal level and a method for obtaining leave for Crown employees to stand as candidates in provincial and federal elections.

Previously, the policy of the Legislature was established in 1897 on March 17, when the journals of the Legislature for that year show that the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That this House is of the opinion that officers or clerks of the civil or public service of the province, or permanent employees, who solely or for the most part obtain their livelihood in the public service, should not actively participate in provincial or Dominion election campaigns, and that officers or clerks of the civil service should not become candidates for municipal councillors.

The purpose for this resolution was to reduce the political interference with civil service affairs and to end the "spoils system" that was in effect at that time. Political hirings and firings could only be avoided if some element of impartiality was developed in regard to civil service administration.

In order to bring our legislation up to date the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) ordered a complete study of the political activity provisions in other jurisdictions and, indeed, at the same time, the provisions relating to bargaining and negotiation that exist in industry and in government elsewhere. In many respects this bill could be considered model legislation for a progressive democratic state. Except for the prohibitions in regard to certain political activities for deputy ministers and other senior management, there is no stratification of the service and the freedom of action within the guidelines set out in the bill is applicable to all Crown employees.

There are certain undesirable practices and certain standards required in order to protect the public and the employee alike and therefore, I suggest a close study of the bill to discover its provisions when the bill has been printed. Some copies of the bill have been prepared in advance for those who would like to look over and consider its provisions prior to the debate on second reading.

Sub-section 9(a) under section 3 permits a Crown employee, except for deputy ministers, and designated officials, to become a candidate for municipal election to any elective municipal office. The only requirements are that the candidacy must not interfere with the performance of his duties as a Crown employee and that there is no conflict of interests with the interests of the Crown. An example of this would be for an inspector in The Department of Education to sit on a

school board in the area on which he is serving. The third requirement is that the candidacy not be in direct affiliation with a political party. This does not affect his right to be a member of a political party, or indeed to support one, but his candidacy should not be sponsored by a provincial or federal political party.

Sub-section 9(b) (1) establishes certain prohibitions that are considered undesirable activities except when a Crown employee is actually a candidate in an election. In this case under sub-section 2 a Crown employee, other than a deputy minister or senior officers designated, proposing to become a candidate in a provincial or federal election, shall be granted a leave of absence. The provisions of this leave are spelled out in the bill and if such a Crown employee is elected it is required that he resign with the entitlement to reinstatement if he returns to the service within five years of his resignation.

The provisions in regard to reinstatement protect him for any position in which he is qualified. At the same time continuity of service is established so as not to affect his superannuation rights.

Sub-section 9(c) carries certain prohibitions in effect at all times in regard to canvassing and the same holds true under section 9(e) in regard to engaging in political activity during working hours, with dismissal under 9(b) being the penalty if these sections are contravened.

It will be noted that deputy ministers are refused all forms of political activity, except the writing or speaking on political subjects not part of a provincial or federal party's political platform.

There are two prohibitions under sub-section 9(b) that deserve particular mention and that is, that except during a leave of absence a Crown employee shall not solicit funds or associate his position in the service of the Crown with any political activity. I believe that all hon. members will agree that these could cause embarrassment both to the Crown employee and the administrators of the public service.

The political activity sections of the bill should encourage the public servants to take a greater interest in our political and social institutions, to the end that our government activity at all levels, local, provincial and federal, should be enriched and strengthened. In the days of positive government it is necessary that we have the minimum of restrictions on the persons of high qualifications who work for the province. Each employee will be guided by his own wishes in such matters

but can feel free to participate if it is his wish to do so.

Section 6 of the bill enacts in legislation a joint council to negotiate such matters as are put on its agenda by the chairman as a result of a request by any member concerning terms of employment of public servants, including working conditions, remuneration, leaves and hours of work.

The provisions of the bill in regard to the joint council are a result of a careful study of the Whitley council system of Great Britain with amendments and provisions designed to meet the requirements of the province of Ontario. This provides the proper atmosphere and the necessary authorities for council to consider matters of employment and to come to decisions in regard to such matters. The council consists of eight persons under a non-voting chairman, four on the official side and four on the staff side, one of whom may be an officer of the civil service association. It is expected that the four staff members will be drawn from broad areas of public service employment to the end that every public servant will have his interests represented on the council. There are provisions that the council must meet at least four times a year and the quorum of a council shall be three members on each side, with the chairman in attendance. The vice-chairman of the council shall be a member of the staff side, nominated by that side.

A most important provision of this section is sub-section 8 in which every decision of the joint council shall be signed by the chairman and the vice-chairman and the chairman shall transmit it to the appropriate authority to be implemented. This empowers the council with sufficient authority to deliver its decisions to the proper agency to put them into effect.

Because of the nature of the council, with four votes on the official and on the staff sides, when a deadlock occurs the chairman shall refer the matter to a civil service arbitration board which shall, after a hearing, decide the matter.

Section 19(b)(2) therefore provides the method of the appointment of the civil service arbitration board. One member is designated from time to time by the official side, and one member is designated from time to time by the staff side, and the third member being the chairman appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council for a period of two years which is renewable. He will be a person who is respected by government and public servant alike. This requires a person of high integrity and great ability.

The decision of the arbitration board has the same force as the decision of the council, the chairman shall transmit it "to the appropriate authority to be implemented".

The joint council and the companion arbitration board should prove to be a most worthwhile extension of our grievance procedure which has arbitration provisions and which has established the benefit of such provisions. The public service of Ontario has developed and matured rapidly under an enlightened personnel administration and we are proud to have played a part in this development.

I commend to the hon. members of the House full support of all of the provisions of this bill. I believe that the major sections in regard to municipal election, political activity and joint councils and the arbitration of unresolved matters will provide a strengthened framework for the development of sound government administration.

Our way of life demands that each person has the right to freedom of activity in pressing his rightful claims and in participating in the life of the community. In this bill we have presented the necessary framework to establish these rights. I would be pleased if there were no prohibitions, but at this time, mature and sound consideration of this problem discloses that certain restrictions are required in order to protect the interests of the public.

In regard to the joint council provisions, we expect worthwhile results since the civil service association is a mature, responsible employees' organization endeavouring to defend and protect the interests of every public servant wherever he is employed. We have been pleased to negotiate matters with this association in the past, and these new provisions will strengthen our relationships.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to make two announcements which I am sure will be of interest to the hon. members.

The first concerns temporary instruction permits for learner drivers. Experience has shown that the present 60 days allowed on such a permit is insufficient for the average learner to become proficient in handling his vehicle before presenting himself to our examiners for testing prior to receiving his driver's licence. Based on this experience and numerous requests from commercial driving instructors, the government has decided to lengthen the term of temporary instruction permits from 60 to 90 days.

This change will become effective on February 18, after which date all instruction permits will be issued for 90 days. At the same time, in fairness to those who presently hold valid 60-day permits, holders of all those issued on or after December 20, may have them revalidated without charge for an additional 30 days by presenting them to either our driver examination centres or issuing offices.

I feel this step will enable learners to take sufficient time learning to drive before taking their examinations—at the same time adding to the safety on the highways.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the hon. members that The Department of Transport has decided, on a trial basis, to extend the office hours in our driver examination centres as an additional service to the public. Commencing on March 1, these centres will remain open on Thursday evenings so that applicants for temporary instruction permits may take their tests, and the inside tests—vision, rules of the road and sign recognition tests—for drivers' licences may also be conducted. However, in the interests of safety, road tests will not be conducted during these evening hours. Effective March 1, all driver examination centres will be open on Thursdays at the following times: 12 noon to 5:15 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a couple of questions directed to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile), due notice of which questions has been given to him.

The first question: Has the hon. Minister replied to a letter sent to him some time ago by the Hon. R. A. Bell, who was then the federal Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, in connection with the proposed financial agreement between the Dominion and this province re the appointment of an officer to assist the Indian people in the Red Lake area?

Question 2: If a reply has been sent to the Minister whomsoever he may be, what was the nature of this reply?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for having provided me with notice of his questions. I think the answer to question one would be yes, I have been in correspondence with the federal Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, the Hon. Richard A. Bell, concerning the Indian residents of the township of Red Lake.

And two, I have indicated that we have placed a representative of my department

in Red Lake. This officer has now taken up his post and will remain on a continuing basis to serve in every possible manner for the well-being of native Indians within the community. Details of federal-provincial relationships in this area of service are now being fully negotiated.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Supplementary to that question, might I ask the hon. Minister if the officer who is placed in that area by his department is called a welfare officer or would his duties extend considerably beyond direct welfare duties?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, the primary object of placing a man there or naming him as officer is necessarily a welfare officer. That is the primary object of it. At the same time he has authority also to combine his efforts with those who might be connected from The Department of Economics and Development and The Department of Education, to look over the whole situation.

Mr. Nixon: I am sorry to pursue this, sir, but is there any thought that these might be extended to other Indian bands in the province?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, what, for instance, would the hon. member have in mind?

Mr. Nixon: I think the Six Nations group would be the group I would have in mind.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes. That is, for off-the-reservation groups.

Mr. Gibson: May I be permitted a supplementary question? Am I to understand, then, that this particular individual, whose name I do not have, is now permanently residing in Red Lake?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right, he is there permanently.

Mr. Gibson: I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE DRAINAGE ACT, 1962-63

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill No. 35, The Drainage Act, 1962-63.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Is that to go to the committee on municipal bills?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): This bill is to be referred to both the committee on municipal law and the committee on agriculture. They are to hold

a combined meeting, not two separate meetings.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General) moves second reading of Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE GENERAL SESSIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The General Sessions Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC OFFICERS FEES ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Public Officers Fees Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE VOTERS LISTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Voters Lists Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE REGISTRY ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 45, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Is that to go to the committee on legal bills?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): All of those will.

THE JUNIOR FARMER ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Junior Farmer Establishment Act.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Is the hon. Minister not going to make—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, I am.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some explanation of this bill, An Act to amend The Junior Farmer Establishment Act. The original Act was introduced in 1952 and made provisions for loans to junior farmers—under 35 years of age—of 65 per cent of the appraised value of a farm, not to exceed \$16,000.

The application of the Act was suspended in 1959 because it was thought at that time that the farm credit needs would be completely met through federal loans. Mr. Speaker, it is of interest to note that during the period in which The Junior Farmer Establishment Act was effective, a total of 3,843 loans were made and the loss was practically nil.

Without detracting from the very effective job of the Farm Credit Corporation, we are now convinced that there is still a very important role to be played by the province in the field of farm credit, a role which can be on a much more personal basis because of the organization of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and a role which is intended to stabilize and strengthen for the future the general farm economy in this province.

This bill does not change the name of The Junior Farmer Establishment Act. The basic emphasis and importance of this bill is that it is still giving recognition to the fact that our young farm people are the growing agricultural strength of the future and that anything that can be done to get them off to a sound business start in their early years will not only be of benefit to themselves but of benefit to the whole province in the years to come.

The bill is intended to complement, not compete with, federal legislation. While giving increased recognition to the junior farmer

as an individual, the intent and effectiveness of the bill has been greatly expanded to give recognition to the family farm and its place of importance in Ontario agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of the hon. members of this House, particularly those from rural ridings, know that the rural economy and the rural way of life have developed through the strength of the farm family unit.

These farm family operations in which the parents and their children worked together, shared the trials, tribulations and joys of independent accomplishment and have been the training ground for the development of character and moral fibre which has not only been of prime importance in rural Ontario but, I would suggest as well, has left and is leaving its mark in urban pursuits also. There are very few businesses today where at least some of the executives do not trace their beginnings back to the family farm.

Mr. Speaker, this bill as proposed is of both economic and social significance to rural Ontario. We must recognize the great economic pressures that farmers face as a result of the increased cost of labour. This situation has forced the farmer to buy more and more machinery, an extremely high-cost item. To maintain an economic production unit, increased productivity per farm unit has been necessary. This has resulted in a marked trend towards specialization and an expansion of the farm unit with increased credit problems.

For these and other reasons there has been a tendency for farmers to sell the farms to their sons in order to obtain money to live out the rest of their days, and, at the same time, leave the son on a farm which was large enough to support him but which is not necessarily large enough to support a complete farm family including the parents.

These situations create economic as well as social problems. There is no doubt that there is a real desire in many cases for the father and his family to go on and build a larger farm family unit and to continue to live together and grow as a sound social and economic enterprise.

There are many instances in the province of Ontario where family enterprises have expanded and developed under sound and desirable conditions. In these cases, they were perhaps fortunate in being able to arrange the necessary finances for the operation. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we can help agriculture to help itself through the recognition of the fact there is an expressed desire on the part of a great many of our junior farmers to continue on working

with their fathers in an expanded and improved way as a family farm unit.

I have talked to many of these young people and they are looking to the future with some anxiety, but with hope as well, but what is more important, a real determination to be successful farmers. Without exception, they have advised me that anything that can be done to strengthen the family farm unit and allow it to expand and grow within the expanding economy of Ontario would be of untold benefit to them.

In those cases where the father has sold the farm to his son in order that they could both have some income, there has not been any real solution. In many instances, the son may find himself back in the same position as his father when he started many years before. Many of us can think of farmers who have sold their farm to their sons or daughters, and we have recognized, in most cases, this was the most difficult act that they ever had to do. There is a deep and binding link between any farmer and the land over which he has sweated and from which he has derived his livelihood.

During recent months I have talked to many fathers who are faced with the problem of a family that is growing up and has a desire to remain in farming. There is no doubt that any opportunity which can be made available to maintain the cohesion of the family farm and provide for its expansion and development is not only going to help the individual farm family, but, as well, will prove of economic and moral strength to the rural way of life and the province as a whole.

Farm families and junior farmers are quite often faced with insufficient operating capital to buy livestock, machinery, equipment and other items after the land and facilities have been made available. It certainly is not sound to curtail the effectiveness of a farm production unit through the lack of operating capital.

Mr. Speaker, this bill gives recognition to this most important problem. There is a realization by most farmers today that only through sound business management practices can the best net returns be realized on their efforts and investment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill gives recognition to this and provision will be made that farm management advice can be made available to those junior farmers and those family farm units established under this Act who have an expressed need of such a service.

Mr. Speaker, I stated at the outset that it was not the intention of this bill to compete

with the Farm Credit Corporation, rather it would complement the federal effort on a more personal basis because of the organization of The Ontario Department of Agriculture such as our county agricultural representatives, the Ontario Agricultural College, and other field staff.

The bill makes provision that a junior farmer of 21 to 35 years of age may receive a loan up to 80 per cent of the appraised value of the farm but that such a loan shall not exceed \$20,000. The period for repayment of the loan has been increased from 25 to 30 years. In addition, provision is made for a bank guarantee of up to \$5,000 for the development and operation of the farm. This bank guarantee would be available to the junior farmer during the full period of the mortgage.

In the case of the family farm unit which has been set up as a legal entity, and is defined as a farm operated by a junior farmer and one or more persons related to him by blood relationship, marriage or adoption, a loan up to 80 per cent of the appraised value of the farm or farms may be made but not to exceed \$20,000. However, in the case of the family farm unit, a bank guarantee for operating and development expenses of an amount not to exceed \$10,000 will be available throughout the period of the loan.

The interest on loans made to a junior farmer or a family farm unit shall be five per cent per annum and the interest charged on bank guarantees shall not exceed current bank interest.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that this bill gives recognition to three important aspects of farming in Ontario today. An increase in the availability of credit at a fair interest rate, the availability of farm business management help and, possibly the most important consideration of all, the preservation and strengthening of the family farm unit.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, this bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Agriculture fills a very wide gap which existed in the farm economy. There is a great need, as the hon. Minister has said, for increased credit for operating the farms of Ontario, and the federal farm legislation in my judgment has been wholly inadequate to meet the problem which exists for credit.

Now this bill, of course, comes at a late date in the life of this government. It should have been introduced a number of years ago, if it were to render its maximum service to the farm people. We on this side of the

House have said many times that the need for an expansion of farm credit was urgent in this province. Now the hon. Minister at this date has brought down what in my judgment is a very good bill. I think it goes a long way at this time towards meeting the problem.

As we move into the committee stage on the bill there will be some discussion on various parts of the bill, but on the bill as a whole, in my opinion, it meets with the approval of those on this side of the House. I would just ask the hon. Minister, is this going to the committee on agriculture?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is.

Mr. Oliver: Well, that is fine.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words much along the same line as the hon. member for Grey South.

When the farm committee of the New Democratic Party was wrestling with the range of farm problems, I recall that one which provoked a great deal of discussion was this question of credit. It was not simply a case of being able to get credit, because I recall on many occasions the observation being made that there were some farmers who perhaps got credit a bit too easily and got in too deep too quickly. It was to get credit on terms that the capacity of a farm today might be able to sustain. As I understand this bill from the outline of it by the hon. Minister today, I would agree with the hon. member for Grey South that it moves in that direction and appears to fulfil this objective.

Now I would just like to add a personal note, Mr. Speaker, by way of underlining the one regret I have, and that is how many years late this bill is. I can put it on a personal basis because I happen to have grown up on a farm which was across the river from Glengarry and on the Quebec side. Even back in the dark, almost medieval days of the Duplessis regime in the province of Quebec, one of the features of that regime was the extent to which credit on terms that were within the means of the average family farm had been extended down through the years. I know of many farms that survived, that rescued themselves from the kind of debt load that they grappled with and were sinking under back in the 1920's—and particularly after the depression hit—that were able to recover themselves and to get into a relatively sound financial position, but only because the provincial government, literally a generation

or more ago in that province, provided credit along the same lines and to much the same extent as this bill is now doing.

So we welcome it, but unfortunately about a generation late.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out just one thing in relation to this bill and that is the fact that though this gives farmers the opportunity to obtain loans, the main criterion that we are worried about is the fact that the operation of farms today, particularly small farms, makes it almost impossible for these farms to operate at all even with loans. There is no use having or getting a loan unless your operation is sufficiently profitable in order to keep your farm to the point where you make a satisfactory living and do a worthwhile operation. That is the big problem we have today on family farms. I think the government is going to have to do quite a bit more scratching to find a solution to make it possible for the farmer to make a reasonably good living now and in the future.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

House in committee of supply; Mr. H. M. Allen in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE PROVINCIAL SECRETARY AND CITIZENSHIP (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1701:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I asked yesterday of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko), or anyone else, the question concerning whether any representations about these charters had been made to the federal government, when there was a federal government. I wonder if the hon. Minister is prepared to supply me with the information.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Yes, as soon as the hon. member is through.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, it was gratifying to note in the press reports this morning that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass), who was here but is absent now, made some representations to the press after the close of last night's session that he would cause an investigation to be made into the matter of whether these affidavits used in obtaining the revival of these charters under sections 325 and 326 of The Corporations

Act were false. I have not the slightest doubt, of course, that the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) will make available to his investigating officers all the information that is at his command.

I want to say just a little more on the subject about the abuses which are rampant with respect to the granting of letters patent. I adverted to the fact that there are people in the province who do not demonstrate too much concern about their obligations to their creditors and they are in the habit, or adopted the practice, of incorporating one company after another and they do this, of course, after the credit potential of one company has expired. It can be furnished or cannot secure any further credit, so they incorporate another one. As far as I am aware no investigation into the character, antecedents or the previous activities of any applicants for letters patent is ever made. In fact, I know of no provision whereby any person at the discretion of the Provincial Secretary or the Lieutenant-Governor in council or any other person can refuse the grant of a letters patent, if the application forms appear to be valid on the surface, or on their face, I should say.

Of course the whole matter of the corporate disguise is one that has exercised the thoughts of a good many people. The courts have, from time to time, tackled this very vexatious problem. Apart from everything else, the corporation is used as a vehicle for the manipulation of the financial structure of an enterprise in such a way as to avoid taxation.

If I could but get an answer to a question I have on the order paper—I think it is question 2, I have not the order paper before me, but it is the question that deals with the acquisition by this government of the assets of the International Transit Company—if you will give me your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, until I look at it—the assets of the International Transit Company Limited. I might if I could but get the answer to that question, I might be able to demonstrate to the House how the corporation was used, in this very transaction, for the purpose of evading taxes. Now in putting that question on the order paper I have nothing to hide, and it is a bona fide search for information from the hon. Provincial Treasurer. He has not seen fit to answer that, as yet.

But the affairs of the International Transit Company Limited, before it entered into negotiations with the government of Ontario to sell its assets, were quite exotic, and mysterious. I think I am safe in saying that in the negotiations for the transfer of these

assets to the provincial government, the provincial government not only limited itself to the acquisition of ferries that ran across the St. Mary's River at Sault Ste. Marie, but it bought every asset of every conceivable kind owned by the International Transit Company Limited. So I am informed.

The government bought the thing lock, stock and barrel, and took the physical assets, took its right to carry on business, and took all the security shares, bonds and every other asset that the company had.

By way of demonstrating some of the abuses that are carried on behind the corporate disguise, I am suggesting that one of the reasons the provincial government was asked to do that was so the shareholders of this company could avoid the payment of taxes. If they kept the liquid assets, so to speak, and gave the provincial government only the ferries—that is all they had other than their securities—then having been left with the bonds, debentures, and securities, they would remain in their hands in the form of undistributed profits.

I will not take your time, Mr. Chairman, or the time of the other hon. members of the House, to give a lecture on the income tax laws, a subject on which I am almost totally ignorant. But as I understand it, if they remained in their hands in the form of undistributed profit, then before they could get them into the hands of the shareholders, they would have to pay a tax under The Corporations Tax Act. Fifteen per cent, my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Chapple) says.

Now, I do recall that last year in the House we had a bit of a disagreement with no less a person than the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) on this subject. The hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, is not in his seat either, and I would not want to misquote him—maybe somebody would tell him what I had said when he comes back.

He seems to say that the business of avoiding the payment of taxes is a sport or an activity in which one may engage and, if successful, then all power to the victim. At that time, I recall sending to the library for a case where I read a judgment—I believe it was of Lord Wright of the House of Lords in Britain—wherein the learned law lord said that the obligation to pay taxes was one of the incidents of citizenship, and no person should receive any marks or rewards or get any stars on his work book if he so manipulates his affairs so as to avoid his just obligations to pay the taxes to the community, from which he derives benefit. It is as simple as that.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Did he say avoid or evade?

Mr. Sopha: To avoid.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Because there is a decision in the House of Lords that it is not without one's duty to avoid but not to evade.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, that is an earlier decision to the one I was quoting. And the subsequent one, I think, overrules it. Or at least, gives a fresh point of view.

But since the hon. Minister of Economics and Development intervenes, let me put it this way: Many the morning I wake up and thank merciful providence I was born a resident or citizen of Canada, particularly of Ontario, instead of Indonesia or Malaya or Pakistan, or Nepal or to one of the other—Saskatchewan?—or one of the other undeveloped countries. I do not necessarily include Saskatchewan in that. I do not want to do anything that would be a disservice to Mr. Thatcher when he is just on the verge of something.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Something, but what?

Mr. Sopha: To get back to a more serious thing, listen for a minute until I tell you what Mr. Justice Holmes said—a very wise man, one of the wisest jurists that ever sat on the Bench. He said that the payment of taxes is one of the prices he paid for civilization.

Many are the benefits, we, as citizens, get in return for the payment of our taxes. I would stand here and say this if I did not pay my own, but I do pay them, I do not try to avoid them. Here is the real crux of the issue: I do not like to see people operating under letters patent, called the International Transit Company Limited, avoiding the payment of just taxes that they should pay on undistributed profits. Especially I do not like to see the provincial government, acting in complicity with them to assist them to avoid the payments of the taxes.

That is not right. It is entirely wrong, and the provincial Treasury or the other part of the government responsible ought to be able to see the finagling that is going on, if they are asked in buying the assets of a company to take shares and bonds and debentures, and other forms of security. To put it another way, the provincial government might get into the business of running ferries across the St. Mary's River, but it is

no part of the business of this government to be stockbrokers, or bond holders, or security dealers. This is not their business.

It is as simple as this: When they were asked to buy those assets of the company, they were interested in taking over your ferry because it is in a transitional period until the bridge opens. What you do with your bonds and debentures and securities is your own business.

Let me just sum it up by saying that I took a trip down to the corporations information office, and I looked up this company, and I looked at the list of shareholders and directors, and I do not live too far away from Sault Ste. Marie, about 200 miles, and I recognized immediately in the list of their shareholders and directors that they have one thing in common. That was their membership in a certain political party, and it was not the New Democratic Party. Let us leave it at that.

Having said all that, I hope the hon. Provincial Treasurer will answer the question before the session is over.

The other day I was adverting to the fact that there are other abuses—and like the hon. member for York South and the hon. Provincial Secretary who approved of the practice of clipping stories from the newspapers, I want to read one in reference to my remarks about inside dealings of directors of companies with special reference, of course, to the provisions of The Corporations Act administered by this hon. Minister.

Here is the news report of a discussion that took place at a very sophisticated gathering—the hon. Provincial Secretary would agree with me that it was a very sophisticated gathering—in the city of Windsor on the first and second days of this month. The Ontario section of the Canadian Bar Association met in that city to discuss problems that were of interest to the legal profession, and, of course, if they are of interest to the legal profession they are of interest, it must follow, to all members of the public.

They invited some distinguished Americans up there to tackle this very problem. By way of interpolation, it seems to me that in meetings of the legal profession they seldom initiate a discussion themselves of any matter of great public interest until that matter has been thoroughly explored in the newspapers. I mean by that, the legal profession is sometimes behind the times in that it does not promote the discussion of anything itself. It waits until it becomes a matter of interest to the public and then the legal profession has a look at it. That seems to characterize most

of the meetings of the Bar Association that are held from year to year. I, as a lawyer, would hope that developments would take place in our profession to the extent that we would be more in the vanguard of public opinion, public interest and public concern about things that affect us in our daily lives in this province. In any event, the news story says this, and I hope the hon. Provincial Secretary will listen to it as I read it. It is not too lengthy:

The Ontario government should consider legislation to protect public investors from possible abuses by company directors who use inside information to trade in shares for their own profit, the Ontario branch of the Canadian Bar Association said here Saturday.

In a resolution adopted at the general session that wound up the mid-winter meeting, the lawyers called for governmental action to regulate the share-trading activities of corporate insiders and the widening of disclosures in takeover bids.

Ontario lags behind other jurisdictions in protecting the rights of the shareholders in public companies, particularly the United States, where sharp teeth have been inserted in Security Exchange Commission regulations.

This fact was brought out by Professor Louis Loss, of the faculty of law of Harvard University, an internationally known authority on company law and securities legislation. He spoke to the administrative law subsection presided over by Charles Henry of Toronto.

With giant corporations directed and controlled by a handful of executives, and with the shares dispersed among masses of investors, it was of the utmost importance that the investor receive the protection to which he was entitled, Professor Loss said.

The duty of the corporate insider to the company was clearly defined in SEC regulations in the United States, Professor Loss said.

A company director must file a monthly report on any change of his ownership of shares in the company, and if he holds shares less than six months, any profit must go to the company. This was rule-of-thumb and far from being 100 per cent effective, the speaker said, but it was clear recognition that the insider has a duty to his shareholders.

The suggestion from the floor that abuses of trust positions were mild in Ontario as

compared with other jurisdictions brought from Professor Loss the comment: "Unless the people in Ontario are more saintly than those elsewhere, the abuses which developed in the United States will develop here." A little later he said: "I am not advocating it, but it might be a good thing if directors of publicly owned companies didn't own shares, but were just professional directors."

Well, that underlines it, Mr. Chairman, in much more effective terms than I could possibly do, coming as it does from a man who was a thorough-going authority in matters of this nature.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the other day, before we got into the little side wrangle between the hon. member for York South and the hon. Provincial Secretary in respect of the granting of racing charters or their revival, to be more exact, I had asked the hon. Provincial Secretary what I conceived to be very important questions. I will not repeat all those questions but I will repeat one of them. This one dealt with the presentation of the brief of this department and the hon. Provincial Secretary to the Roach commission.

A news report, during this discussion between the hon. Provincial Secretary and myself, said something to the effect that the hon. Provincial Secretary saw me down at the courtroom. It was not a courtroom at all. But he saw me where the Roach commission was holding its hearings at the corner of Bay Street and College, and he said something to the effect that I did not have the guts—I hope he did not use that expression but it was something to that effect—to get into the witness box like himself. Then the reporter who reported that little exchange in this Legislature, whom, I suspect, was caught up with a little enthusiasm, wrote: "This was greeted by a thunderous ovation from the government benches."

Well, we are not unaccustomed to that and there is nothing unusual in that. But I just wanted to make it a matter of record that when I was there I was there in quite a different capacity than the hon. Provincial Secretary.

The difference between the hon. Provincial Secretary and I that day was that he was under subpoena to the Roach commission and I was not. He was being investigated and I was not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I went of my own accord, voluntarily, freely, without any subpoena.

Mr. Sopha: If he was not under subpoena to be there it was certainly suggested he be there, and if he had not been there he would have been under subpoena.

I want to make it absolutely clear also on this score, that anything I knew about the matters that led to the creation of the Roach commission was given in evidence before the Roach commission, every bit of it. There was nothing held back. Had I gone in the witness box there is nothing more that I could have added to what was adduced. In fact, I go on to say that I discovered that I only knew a part of the story in the matter that I knew something about. Even I was shocked by the subsequent disclosures. I leave it at that.

Now before I put that interpolation in I was referring to the fact that I had asked about this brief—and the hon. members may remember if they saw it, I think they weighed it down there and it weighed something like 15.5 pounds, the brief. It came to about—well, I forget, it was more than 1,000 pages and one of them, a book about that big that I think weighed 8.75 pounds itself, one of them consisted only of the granting of social club charters. Mark this, now; you have to follow this closely to get it—it consisted only of information relating to the granting of social club charters where no objection had been received from the police. Do you follow that? About 1,400 pages of names and directors and other relevant information about social club charters where no objections had been received from the police.

And, lo and behold, looking through it, I saw that our law firm incorporated the Coniston Curling Club and no objections had been received from the police, not that anybody in Coniston or anywhere else expected any objections from the police. I think the chief of police is president of the Coniston Curling Club. That may have some relevance. But that was only a little ancillary, a little brief.

But the main brief—to get back to this—I have alleged two things. One, that the hon. Minister wanted the deputy to sign that brief; two, that the deputy Provincial Secretary refused to sign the brief. I have said that flowing out of that that the hon. Minister owes an explanation to the House regarding the discussions which took place with his deputy about the signing of the brief and tell us why the deputy refused. We should also like to know something about the nature of the communications which took place between the hon. Minister and his deputy concerning the deputy's evidence given to

the Roach commission. I think we are entitled to nothing less than a full and frank disclosure of those matters.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I assume there is no one else on the other side who has anything else to say.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Sudbury has spoken at great length and I have come to the conclusion that if you talk in a certain voice and if you assume a certain posture, it is amazing how much sense there appears to be in the knowledge spoken.

I am delighted to see the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Thompson) back in the House after an absence of several days, because—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): He will be here for a long time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One of the great pieces of wisdom that this House heard from the hon. member for Sudbury was that citizenship was no concern of the province, because that came within the jurisdiction of another authority, a federal authority. I make the first suggestion, that that law school that we both graduated from must have had a void, because I suggest to him that one of the Acts that he should read is The British North America Act. The only jurisdiction assigned to the federal government is that of naturalization, not of citizenship. The hon. member should at least read the fundamental basic principles of the law he proposes to expound. I say this to the hon. member—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One of the reasons I am going to fight hard, and fight as I have never fought before to be re-elected, is to ensure that the Liberal government does never get into power to wipe out The Department of Citizenship in Ontario. That is the first thing I am going to do, if I have no other reason.

The hon. member gets up and he talks at great length—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Who established The Citizenship Act?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would suggest that the hon. member for Dovercourt take the hon. member for Sudbury out and tell him about these things. The hon. member for Sudbury said: "Why does the hon. Provincial Secretary not do something about Confederation?"

And I quote him: "I have not heard what the government has done or intends to do. I

have not seen the voting of any funds for this great event."

That is the amazing thing. Some people talk from knowledge, some people talk off the top of their hat. All the hon. member had to do was to listen to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) and look in the blue book, the estimates filed in this House: Vote 1401, item 16, "a grant to the Fathers of Confederation Memorial Citizens Foundation, as may be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in council", over \$800,000. The hon. member should do a little bit of homework and not continue talking off the top of his hat.

Mr. Chairman, we received one suggestion, a suggestion that the Provincial Secretary's department set up a credit bureau that every applicant—now listen to this, this comes from a graduate of a law school—every application and every applicant should be screened through a credit bureau. There are six million people in the province, over 2.5 million adults, and we should set up a credit bureau to screen each and every one.

I suggest the hon. member get up and make a motion again that the vote for the estimates of the companies branch be increased by what, about \$7 million, Mister Accountant? At least \$7 million, to screen everybody.

It is ridiculous. The nature of the suggestion is ridiculous. We incorporate, we screen them thoroughly; their credit rating is good. They go out and the shares are transferred. Does the hon. member propose that we police every transfer of every share in the province of Ontario? The hon. member should stop talking off the top of his head and make sense next time.

Mr. Chairman, he did not read the blue book, he does not even read the red book, The Corporations Act.

There was a long discussion the other day and there will be quite a conversation in *Hansard* regarding it.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Why does the hon. Minister not answer these questions? Stop all this—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I yielded the floor to the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Tell us about abusing the deputy.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have the floor, the hon. member gave me the floor, I accepted it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you, if that hon. member stands up when I have the floor,

that he have good reason. Let us have a bit of order.

He gets up, he is a graduate of a law school, and he expounds at great length about the law, and he did not read the blue book, he did not read the red book. Section 3—I am not going to take too much of the time of the House—section 3—

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister has been taking a lot so far.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, he is not paying attention, the hon. member is not paying attention.

Mr. Sopha: I have my copy here.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes, I can see by the lack of thumbprints it is a brand-new copy. Section 3: "The Lieutenant-Governor may in his discretion issue". And a few minutes ago the House was being told that if the application is in proper form we have no right to refuse. The latest graduate of any law school in the province knows that the Provincial Secretary has discretion in the issuance.

Now for the question of letters patent not being charters.

Read the next line: "by letters patent issue a charter". I refuse, Mr. Chairman, to give the hon. member any more lectures in law.

I will say this, Mr. Chairman, he did make reference the other day to several matters respecting The Corporations Act and disclosures and things of that kind. I do not propose to go into any of them, but just to touch on the fact that—and this is for the information of the non-lawyer members of the House—that The Corporations Act of Ontario has the most up-to-date and far-reaching disclosure provisions of any jurisdiction in Canada.

Back in 1954, we incorporated virtually all the recommendations of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Ontario, and that is the body of which the hon. member did not even know the name; it is the governing body of the province. They have presented a brief—for we are in continuous touch with them—they have presented a brief and the department is in the process of examining that brief.

I will not go into all the other misstatements of law into which the hon. member went, I will answer a question that he asked the other day.

Incidentally, on the point of disclosure by directors, that is a matter which has been under consideration by the department for

an extensive period of time. I hope to have something more to say at the proper time in this House.

The hon. member asked yesterday—he said of himself: "I am not polite".

There is no interjection here or "Hear, hear!"

"I would like to ask: Were any representations made to any department of the federal government from this government, or any department of this government about these charters?"

He says: "I ask that question politely, but I would like to have the answer tomorrow if I could have it".

Well, we give service in The Department of the Provincial Secretary and the answer is this: no, we did not make any representations. But on July 26, 1961, some three months before we revived the corporate powers of any corporation, I received a letter from S. B. Pratt, the assistant chief of the parimutuel betting. I will not read all the letter, but the substance of it is:

They were further advised that any company incorporated in the proper manner prior to March 20, 1912, and who were in good standing, either by continual payment of annual fees or by means of revivor action would also meet the requirements of sections 178—

Mr. Sopha: I wonder if you would cut out the nonsense. I have asked you as an hon. member of this House to tell us about this matter between you and the deputy. Have you no honour at all? No honour at all, that you will not get up like a man. The difference between you and I, my hon. friend, the reason there are no thumbprints on my book is that my hands are clean and yours are not.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I said the other day that I have the utmost deference for Mr. Justice Roach, a commissioner appointed by the government for the benefit of the people of the province of Ontario. I do not intend to say, as I indicated last time, another word until that report is presented to the people. I will have a great deal to say at that time.

Mr. Whicher: I would have to insist that the hon. Minister say something about this. This has nothing to do with the Roach Commission whatsoever. It is a difference of opinion between himself and his deputy, and the question has been given here in a perfectly normal fashion, and we, as members of the House, deserve an answer.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1701.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): No, apparently the hon. Minister is not going to answer that particular one. There are several things under the main office I would like to talk about. This matter of racing charters, I think, perhaps should be reviewed and brought up to date in the light of what was in the paper after the House closed yesterday.

I think the matter raised by the hon. member for York South would have demanded, to my mind, from any hon. Minister who feels his responsibilities seriously, some sort of an answer. We had no answer at 3.35 of the clock this afternoon. Even though this matter has been hashed over at substantial length for two days' sittings of this House immediately preceding this one.

The issue is a very simple one, Mr. Chairman. The issue is raised by the hon. member for York South that there were false affidavits presented. That is issue number one. The hon. Attorney-General stated to the press last night, he did not state to this House, that he was going to investigate.

I wonder what the hon. Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship is going to do in regard to this? I think this House is entitled to an explanation.

Point number two. I think those answers should be given here, but obviously the hon. Minister is not going to answer, so I am just going to delineate the points that deserve an answer and let them go at that. Point number two. The hon. Minister for, I would guess, an hour yesterday afternoon explained at tedious length and with great drama and fingerpointing to the right, left, rear and front, how he had to do what he did. Then at the end of his great oration he said that since it has caused so much fuss, he is never going to do it again.

I would like the hon. Minister to explain to us why he had to waste an hour of the time of this House explaining how, by law, he was bound to do what he did, and then in a few seconds at the end of that hour-long speech say, well, I am never going to do it again because it has caused so much fuss.

Suddenly the hon. Minister discovers he has arbitrary power which he spent an hour explaining previously he did not have.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to some consistency from the hon. Minister in this House?

Mr. Sopha: Well, if you hope for that you are in the stars.

Mr. Singer: Finally, Mr. Chairman, the point made by my hon. colleague from Sudbury and emphasized by my hon. colleague from Bruce, on the question about the exchange between the deputy and the hon. Minister did not touch or relate to any of the matters referred to in the Roach commission. They were not in the terms of reference, and they were not brought before the commission in any manner whatsoever. They are matters effecting the relationship of this government with the civil servants of this government and have been raised by an hon. member of this House. They deserve an answer from the hon. Minister, if the hon. Minister is at all responsible. If the hon. Minister chooses not to answer, then we can all draw our own conclusions as to the extent of his responsibility.

The next point I wish to make is this: There were some discussions about citizenship, and whether the hon. member for Sudbury said there was no right to take—I have forgotten—it was so garbled by the time it came back at us. Let me go at it in this manner: The hon. Minister in recent years, or his department in recent years, has attached a new title to it. It is The Department of Citizenship as well.

During the course of this fall, under the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) who was then the Minister of Lands and Forests, the hon. members of the Legislature were invited to take a trip into northeastern Ontario. Some of us, myself particularly, I suppose for the first time, had no opportunity of seeing the conditions under which the Indians live in the far northeastern sections of the province of Ontario. To say mildly, sir, that we were shocked at the conditions that exist in certain parts of this country and the conditions that the Indians live in, is to understate the case by a very substantial degree.

I feel certain that most hon. members of this House have read the excellent articles in the Toronto *Telegram* written by Mr. MacGregor and the articles written in the Toronto *Daily Star* by Mr. Morris concerning the plight of the Indians in other provinces, and touching on the plight of the Indians in this province.

In the vicinity of Moosonee and Moose Factory, it became particularly interesting to note that certain efforts are being made by certain religious groups to bring young Indian children in from the trap lines and give them a certain level of training, a certain touch of civilized life, decent clothing, decent food, and, for several years, a certain degree

of education. Mr. Chairman, the fascinating thing is that after these youngsters have been given this taste of civilization, good food, good clothes and some education, those in charge just wipe their hands of the whole problem, and these youngsters are allowed to go back to whence they came to the trap lines.

There is no effort being made by the government of this province under its citizenship branch, and I think that is where it logically should be, to train these Indian youngsters to take a role in the economic community in this province of Ontario.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (York-Humber): That is not true, and you know it.

Mr. Singer: I say it is true.

Mr. Lewis: I do not believe you.

Mr. Singer: I do not care if you believe me or not; this is what I observed. If the hon. member for York West will bide his time, he can get up and say whatever he wants. In the meantime, I would refer the hon. member to the series of articles that are run in the two afternoon dailies.

Mr. Lewis: Why don't you tell us what you witnessed?

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for York West obviously can neither read nor see. He was there and he should have seen it the same as everybody else. I refer him to the articles in the *Toronto Telegram* and the articles in the *Toronto Daily Star*. He does not believe what he sees. The point is, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the interjections from the hon. member for York West, the point is—

An hon. member: You were not looking.

Mr. Singer: The point is, Mr. Chairman, not withstanding the inane interjections by the hon. member for York West, the point is—

An hon. member: York-Humber.

Mr. Singer: The point is that with this Department of Citizenship there is an opportunity for this hon. Minister if he wanted to do a job to do something for this very important group of citizens of Ontario. We have not seen a single finger lifted in the direction—

An hon. member: What?

Mr. Singer: We have not seen a single thing done; a single indication that there is

a responsibility, a single indication that there is even an acknowledgment of the problem.

And the hon. member for York West—

An hon. member: York-Humber.

Mr. Singer: York-Humber, I am sorry, excuse me. The hon. member for York-Humber indicates the Tory blindness, the Tory reaction in all its unhappy ramifications.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to turn to another subject and that deals with matters arising out of the report of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario, tabled by the hon. Minister in this House on December 19, 1962.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There is nothing in the estimate of The Department of the Provincial Secretary relating to the report of the Liquor Licence Board.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it has always been my understanding that the Liquor Licence Board reports to this House through the Provincial Secretary. To confirm this understanding I asked for, from the Clerk, and received this report which the hon. Minister tabled on December 19. It has been my understanding that in a democratic parliament a Minister is called on to report for the various branches of the government he administers. This is the Minister who is called on to report for this branch and, therefore, I propose to talk about this subject.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Secretary tables reports from every department of government but he does not answer for every department of government. It is a procedural point. If you want to debate liquor I will take that report and put it on the order paper and call it as a separate order of business and you can discuss anything that may be in it. This is the procedure I suggested to the House last year in order to expedite these matters and this I am prepared to do again.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that this was the reasonable place to do it, because there is no place in this book and we had a similar sort of argument last year about the election laws of the province. We have a great deal of trouble discussing these things as they come up. Certain of the matters that I would like to discuss this afternoon are particularly current;

it would seem reasonable and logical to me if we cannot get at it through the—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, there could not be anything more convenient than what I have offered to do. What more do you want? I will put the report on the order paper as an order of business and we will call it as a separate—

Mr. Singer: Why cannot it be done today?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Because it does not come within the estimates of the Provincial Secretary and the Minister of Citizenship, that is why. We are trying to run this House in an orderly fashion; I am responsible for running it and this is what I propose to do.

Mr. Singer: Well, who then answers for it?

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Energy Resources): He does, certainly.

An hon. member: Who does?

Mr. Singer: No, that is not it. The hon. Minister from St. Andrew (Mr. Grossman) is the Liquor Commissioner. He has The Liquor Control Act, and what I propose to talk about has nothing to do with The Liquor Control Act. It has to do with The Liquor Licence Act. The only person I can get anywhere with on the front benches of the government is the hon. Provincial Secretary. Now, he is here before us at a time when he is bringing in his estimates and certainly it relates to his estimates and we should be able to talk about The Liquor Licence Act.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, we have a committee on government commissions to deal with this very point. Before that committee will come the chairman of the Racing Commission, the chairman of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, the chairman of the Water Resources Commission. You will have an opportunity there to examine and question the men who are charged with the responsibility of running these commissions. If you want to debate these questions, I will give you an opportunity to do so. I am quite prepared to put them to a debate. We have done this, this is an accepted procedure in this House, it has been used for many, many years. We have done it with reports of select committees when we wanted to debate them—you have no Minister under whom they may come. Those select committee reports have been placed on the order paper as an item of business so that they can be freely debated, and I think this is the correct procedure.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me answer. The committee on commissions serves an entirely different purpose. They bring before them certain people who are appointed. They are appointed by the government and they are left there as long as the government wants to leave them there. And those people, when they appear before the committee on commissions and they are backed into a corner, can, and with good reason, resort to the excuse that what they are doing is government policy. Now, what I want to debate is government policy, and the only place I can debate government policy is here before a responsible Minister, and the responsible Minister should be the person who has his signature on this document.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Nonsense, he tables the Hydro report also.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1701 carry?

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question before you put that vote?

The question is simply this: the hon. Prime Minister has stated that the place to ask these questions is in front of the committee on government commissions. All of the hon. members of this Legislature are not part of the committee, therefore we would be excluded from discussing these matters if it is going to be put into that committee. And I suggest to you, sir, that all the members of the Legislature have a right to discuss all matters of government business. And I suggest that by treating this in this manner you are indeed excluding a certain number of the members of this Legislature from discussing the affairs of this province.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, the rather puerile efforts of the Opposition to leave the impression that I am trying to hide something or cut off some discussion—

Mr. Singer: Let us debate it now.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: —does leave me pretty cold. I tell you I will put this report on the order paper. It can be debated. You can ask any question you like; you can say anything you like. You can take the report. It will give you a free uninterrupted debate in this House on the whole liquor question. Now what more could you ask than that? I am simply trying to run the affairs of this House in an orderly manner, in order that we may get on with the business of the

province and debate these things where they should be debated.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Prime Minister, I would like to ask this question. In other words, from what you are saying—all these commissions do not have to respond to any Ministers of the government, am I right in assuming that fact? Because from what I can see then, you cannot discuss any of the commissions' work under any of the Ministers I would like to find out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, no. You will find that there are places to debate these things. The Water Resources Commission, for instance, has a monetary request which comes in the estimates of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. But with some of these things, there are specific places for discussion, and I am making one available. I do not know why we should get into this great big hassle. It is not a matter of any great importance, except the hon. member wants to force his will on mine when I am responsible for running the business of the House. Perhaps this is what is behind this debate—simply a matter of procedure. The whole thing will be debated here. The hon. member can say anything he likes. Question the government all he likes, but let it be done in an orderly fashion—that is all I suggest.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, what the hon. Prime Minister has said brings up a question of long-standing difficulty. That he would appreciate, I am sure. Not only the Liquor Board and the Liquor Licence Board, but we have the Ontario Hydro Commission, we have the Parks Board, we have the Hospitals Commission. I think it is a weakness in our legislative system that each one of these great commissions spending large sums of money have only a weak relationship with the Legislature and that they are not responsible to a Minister of the Crown.

I have said this for years and I repeat it here and this brings it very much to mind. The Liquor Commission should be the responsibility of some Minister of this Legislature. The Hospital Commission should be responsible to some Minister, and likewise down the line. It is not enough for my hon. friend to say, as he said this afternoon, if you want to discuss the liquor situation, the Liquor Commission, we will put an order on the order paper. We should not have to do that. Supposing we want to discuss the

Niagara Parks Commission, then we would have to ask my hon. friend as a courtesy to put on the order paper a matter under which we could discuss the Niagara Parks Commission.

Some way, some day, we have got to come to the place in this House where, if we are going to have more and more commissions doing part of the work of government that those commissions shall be directly responsible to some Minister of the Crown, so that the members of the Legislature at some period will have the widest possible opportunity to discuss the affairs of those commissions and committees. We have not got that privilege at the present time.

So I think my hon. friend from York South has a point indeed. It is true—

Mr. G. Laverne (Russell): Got him in the wrong riding there.

Mr. Oliver: Well, it is all right, you know who I mean anyway, my hon. friend, the Provincial Secretary. Technically the hon. Prime Minister is right, this commission reports, among other commissions, through the Provincial Secretary.

It is hardly right to say that because it reports to the Provincial Secretary that he should be the Minister responsible. What I am saying is that there must be a reform in our legislative set-up that brings these commissions before the scrutiny of the Legislature at a time when the hon. members will have the fullest opportunity to discuss the matters pertaining to those commissions.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise some questions about The Department of Citizenship. The hon. Minister was good enough to suggest to me that during my very brief absence the hon. member for Sudbury had implied that his branch should be demolished, and that it should be a federal responsibility. I read what was said in *Hansard* and I would suggest, sir, with due respect, that the hon. member for Sudbury did not say that. But I would suggest to the hon. Minister myself, sir, that if he does not give more substance and get closer to the needs of the people in this province in this area of work, then it should be abolished.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is too bad the hon. member was not here the other day to hear what work was being done.

Mr. Thompson: I read very carefully, sir, your report. As I mentioned before, during the last estimates about my good friend the

hon. Minister of Citizenship—I have, sir, heard this expressed by others than myself so I am not prejudiced about it—he is a man with a poetic soul. We were at a meeting at which the hon. Minister spoke eloquently. I want to re-emphasize that poets often dwell in images and their thoughts are up in the air in many cases. The type that we want here is to have poetry like Schevenko might have expressed, sir—and I think the hon. Minister will recognize that name—or that Burns might have expressed, words are much more deep to the real problems of the people.

I would like to start first of all with Indians, the first Canadians of Canada. There is not a word mentioned about them in the hon. Minister's estimates. How many of these fine citizens of Canada—the first citizens—have left the reserves and have come into metropolitan areas? I ask the hon. Minister that question: how many have come, for example, to Metropolitan Toronto? What kind of work is being done to help to integrate these, our first citizens, into the urban community?

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York Centre raised the question, and someone said, what would you do? Well I would suggest to the hon. Minister that in this whole area, he does not have to look far afield, he could just look for example to Manitoba. I notice where the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) has suggested he was going to have a welfare officer and I, sir, hope that he might have moved even further than this, become a little more dynamic in his approach towards the Indians who are moving from reserves.

I read the study that has been done by the Manitoba government, have read of the community programme development by the Manitoba government in helping the Métis and Indians off the reserve. I have seen this as a responsibility on the part of this department. I would suggest, sir, that if the hon. Minister were really acute to the problems of this citizen, the Indian, he would have been aware of the community efforts taking place: the start of an Indian House in Toronto; he would have been aware of efforts starting in other communities and he might have told us not only that he had been aware but shown that he was keen to say something in the estimates to congratulate the people who are doing this, and also given some concrete suggestions how he and his government are going to help these people in this project.

I would suggest that again there is almost

an emptiness in the proposals that the hon. Minister says his department has carried out during the past year. I notice the discretion on the part of the hon. Minister, that in his submission he does not tell us what topics he discussed at these seminars. Last year, and I almost felt he blushed when he suggested the topics, he told us that they discussed minimum wages, safety regulations.

What could he tell to the people who go to work when there has been and still is a complete lack of guaranteed minimum wages for the men of this province? What could he discuss, Mr. Chairman, except to say with shame that we have not followed through in any legislation?

What about safety regulations? All through the sessions that I had the privilege of attending, there has been no legislation brought forward for many of the people who have come from Europe to guarantee any safety in work for them! And yet the hon. Minister is going to have tea parties—prior to you, it was tea parties—now you serve a luncheon, I notice, when you discuss these questions.

What the people want in connection with citizenship is to add substance to it, to have a government that is alert to provide a framework of legislation so that they can hold themselves with some dignity and be assured of their safety and at least of a minimum wage. I would suggest again that this is an area in which you could certainly work much more aggressively.

One thing, in my own area, in my own riding, that came up a while ago, again something with substance to it, is a question of a group of newcomers who had come from a rural area and who are having the tough situation of having to pay heavy mortgages, heavy interest rates with respect to mortgages. I mentioned something about that about two weeks ago. I would wonder that the hon. Minister would not see it is a role and a responsibility of his information service to try to encourage the newcomer, give him advice about basic problems, such problems as employment and such problems as housing. I would hope that he would say he would work in the area of credit union; something with substance, not just the tea-party atmosphere and the vagueness that we have seen on other occasions.

I would refer, sir, to the language classes. It seemed to me as I sat through the manpower committee—and I am not at liberty to talk too fully at this point about the recommendations that are being made—I noticed the chairman, and I commend the way that he again permitted open questions

to be presented by all members who were present there. We are waiting with keen anticipation for the results of this brief.

But something that interests me all through the committee hearings—during the questions and the briefs that were brought forward—were the questions about newcomers to Canada in connection with getting job training, in connection with being able to get apprenticeship. Where there was a serious gap in their education qualification they would have to take a long period of retraining, academic retraining, before they could be acceptable for vocational retraining.

I know that the hon. Minister is aware of this. In his own riding he has had representation in connection with this. I would have hoped that at this time when he submitted his report on The Department of Citizenship there would have been meat and substance about helping people, helping newcomers with respect to retraining.

I would say that where the people have a real problem in adjusting, they are open to financial exploitation. I noticed last year—perhaps it is because I am of Irish background myself—but I raised the question a number of times last year about a pig farm. It seemed to me that all I got from the other side was hilarity at my concern about the slaughter of pigs. But it was deeper than just my natural enthusiasm about pigs, it was deeper than that, because this was a project that had been started, newcomers had been exploited, their savings had gone into this armchair farm effort. Some of them had come down to complain and inquire from this government. Some newcomers came, and the hon. Minister tells us that his department is there to advise the newcomers.

I myself have talked to one of the people who came down. He went the merry round of bureaucracy and no one suggested to him that there is a department that he could go to and get help.

Therefore I suggest, sir, that there needs to be much more publicity, and co-operation between the various departments, in order that someone with these kind of problems can be directed to the source of referral and guidance which the hon. Minister says exists in The Department of Citizenship.

I would like to ask further, because every time we examine the estimates of the hon. Minister I am always left with a sense of vagueness about what really concrete things are being achieved. I should say that I have never really found out, and I have asked every time. I do not think the hon. Minister is a slippery person in philosophy or by

tongue, and perhaps it is because I am slow. But I have never been able to find out the number of people the hon. Minister has in the citizenship classes where you get a citizenship certificate. You can take this certificate, as I understand, to the citizenship judge and he then recognizes that the person has qualified academically. I remember once that the hon. Minister expressed enthusiasm about that big project.

I have never been able to find out how many people, within the past year, for example, have graduated in this course. I have never really been able to discover, and I have been looking at this, why the hon. Minister should take pride in the fact that his department is now going to pay and set up its own language instruction material.

I would be interested—I realize the hon. Minister has a very able memory, but I notice he is not making any notes on my questions. I am hoping that he will answer them. May I reiterate one was about the number of people who graduate and my second question is why would the hon. Minister take pride in having to, I presume, print his own material for language instruction? Why would he not use the federal government's?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Ours is better.

Mr. Thompson: Well, yes, that is what I thought. Once again, under the federal department, in the last four or five years, they do not seem to be keeping up to date, and the hon. Minister is having to take the responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: These negotiations have been going on a long time.

Mr. Thompson: I know, but the hon. Minister was very happy to get the material previously, and I know that he used it a great deal when there was another government in office.

The other question I would like—the hon. Minister has answered the first, I think, and he has answered more succinctly than I thought he would. The other question that I would like to ask is about the research project of the department. These are always very vague to me.

However, just before I come to them, the hon. Minister talked about kitchen workshops, where there was the teaching of ladies who could not get out, you go out and teach them English in the kitchens. Last year I had also asked about the number who were taught and I did not get an answer to that. I am

also concerned if the hon. Minister is still continuing it or not. I would be interested in knowing the number of ladies being taught, in the kitchen, to learn English.

Then with respect to research, sir, I notice the hon. Minister throws in a lot of names of organizations that he is working with on research, but he does not somehow come around, in my opinion anyway, to tell us what the research is about. I wonder if he would just note down that I would be interested in learning of the projects, the research projects, that he is intending to do.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, with the hon. member for Sudbury, that I myself have very grave doubts of this Department of Citizenship that the hon. Minister has set up, if all it is doing is appealing to the poetic instincts of the hon. Minister. In its idealism, I think we can achieve, on a national basis far better and far wider. I would like to think when we are looking toward citizenship, we are trying to enthuse people to look up to the small mountain peak, I would like to look up to the highest Canadian mountain peak.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): The hon. member is getting poetic.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I am, and I hope it is on a national basis that I get poetic in connection with citizenship. It is substance that we want here from the department. It is substance about the welfare and the working conditions of the people, and that to me applies to this province and to the department. There, sir, I think the hon. Minister has a real job to do.

I congratulate him in some areas. On his language classes to some extent, although I have never discovered how many graduates, I congratulate him. But he still has a long way to go and when we form the government I can assure him we will show him what can be done.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I hope that does not include the wiping out of the department.

Mr. Thompson: I notice the hon. Minister did not put them down, could he answer my questions about the number who take kitchen training and the number who have graduated?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I refer the hon. member—when he wants to find out the substance of the work of the department—to my remarks the other day in the House; as to the value of them that is a matter of

his opinion. I prefer to be judged by the people outside.

In respect to the kitchen classes, there are about 150 women taking them in the Hillcrest Park area and we will provide teachers for any group of six or more women who will participate anywhere in the city.

In respect to the language training, I gave the statistics. About 1,500 obtained certificates. But there is no compulsion in our classes; they come, they take the lessons, we do not force them to take any examinations, it is up to the student. We encourage them to come into the classes as much as possible.

We have four classes of women training Italian and Portuguese, learning sewing machine. There will be a class of 75 at COSTI that we are going to upgrade in order to assist them to get ready for their technical training.

And I close by telling this, that if the hon. member read my remarks the other day I indicated to him that we were foremost in the field at our level of jurisdiction in the world, we intend to stay right there.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I am glad I waited to hear the hon. Minister's reply to some of the things which the hon. member for Dovercourt brought up. I am glad I waited, because it proves to me that the hon. Minister is a very modest man.

The hon. member for Dovercourt brought up the question of Indians in urban areas. I thank him for bringing this matter to the attention of this House because it is a real problem. As I said, I am glad the hon. member brought it up. There is a story to be told about Indians, especially in the urban areas such as here in Toronto, and I, if I may, would like to bring some of the personal experiences I have had along this line of endeavour by this government, to the attention of the House, because I think there is a story to be told.

Perhaps the hon. member for Dovercourt has not heard this story. I do not think it is because he has not been in this House the last three weeks, I think it is just that the opportunity has not yet been given.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on a matter of privilege—point of order, I am sorry. I do not want to ask the hon. member to retract that statement but I happened to have been away for about three days. My party is unusual in this and the fact is that I show a permanent loyalty to my party and to my leader.

Mr. Lawrence: I am glad to have the reassurance of the hon. member for Dovercourt that he has, while away from the House, been looking after the interests of his riding. He mentioned loyalty to his hon. leader and to his party. Some of us may be confused as to whether he is speaking about the federal party or the provincial party, but I am glad to hear that reassurance.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, if I can get back to the Indians here in Toronto? The bottom end of my riding, Mr. Chairman, now has a great number of these people, and I cannot help but use the term unfortunate people. Here in Toronto there have been some preliminary estimates done by the welfare agencies in that area. Just an indication of one agency's experience in the lower-end of my riding in downtown Toronto, may I say that they estimated that about three years ago in the Sherbourne-Jarvis-Parliament-Carlton Street areas there were about 200 Indian families. This was just a short time ago.

The last estimate taken of the Indian families in that area is now up to 1,200. That is a tremendous growth of these people in the last few years, and especially in the last few months. It is creating a problem here in Toronto that I am sure is also going to be echoed and duplicated in other large urban areas. They have had some experience of this problem in Winnipeg in the last couple of years.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, the problem is going to be even greater here in Toronto.

I think it is a problem that should be brought to the attention of this House. The problem with the Indian in a large urban area is, quite frankly, that they do not assimilate to the normal, busy, crowded urban life, the way other new groups do.

The Indians themselves are a proud people, a proud race, and, perhaps, they have every right and justification to be that way. But the problem is a welfare problem, a justice problem and an educational problem. Because most of them are settling in my riding I am happy that the hon. member for Dovercourt brought this up today, and I feel that I would be negligent in my duty if I did not bring to the attention of the House just what some of these problems are.

The Indian people do not understand our ways in the urban areas and they do not fit into our urban life. If any of you have had the opportunity of being in the drunk courts on a Monday or Tuesday downtown here in Toronto, you will see this problem. A very great percentage of these people who are

caught in the web of the white man's justice are now Indian.

It is a terrible problem in the welfare field. It is a very terrible problem as far as the police are concerned. We have one welfare agency on Sherbourne Street—a settlement house called Central Neighbourhood House—that is doing some very great pioneer work in this field as far as trying to ascertain just what the problem is, what the extent of the problem is and how we should tackle it.

When the hon. member for Dovercourt attempts to condemn this government and this particular hon. Minister for doing nothing in this field—I am not going to castigate the hon. member for doing that. All I am saying is that the hon. Minister is a very modest man for remaining in his seat today and not telling you what this government is doing.

Mr. Thompson: What is he doing?

Mr. Lawrence: Just a minute, I will get around to it. Another group as well as the Neighbourhood House is attempting to tackle this problem. A very active and new group under the leadership of Mrs. Margaret Jennings is attempting to set up an Indian-Eskimo centre here in Toronto. I hope that publicity will get spread around about such a centre so that these misguided, misinformed and utterly confused people will go to that centre, and there obtain the proper guidance. It will be a guidance centre as I understand it, sending these people out to the proper agencies and the proper places in which to have their problems solved.

Both the Central Neighbourhood House and the people who have now set up the Eskimo-Indian centre have been in contact with this government. There have been extensive negotiations going on over the last year with this government, and it relates not only to the hon. Minister whose estimates are before the House today, Mr. Chairman, but as well to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). I am not one particularly lavish in my praise to governments where there have been no governmental activities at all. But, in this particular instance, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that there has been nothing but the utmost co-operation and the greatest sympathy shown to these people, and to the people who are attempting to help them, by this government. Not only from one department, but from at least two others to my own knowledge.

The Central Neighbourhood House is a

settlement agency associated as a united welfare agency here in Toronto. With the help and co-operation of this government it is going to be setting up a two-year or three-year pilot project and study, in downtown Toronto. I understand this is really going to be a pioneering study. There has been nothing like it on the North American continent before. It is a pilot study just to ascertain what the problems of the Indian in an urban area are, specifically what the extent of this problem is in downtown Toronto, and how we are going to meet this problem, because it is going to be an even larger and greater problem than exists today.

I had no knowledge that the hon. member was going to bring this up today. I anticipated I might say a few words when the estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare were before the House. But, just as a complete coincidence as I came into this House today, I was handed a copy of a letter from the hon. Minister of Public Welfare indicating that there is going to be a conference and a gathering here in his office on February 20 next, to which both of these groups are invited. I hope that a lot of the problems will then be solved and some co-ordination achieved between these two groups.

As far as Mrs. Jennings and the Indian-Eskimo centre is concerned, under the guidance of this government there have been indications of support and leadership shown which will result in co-ordination between these groups and the department. As I said, the hon. Minister himself must be an extremely modest man not to be making these statements to the House, but I feel that someone should.

If the hon. member for Dovercourt does not know it, and he should know it, there is an advisory committee to this government made up of Indians and they are doing extremely valuable work. A great deal of effort is being put into the Indian problem in the province of Ontario, not only in the urban areas but right across the board including the Indians up in the reserves. Quite frankly I am not too sure that this government even has the jurisdiction or the authority to do that work, but they are doing it. I feel that instead of being castigated, this government should be recommended, and highly recommended, for this work.

This work not only extends here in Toronto, it not only extends into the reserves in southwestern Ontario, but it extends to the biggest problem, the Indian in the north through welfare, and through the hon. Minister's estimates that are now before you

and through The Department of Education. This government is doing an extremely large and great amount of work in these northern reserves as well as here in the urban areas. For a change, I feel that instead of these insults and innuendoes being thrown from the other side of the House, for a change, they should get up and congratulate this government on the work they are doing.

Mr. Lewis: May I be permitted? First I wanted to say some kind things to the hon. member for York Centre, but I see he has left his seat, and may I ask at this time if the hon. member for Dovercourt was on our northeastern trip into Moosonee last year?

Mr. Thompson: No, I have listened to the situation and looking at the picture—

Mr. Lewis: I cannot hear the hon. member too well. Was he at Moosonee last fall?

Mr. Thompson: I was not there, no.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to put it on the record. I attended that northeastern trip and I will say this—the hon. member for York Centre is not in his seat—we made it our business to take a tour of Moosonee to look into all conditions, and I want to assure this House—and may it go on the record—that the Indians in Moosonee are well clothed, well housed, well fed. There is good hospital accommodation, there are adequate educational facilities, and if you were to go up there today, with the unemployment situation as it is, looking for help, you could not man a corner grocery store. They are quite happy and I suggest before we shoot off our mouths down here in Toronto that we go up to Moosonee and see the real conditions.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, as the representative of the most northern riding of this province, I feel compelled to offer a few comments about the remarks made by our eastern Toronto members on Indian affairs.

Nothing I hear here in Toronto fills me with more contempt than to hear the experts, such as the hon. member for York-Humber and the hon. member for St. George, expounding on a subject of which they have no knowledge whatsoever.

The hon. members sat in this House before my time and heard the words of Albert Wren, my predecessor, and they have heard me speak on the problems of the Indian in this province. What the hon. members do not know is that the province of Manitoba has

done something about it. What have we done? Nothing. No.

I have heard the hon. member for York-Humber speak on our Moosonee-Moose Factory trip. For the information of the hon. members I was on that trip. I was at Moosonee, I was at Moose Factory, and I concur entirely with the remarks by the hon. member for York Centre. What I saw apparently was something different from what the hon. member for York-Humber saw, and I may say, sir, that I saw everything I possibly could. I do not know where he was at the time.

Mr. Lewis: I was with the hon. member.

Mr. Gibson: No.

Mr. Sopha: Nobody knows who was there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gibson: If I may turn to the specific problems of the Indians in the district of Kenora which, as I say, is the most northern district of them all. I assume that the hon. member for St. George will concede that he has no knowledge of this particular problem. I should like to say this, that from the time I first went to school until the time I finished high school in Kenora, I came in contact with three Indians and that was at the high school level.

One of those was a girl and two of them were boys. I do not know whatever became of the girl but I do know this: one of the boys tried to get a job in Winnipeg and was refused a job because of racial grounds. The second one never did try to get a job because of the experiences of the first one. Both of them have now ended up back on the reserve with grade 12 education, and one of them in particular is not noted for his sober behaviour.

That is typical, Mr. Chairman, of the conduct of the Indians, and it is something, I suggest, that is a problem which should well fall within the aegis of the department of this hon. Minister.

The typical behaviour of a post-school Indian in our district varies, depending on whether you are male or female. If you are male you are sent to work in the family home. If you are female you are sent out of the family home to obtain employment in any fashion that you can. The key to this thing is the 16-year-old breaking-off period. If you are 16 years or over out you go, because you no longer draw children's allowance that can be used in the family home.

I suggest this. As has been said earlier in this House, the Indians are our oldest residents. They are our oldest citizens, second-class though they may be treated by this government. In my time in the district of Kenora—I have been there for a few years—I have never known nor ever heard of a member or representative of this department to come and visit to consider and to see what can be done to help the Indians. I ask this government this. What has this department done, what has The Department of Citizenship done to help the Indians in our area in the past, and what do they propose to do in the future?

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1701 carried?

Several hon. members: No, no.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. Minister was going to answer the question. I have a question I would like to put. Is he going to answer the previous question?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am not going to answer any questions.

Mr. Gibson: Surely, Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to the courtesy of an answer?

Mr. Thompson: What are you going to do about Indians?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The picture has just been explained at great length.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: May I make a comment on this, Mr. Chairman? I think there is a serious need for concentrated attention in this area, especially in the Red Lake area, but I think it is something that we must approach on a broader basis relating to Indians living off the reservation.

The conditions, however, are not brought about simply in relation to the field of housing. They are economic, they are educational, they are in relation to medicine and hospitalization and so forth. Last year we introduced in this House as one of the points of our housing programme, Mr. Chairman, a study in relation to Indians living off the reservation.

This requires, in order to bring it about, a degree of co-operation and understanding between the municipalities, or the areas involved, whatever municipal organization there is, the federal government and the government of the province of Ontario. It also, quite apart from housing, requires certain social aspects in The Departments of Welfare, Education, etc. We have been

working in the housing branch of The Department of Economics and Development with the federal government in the CMHC, the Indian Affairs Branch and other organizations as well as The Department of Public Welfare and others.

We are sending people to the Red Lake area at the end of this month. We would have had them there before this except that the delegation that came from the municipality asked us to put this off until the end of February.

We are going there and we are going to come up with a programme that will make it possible for Indians living off reservations in this area to embark upon either a programme of their own home ownership or a rental programme. It may very well be that, before the House rises, out of the negotiations in the community and with the federal government, that we can have something more positive and concrete to show this House.

We would like to begin on a pilot programme in the Red Lake area. There are two ways, as I said, in which it can be done, but I think and I hope, by the time my estimates come before the House, I will have something more specific to relate to the House.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of some regret that as an Opposition member I am not permitted to rise during the estimates of the hon. Provincial Secretary to discuss housing in the Red Lake area. The subject with which I was dealing was the integration of the Indian population with the white population in the province of Ontario. I am simply asking the hon. Provincial Secretary to advise what The Department of Citizenship has done, and will do, to aid and assist in the problem of the integration of these people who form a very substantial portion of our population.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, I would try to point out to you it is impossible to integrate people unless you deal with their housing as a basic element.

Mr. Gibson: Good grief!

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister, do you have a special housing programme for newcomers who come to Canada? I know that it was suggested two years ago by the hon. Minister of Citizenship—he was going to have a housing programme, he was going to have a referral service centre at the Union Station for newcomers. For some reason this was not followed up.

The hon. Minister of Economics and Development, I think, made a very important point. He said: How do you deal with the integration of people if you do not look after the housing? Could I ask the hon. Minister of Citizenship what programmes have you got in connection with housing of newcomers?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: It comes under this department.

Mr. Thompson: What does the hon. Minister do? Could I ask you what programme you have?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The matter comes within The Department of Economics and Development. But I suggest this, and I say this to the hon. member as sincerely as I ever did—it is the only point that I ever differ with him—I do not appreciate him playing newcomers against other citizens. The last time this was discussed the hon. member talked out of one side of his mouth for housing for the newcomers and then he immediately talked out of the other about the rest of the citizens. I do not appreciate this playing one off against the other.

Mr. Thompson: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have the floor. I have the floor.

Mr. Thompson: On a point of order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is not parliamentary to talk of a member talking "out of the side of his mouth" and inferring that I am insincere in the remarks I make. I think if anyone can speak, certainly from the example of the work that he has done, that I have shown sincerity towards all people in Canada. I can speak.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, this government is interested in housing for every resident in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to see some examples of it.

An hon. member: Well, do something about it, then.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I think that is a most unfair remark that the hon. Minister made about the hon. member for Dovercourt. I do not think that there is

anyone in this House who has spent more time in helping people who have come to Canada in recent years, and to accuse him of playing newcomers off against other people in this province or this country is most unfair.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He may not have done it intentionally.

Mr. Trotter: I do not know if you made it intentional, but you certainly played it up and that is a most unfair remark, because of all the people I have met in public life I do not think there has been a more dedicated, able person working among the newcomers than the hon. member for Dovercourt.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I did not dispute it. I was pointing out to the hon. member very sincerely the possible effect that some of his words could have.

Mr. Thompson: I want to make very clear the possible effect that I want my words to have and it is simply this: In connection with newcomers coming into Canada, and in connection with the people already in Canada, that to me one of the most important aspects is that the people of this country and this province should have adequate housing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I agree completely.

Mr. Thompson: And I would suggest to you, sir, that you have such an empty, superficial approach to this. When you at one point suggested that you were going to set up a housing referral service for newcomers coming in, I asked: are you going to set it up? What have you done? Have you done it? Do you feel it is a fundamental need? Why have you not gone through with it? Answer that.

An hon. member: They had tea parties instead of housing.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member cannot seem to get those tea parties out of his mind. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, at the time that this matter of housing referral at the Union Station was being discussed, there was a meeting held of major welfare agencies of the province within the Metropolitan area here. It was their considered opinion that the work could be done through the travellers aid, whom we support financially, and the work is being done that way. The housing programme has been displayed by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and he will have his programme laid before the House for every citizen without distinction.

Mr. Thompson: I stand again on this, sir. I mentioned it two weeks ago. I have lived in a house where I think there is overcrowding. There are shocking conditions. It is beneath the dignity of people to live in such houses. It is because of the lack of adequate housing in this metropolitan area, not only for immigrant families but for people who have low incomes.

While I am on this subject I would like to refer to the Indian as the first Canadian. If you are suggesting I am trying to play one group against another, I assure you I am not. I have taken an interest in our first Canadians for a considerable time and have worked with Father Renaud in Ottawa on an Indian commission, one of the first voluntary Indian commissions started. Mr. Chairman, something that I would have hoped the hon. member for St. George would have mentioned—I am sure he knows of it—is an Indian commission which is doing research into the Indians who are coming from the reserves associated with the Canadian Adult Education group which assisted in setting it up. They are doing factual research.

But the significant thing that I notice, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. member for St. George described the reason you did not say anything, Mr. Minister, sir, was because of some modesty you have.

Then he went on to describe what community groups are doing, what Mrs. Jenning and her group are doing, what another community group is doing.

I will tell you what they are also doing. They are demanding from this government that they assist in some way with the responsibilities in connection with human betterment for which private voluntary groups cannot assume the responsibility.

During the last session, I had representation from the people who are trying to organize the Indian House here. I would say that I have questions about the philosophy of having separate houses such as this, but they were trying to organize this. The co-operation they wanted from your departments of government were not only to meet with you—you seem to glory in saying that you had a housing meeting—what I want are results, not meetings.

In connection with this, these people have been coming to get some financial assistance. And I will go further than this, they had the—

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): They are going to get financial assistance. They have both.

Mr. Thompson: They are going to get financial assistance?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry. The hon. Minister of Public Welfare is just answering me on a very important point.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I had a meeting with the Indian-Eskimo executive one day. I directed them to the office of the hon. Prime Minister, I believe; the Minister of Education, and they walked out with a cheque for \$3,150—exactly to the dollar that they wanted at that time.

Mr. Singer: It is not charity they want. They want to be trained to fit into the community.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am talking about that association. You do not even know what we are talking about.

Mr. Thompson: Was this from the point of view of the house that they are going to set up? What was the purpose of giving \$3,000? What did you give it to them for?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, I think it is public money. I would like to know what you gave it for.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It was given to the Indian-Eskimo association—

Mr. Thompson: For what project?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —for purposes of organizing. They were a new organization and wanted some assistance to get off the ground, so to speak, and they were extending their efforts across Canada. Frankly, they said to me, if we can get some support from the province of Ontario I am quite sure with that lead we can get some support in the province of Manitoba, and the province of Saskatchewan. And as usual, we led.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Hear, hear.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, just let me finish. I was not going to enter the debate but these things have come up so I might as well explain.

Representations were made to us by one of the organizations mentioned by the hon. member for St. George. I really cannot remember the name of the organization but I can remember the name of the individual: Mrs. Jennings, with whom I had been associated previously on some citizenship matters and who is a very hard working, charming woman who devotes a great deal of her undoubted talent to helping those less fortunate than herself. They made representations to the government for assistance and this matter is being studied very closely at the present time. Do not tell me that we just study everything and do not do it. Public funds are involved here. They are asking for expenditures. It has to be checked with various departments of government so that we can assure ourselves that the money will be spent in the proper fashion, and that it is a proper place into which to put public money. We are dealing with these people constantly, and I will just say to the hon. member if we do not meet with them, we cannot communicate with them, and we will never know what they want to do, so meetings are necessary.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, actually meetings are necessary. The question is the frequency of meetings and the results of the meetings which seem to me to be important.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Wait for it, it will be there.

Mr. Thompson: I have been waiting.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The hon. Minister will recall that I asked him if he would answer a question while he was speaking yesterday. He told me that I would have my opportunity afterwards. I am particularly concerned, if I might revert, to the matter of these racing charters and the explanation given by the hon. Minister yesterday. This is the first opportunity I have had to raise the question again. The hon. Minister went to some length pointing out, as I understood it as a layman, that he had no alternative but to revive these various charters when an application was properly made, and in his opinion this application was made. Then the hon. Minister told us later on—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I made no such statement at any time.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time the hon. Minister has questioned that he had made the statement. Two or three other hon. members in this

House spoke in the meantime and said substantially the same thing.

If I might be allowed to proceed? I understood that the hon. Minister said that he would exert his authority as a Minister to see that this did not recur. My question to him is: is this an arbitrary decision of the hon. Minister or is this a matter which is permitted him under the statute? If this is an arbitrary decision, it seems perfectly reasonable that a new Minister could take a different attitude.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: May I just speak to this question, Mr. Chairman? This matter of revivor of these charters was dealt with at some length in the House a year ago. In the late spring and early summer I interested myself in it. I was dissatisfied with the procedure for reviving these charters, although it appears to be perfectly legal within provisions of The Companies Act.

I think any counsel would give an opinion that these charters can be revived in this fashion and that when revived they have the powers they are presently exercising. But it did not seem to me to be what I would term a very neat or tidy way of dealing with the question of racing in the province particularly as there were alternative methods over which we would have control in this House, that is, to bring a bill forward in this Legislature if you wish to establish an organization which could go to the Racing Commission and get racing days. So I instructed the hon. Provincial Secretary not to revive any more charters. In other words, to bring these procedures to a halt.

There were people who had been doing this over a period of years and there were various individuals who had made plans to go about it in this fashion. Those which were being dealt with at that time were completed, but no other applications for revival since that time have been entertained as far as racing charters are concerned and none will be.

I would only make one other point in regard to the racing charters and that is this: The racing charter gives you the opportunity to conduct parimutuel betting, but unless you can get racing days allotted to you from the Racing Commission you have no opportunity—

Mr. Sopha: They always get them.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, now, I suggest to my hon. friend that they do not always get them and with the growth of racing in the

province, which appears to be very popular—it certainly is popular with the horsemen and it appears to be popular with our citizens because they support it—the Racing Commission has to balance out the requirements of the tracks and so on across the province. This is their function and this is why they are there. Therefore, simply to revive a charter does not give you the right to hold a racing meet. After you have the charter you have to go to the Racing Commission which in turn allocates the racing days. There are a good many of these charters which have been revived that have no racing days attached to them, as I understand it.

While I am on my feet, I might as well say that the eternal desire to paint all these applicants as Tories leaves me a little cold. We are the party in power. We have a greater majority of people in this province supporting us than any other party. Therefore, in any group of people you are going to meet anywhere, you are going to have a predominance of Tories. It does not matter what group you pick.

An hon. member: Why does the hon. Prime Minister not try it out? Why does he not test it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will get around to these things. We will get around to it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, now. Why does that little boy from down Windsor way not watch his tongue? I can tell you of one man I am not afraid of.

Mr. Reaume: What?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can tell of one man I am not afraid of.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, let me finish my explanation to the hon. member for Wentworth.

An hon. member: Little boy blue.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, that is better than little boy pink.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the record may be kept clear, the procedure that was being followed was a result of the discussions here and my own examination of the situation. I did not like it. There was an alternative which I thought a better procedure and, therefore, last summer it was decided that

there would be no more of these revivors. This is how it came about. This is the story.

Mr. Singer: What the hon. Minister told us then was not right.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Oh yes, it is. That is exactly what he told you yesterday. He said that he was not going to revive any more charters. I am telling you that I asked him to do that.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was really trying to establish the principle of what charters can be revived and what charters cannot be revived. Is this a matter or right, or is this an arbitrary matter determined by the particular Minister or the particular Prime Minister who happens to be in power at the time?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, the point really is, if the hon. member could see it this way, it is a right for any corporation. We might really do harm to somebody, name unknown, if we were, for instance, to amend the legislation and to remove out of the Act the right to revive any charter.

I do not think that would be a very sensible thing to do and there are other circumstances which may be perfectly logical and a very good procedure to have available to somebody in the intricacies of business. What we are doing is simply saying that we will not revive any old charters simply for the betting rights that are associated with them under the Criminal Code. Those people who want those rights are not denied them, because they can come forward and submit a bill to this House where we can examine it and decide whether or not we wish to grant it.

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Chairman, at what date did the hon. Prime Minister start this new plan of not working on the old charters?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I could not give the hon. member an exact date. I suppose I could go back in my diary and find out the dates of the appointment I had to discuss this. I discussed it with the hon. Provincial Treasurer who has had some background in this matter. I really knew nothing about it myself until this matter came up.

Mr. Reaume: The only reason that I ask that question—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It would be some time in June, I think.

Mr. Reaume: In June?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes.

Mr. Reaume: I was just wondering whether it was after Earl Rowe had gotten all of the old ones or not. Was it after that time or before?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I believe the last ones revived were revived on behalf of some men in Hamilton. I do not know what their names are. I do not know when Rowe made his application. He must have started it before the time I examined the situation. What we said was, for those who have made application we will process them as they have been processed in the past.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Did you make an announcement at that time?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Do you not think that was unfair?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, I do not think it was unfair. If another person applies for a revivor we just say "Sorry, we are not going to revive them".

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, surely this gives a privilege to those people who happen to have done it beforehand. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister if he really wanted to deal with this in an unbiased manner it would have been more proper to take the action he has now taken in the very beginning. But the simple fact is that following the procedure and by taking the arbitrary action on the part of the government, the government has in fact said, "If it suits us, we will accept this one. If it does not suit us, we're not going to accept any more".

In so doing, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government has in fact granted a monopoly to a few people, without their having to go through the process of having—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, anybody in this province who wants the right to conduct parimutuel betting in connection with horse racing can bring a bill forward, right into this House. The power is there. We would have to deal with it.

Mr. Sopha: Why didn't Earl Rowe do that?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Because the policy was different, until I changed it.

Mr. Sopha: There has been no announcement on it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, who has been hurt by this?

Mr. Sopha: Have you heard of the public?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Certainly I have heard of the public. I say that if they want to know, they go to somebody. If the public comes to you, you would say bring a bill into the Legislature.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I submit to the hon. Prime Minister that by not making a public announcement, by determining in his own way, quietly—I would not say secretly because I suppose it did eventually become public—this would not have been known until the matter was raised in this Legislature. There was no announcement. The public were not informed about who could, and who could not. In dealing with the matter in the way that they did, they did in fact, show partiality to some groups. I am not suggesting they were all Tories, or they were not Tories, I do not know. I am concerned with the principle that the hon. Prime Minister has only now found an alternative method of dealing with this problem.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It has always been there.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: It has always been there, but the hon. Prime Minister did not choose to use it. By doing it the way he did without bringing it out publicly and making a public announcement, he did, in fact, show partiality.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, if any members of the public were interested they would, I presume, apply for a revivor, and they would be told that this method of action is now closed to them. But they have an alternative. No rights have been taken away from them.

Mr. Singer: The remarks of the hon. Prime Minister are most interesting. He tells us he determined this matter last June, and that the policy was changed as of last June. I must admit there is some sense in it. But, if this in fact is correct, why did we have an hour of gobbledygook from the hon. Provincial Secretary yesterday afternoon? Why did we go through all of this procedure? Why did the hon. member for York South have to repeat his charges? Why didn't someone on the government benches, if you are not going to let the hon. Provincial Secretary talk, get up and say "We have examined the policy and we found it is wrong and we are going to change it"?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You know why. Because the hon. member for York South was criticizing and making very serious allegations against the people who follow this procedure. That is what the hon. Provincial Secretary was answering. The inference was that they were all crooks. That group over there think they have a monopoly on righteousness and honesty, but that is not so. This is the point. The hon. Provincial Secretary was answering the allegations of dishonesty made by the leader of that group. I believe it is fair for me to say that he implied dishonesty. This is what the hon. Provincial Secretary was answering. He was not answering the policy involved.

Mr. Singer: All right, accepting this, surely this government would appear in a better light in the eyes of the people of the province of Ontario if the hon. Minister had said this in explanation for what he did in the past, and that it is not happening any more. That is not the way the debate transpired. Anyone who was here yesterday knows that—his hour-long explanation, and finally as a petulant aside, he said, "I am not going to do it any more."

Now, surely he did not say the Premier had told him in June that this was no good. He was justifying it. He was justifying a continuation of it. It is more than passing strange that the Premier has now to come to his rescue, take over the debate and explain that the policy was reversed and the hon. Minister did not give us any indication of it at all.

I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister, apparently we are not going to get it from the hon. Minister, what he is going to do about the most serious charges that were made by the hon. member for York South, when he alleged that there were false affidavits.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South did not, at least not to my knowledge, give us any details of his charges. But I have asked the hon. Attorney-General to investigate these general allegations that he has made. The hon. member says that the facts in the affidavits are wrong. I assume the hon. Attorney-General will go to the man who took the affidavit and question him, tell him this is what he has been accused of. We have no evidence. All we have is the bare allegation that they are wrong, and that someone swore a false affidavit.

This is not backed up by any facts, any evidence, but I asked the hon. Attorney-

General to investigate it. I presume he will do so with the facts he has available. I believe this was in the press this morning. I believe the hon. Attorney-General mentioned this to the press after the House rose. In any event, that is what we propose to do.

Mr. Singer: This was what was in the press. Very often we hear an hon. Minister who is on the Treasury benches say to the reporter they did not say it. This matter has been very hotly discussed in this House, and I would have thought that the House was owed the courtesy of having the announcement made here.

When the Premier says there were not facts I would think when an affidavit states that a meeting took place on a certain day, and an hon. member arises and says there was no such meeting, there is a fact. I would think that when an affidavit states that certain information was brought to the attention of the person who swore it, and when an hon. member arises in his place to state there was no such information possibly available, there is another statement of fact.

So, at least in two instances that occurred, and there are probably more, if I had the transcript of the hon. member of York South's remarks in front of me, but I have not. In those two instances, he made positive assertions of fact, that are contrary to affidavits that are in the hands of the government. When the hon. Prime Minister says there is no evidence, there is evidence. There is evidence brought forward by the hon. member for York South.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, I have advised that it be investigated.

Mr. Singer: Well, will we get a report before the House rises? Or is it going to be allowed to die or left in limbo during the fighting of an election campaign? Are we not entitled to get an answer?

Mr. Bryden: Or until something in Vancouver blows it over again.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, the matter has been allowed to be distorted, and I would like to bring it once again into its sharp outlines. The hon. Prime Minister gets up and says, if I understand him correctly, that sometime in June, he cannot be any more specific than that, he made a decision that this method of reviving racing charters could not be allowed to continue. Hereafter no more revival of them would be permitted, and henceforward a private bill of the Legis-

lature or of the Parliament of Canada, would have to be sought. Let us say right here and now that the last thing the promoters of race tracks would want to do would be the securing of a private bill in the Legislature. Let us leave aside the Parliament of Canada because, after all, it will be readily recognized without the necessity of painting pictures that the promotion of a race track in Windsor or Ottawa is not quite the same thing as securing a charter for the creation of a Christian society for the propagation of the gospel in Nigeria.

One could just picture—and the imagination would be absolutely titillated with the prospect—that if this group headed by Baskin, the MP of Renfrew North, came to the private bills committee—that committee where we wrangled for an hour this morning about whether Scarborough should be allowed to make a noise or not—and wanted that committee to pass a bill to give him the right to race horses in Ottawa, the place would be jammed to the walls at the prospect of the mayor of Ottawa herself arriving to do battle with him. And she would be there, according to the press reports; indeed she would.

There would not even be standing room. I daresay not even a mouse could get in the room as Mr. Baskin and Mayor Whitton confronted each other as to whether he should race horses in her backyard or not.

And so it goes with Windsor. We have the most representation from Windsor in this House. It is we who speak for the people of Windsor. The hon. Prime Minister speaks about the majority of people being Tories. Well, as I look at my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), the majority was absent there when they replaced the man who used to be in the Racing Commission. I have not strayed very far from the subject in saying that.

A determination of whether they race horses in Windsor or not would be made in that committee, and for Earl Rowe and his son, Lennox, it would be the last thing that they would want—to expose it to public scrutiny and give the opportunity to the representatives of the people of Essex county to decide whether they wanted horse racing or not. No. We must keep it in sharp outline notwithstanding this decision made at the midnight hour in June that we are told about—a decision that did away with the necessity for justification by that man in whom the hon. Prime Minister can no longer have any confidence. He cannot have any confidence in him.

Mr. Singer: He does not even let him talk for himself.

Mr. Sopha: He says that back in June he called this man up to his office and he told him that this revival of racing charters must stop. The next legitimate thing is for the hon. Prime Minister—we are not supposed to say this—but the hon. Prime Minister, when he could have no confidence in the man who holds this portfolio, is to send him packing. He sort of came down like a bomb at a pinball machine until he hit the very bottom.

But there are the sharp outlines of the thing, you see. Baskin and Earl Rowe could have come to get their private bill, but they chose not to. According to the allegations by the hon. member for York South—according to him the way they did it was to send a secret agent in first, Mr. McNeil, the man whom they sought apparently—I do not know—but a man whom they sought to come into their employ, who was privy to all this information.

McNeil knew what was going on in the Provincial Secretary's department even if the hon. Minister does not. And apparently the one man in the House who does not know what is going on in that department is the hon. Minister himself.

Mr. Reaume: He does not want to learn either.

Mr. Sopha: My hon. friend from Essex North says that he does not want to learn either, and he will not learn.

Mr. Reaume: He cannot.

Mr. Sopha: We will not learn, you see. They sent him in and they got these things. They weaseled these charters out and got them revived, this practice now that has become anathema. It is under the scourge. It is going to be abolished. When the Tories got their charters, and they are all Tories no matter what the hon. Prime Minister says or how he gets up and tries to get out of it, they are leading Tories—

Mr. Singer: They are Members of Parliament.

Mr. Sopha: Members of Parliament when there was a Parliament, you see. They got their charters. Now the hon. Prime Minister says that is the end of it. It is the end of it.

Well, if the hon. Prime Minister continues to repose confidence in this hon. Minister, if he wants to make his announcements about

investigations outside the House—then he is dealing with a group of people over here who are going to keep these matters in focus, in sharp outline. As I said, we are not going to forget these things. We will settle this issue with them. We will settle this issue with the hon. Provincial Secretary on the place and at the time where issues like this should be settled. We welcome the coming of the day to settle with him.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I regret that the hon. Prime Minister has seen fit to absent himself from the House just at this particular moment while this matter is still under discussion, after he himself has had a few words to say about it. It would seem from my observation that he treats it as something of a laughing matter because he was chuckling and laughing a good part of the time when it was under discussion in the last little while.

He is a great hand, as are his colleagues, at casting aspersions on the hon. leader of this party (Mr. MacDonald). This is an old tactic these hon. gentlemen use in diverting attention from their own inadequacy, and it has been resorted to again.

I think it is most unfortunate that a person holding the high office of Prime Minister of this province should resort to such a tactic, but that is what he has done again. Now that he has done it I would not like this House to fail to notice that the conduct of his government, of himself and his hon. Minister has been far from frank and open in this matter, to put it mildly.

This matter was not raised for the first time yesterday. It was raised when these estimates first came before the House. I am not sure whether it was the day before yesterday or on an earlier occasion this week, but it was earlier than yesterday when it was first raised. It was not until yesterday, after the matter had been under discussion for a considerable time, that we learned that the policy complained of had been abandoned. We were told it was last June.

Mr. Singer: We did not learn that until this afternoon.

Mr. Bryden: Until this afternoon, yes, even later, at any rate after a lengthy discussion. Mr. Chairman, I would think that any Minister or Prime Minister who was trying to be fully frank with this House would have made that announcement at the outset of this discussion.

Indeed, I would agree with the hon. gentlemen on the Liberal benches that it

should have been made at the time when the policy decision was allegedly made. But not having been made then, at least to be fair to this House, the first thing the hon. Minister or the hon. Prime Minister should have done in commenting on what the hon. member for York South said would have been to announce that the policy had been abandoned, and had been abandoned some substantial time ago.

I would also point out to this House, Mr. Chairman, that the abandonment by the government of the policy, whenever it took place, is an admission by them that it is a fundamentally wrong policy. If it was fundamentally wrong then I submit to this committee, Mr. Chairman, that it ought to have been abandoned at the time the applications came in. The gentlemen who made the applications ought to have been advised that they should take the open-and-above-board procedure of applying for legislation, the alternative which the hon. Prime Minister has said was open to them and is still open to anyone else. Surely that was the proper way to deal with this whole matter.

The fact that it was done by the back door, that ancient charters were revived, with the effect that it was unnecessary for the gentlemen concerned to use a public procedure, is something that this government should explain much more satisfactorily than it has done up to now.

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Chairman, in as much as there has been some talk of having a track in the city of which I am from, I thought probably I should mention a word about it. Frankly, I feel that the people of Windsor would welcome the operation of a race track. I do not think, however, that the people of Windsor want anybody to operate one there after having obtained a charter or charters via the back door. If Mr. Rowe or his friends have obtained a charter from the back door, your back door or any other back door, then I say that this is wrong and under those conditions the people of Windsor would not want the operation there of a track by those type of people if they did the things that they allegedly have done.

If the policy altered, and if the policy changed in tune, and we have only the word of the hon. Prime Minister for it, well, it is all right, it is perfectly all right.

I think in all fairness that regardless whether it was before or after the 18th of June or when it was in June, it was only fair that the people of the province, and especially the hon. members of the House, ought to have been informed at that time

by a very clear-cut statement coming from the hon. Prime Minister himself in view of the fact that there had been so many arguments pro and con in this province of ours as to how these charters were being obtained.

Now you did also say that if no letters had been written, or something of that sort, in no action for the revival of an old charter had not been started prior to this date of your so-called statement or change of policy, then there would be no more new charters granted unless they applied to the Parliament up in Ottawa, or here. But I think that that leaves the door wide open, too, and again that we might find ourselves in the very same kind of muck that we are in right now that by reason of some fellow, whoever he happens to be, having made a phone call in May or April, that might be interpreted by you or the hon. Provincial Secretary—and I do not really think at this hour that the hon. Provincial Secretary could interpret anything—I want to find out from you, and I think we have a perfect right to ask you to issue a statement and make it one that is clear. There is nothing clear about the statement you made while rubbing your hands and referring to people over here as being a little 'pink'. Well, nobody worries about that.

I just want to say this to the hon. gentleman: My dear friend, if you think for a moment—I am sure that you do not—but you think for a moment that there are more people in favour of your party than there are of our party, then there is only one way of finding it out and that is to go to the people at the very earliest date.

We are mindful of the fact that you and your little agent to your right are carrying on large numbers of tea parties but when you make this sort of a crack, you see, you think that your party speaks for more people than our party does, then it opens the door for us and we do not have to stick to the estimates that we are now dealing with. But I am going to plead with you once more. I think that this is an important problem. You have treated it with a smile on your face, and just about in the middle of it you walked out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reaume: All right, all right, wise guy, I know you are laughing. We will wipe that off your face though. What I am asking you to do, if you will—and I do not think it is a big job for you if you will only do it—why do not just issue a clear statement as to how you stand on charters, the revivor and a change of policy as of a date in June and mention clearly in your statement what day

this thing takes effect? I think in that way that you would be doing the people of the province a great favour because I can plainly see that the policy of the Premier and the policy of the Secretary of State are two foreign policies; he might just as well be the Secretary of Foreign Affairs because everything that has happened in this House for hours now has been as foreign to him as anything in the world could be.

I am glad, sir, that the hon. Prime Minister has now taken over the affairs of the department to try to get it straight. I would be hopeful that in this House, probably Friday, that a statement would come from you, sir, making this thing clear in the minds of everyone.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of prolonging this debate, it has gone on long enough but I just want to make one point and that is this: I believe the hon. Prime Minister when he said that he had decided in June of last year that no more charters would be given along these lines. But after the conduct and the performance of the hon. Provincial Secretary yesterday afternoon, it is very, very difficult to conclude, even by inference, that he knew anything about the decision of the hon. Prime Minister.

There is one point I want to make: if that was the decision of the government last June, one may conclude, I presume, that the statements and the protest and the comments of the hon. member for York South at the last session, the spring session, regarding the Ottawa raceway, must have had some effect on the decision of the hon. Prime Minister. Can we conclude that?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Sure.

Mr. Thomas: In fact, at that time when those statements were made in the Legislature, the hon. Minister did not have the courtesy to comment at all.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member for Oshawa that probably this debate has gone on long enough. Before it concludes I think that there is one answer to a question that the hon. Prime Minister must give to this House and to the people of the province of Ontario.

The hon. member for York South has made serious charges concerning people in high places in the province of Ontario. What I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is this: If the charges as alleged by the hon. member for York South prove to be true, will the hon. Prime Minister see that these charters

as issued to these people will be revoked? Now, surely, you should give us an answer to that?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There are about three questions. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, as far as the hon. member for Essex North is concerned: When I made the reference "pink" it was following his reference to "little boy blue". It had no connotation of any kind and I would never leave that impression.

Mr. Reaume: Oh, I am sorry, too, I did not want to hurt the hon. Prime Minister's feelings either.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Certainly we will investigate these allegations and if they prove to be true, or whatever is discovered in the investigation of them, whatever action is indicated will be taken. I take this just as seriously as you do, just as seriously as the hon. member for York South.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, before this vote is carried, I want to say to this House that the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister when he stood in his place a little while ago and said that he had come to the decision sometime in June that this was not the right way in which to secure these charters; he found that his mind rebelled at the way previously used and at that point he called in the hon. Provincial Secretary and he said: This far and no more.

He comes into the House today and he asks us to see him as a man with clean hands in regard to this matter. The thing that bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is this: that my hon. friend was Premier all through that period in which Rowe and his associates were scurrying around this province and gathering up these ancient relics, these bits of paper, that used to be charters, when they were going through this silly formality before The Department of the Provincial Secretary. And my hon. friend said not a word.

He did not see anything wrong, apparently, with the procedure at that time. He waited, Mr. Chairman, till his Tory cohorts got what they wanted from the hon. Provincial Secretary's department and then he became so holy overnight, he gets up and says: "These things that have gone on are distasteful, they shall not go on any more". Well, they need not go on any more because his Tory friends have got all they wanted. I would say to the hon. Prime Minister that he does not look too good.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious we are into a political dogfight. But the various remarks that the hon. member has attributed to me in my reference to this procedure are not so.

Look at it from this point of view: There was a completely legal procedure and there were two alternatives. Now is this such a large matter of policy or is it a matter of administration when there are three ways by which something can be achieved? It appears to me that one of those ways is better than another and, therefore, I am going to ask that it be done this way.

Now is this a matter that needs to be trumpeted from the rooftops? Frankly, I did not think so. I will find the exact date, if it has any significance. I recognize the hon. member is trying to tie this down to June 18, when there was a federal election, and what significance that has I fail to see.

I had to inform myself as to these various procedures. I was not an expert in getting charters, but I had to get into the Criminal Code to see what alternatives were available and this I did after the session ended to find out really what the facts of the matter were. I had no way, nor can you assent, as the hon. member is attempting, to let these people scurry and do all these dishonest things. No one has proven to me so far that anything dishonest has been done.

Up to that time it appeared to me to be a highly artificial and legalistic procedure, which it is under The Companies Act. I do not even know who had applications for charter revivors at that time. But it would be very simple to check in the office of the hon. Provincial Secretary and find out. I could not tell the names of who they were. I just thought that there was a much neater, tidier procedure available. So why not use it?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, just one final remark and I will leave it. It seems to me this was brought to the attention of the government by the hon. member for York South during the last session. As I recall, this was certainly well in advance of June. Now if we take the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister at face value, my own question to him is: why did he not take action when it was first brought to his attention? Why did he leave it until further charter revival applications were in the department of the hon. Provincial Secretary before he acted?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would have to check to find out. In fact, I could not tell

you whether there were any applications made. I do not even know the dates that they were made. But you do not do everything in one day. This is a large government. I have a lot of responsibility. I have to take things in their order. At any given moment I have unfinished work on my desk. It came up in due course in consideration of the operation of government.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on item number six, the government hospitality fund. Originally, last year, they appropriated the sum of \$30,000 for this item and then subsequently another \$20,000 was raised by Treasury Board orders.

Mr. Chairman: Item five?

Mr. Trotter: Item number five, I am sorry. I think that this item is indicative of the wild spending on the part of the government. I realize you have to do a certain amount of entertaining, you have foreign guests, you want to do the proper thing, but the money which is now being spent is entirely out of proportion of what should be done.

Last year we appropriated \$30,000. We spent \$45,000, and now we are going to appropriate \$40,000 for the coming year. We have increased the money for the free-loaders' circuit by about 30 per cent, and certainly you do not see any such increase in welfare or for the Indians or welfare grants.

This business of holding high-cost receptions for various groups is bad for the government, and I think if these people realized that it was the taxpayers' money being spent they would certainly look twice.

Now I realize there is an election coming on and it is a great opportunity for the government to use government funds in order—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This fund is exactly the same this year as it was voted last year. There was \$40,000 voted last year and we are asking for \$40,000 this year.

Mr. Trotter: On page P-2 it says "Appropriations, \$30,000". I am sorry, that is two years ago. You have still gone \$5,000 over the appropriation.

In any respect, it shows you that in two years you are spending almost half as much again on what I call the free-loaders' circuit. I realize these various groups you treat are no doubt very good people, and I take no objection to them. I take no exception to

these groups themselves, but, for example, when you spend on the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants over \$4,000, I say that you are going completely out of line.

An hon. member: They ought to be able to buy their own booze.

Mr. Trotter: And, again, let it not be thought that the chartered accountants are not a good group. You have here in the public accounts for 1962 over \$35,000 which you do not even bother listing in the accounts, because they are accounts under \$3,500. That is an awful lot of liquor at public expense. I realize, I am quite sure, that it is a result of an election coming up.

The Trade Crusade was held here on Tuesday, as an example. I think it was a shocking thing, that so much government money should be spent on a trade crusade. These people, whether they be from this department or anywhere else, will work with government without having to have money spent on them. You had nearly 2,000 women on Tuesday night in this government, all of them, I would say, are patriotic and gladly co-operative. Why do you have to set up three or four bars in order to pour gallons of booze into a multitude of women in order to get a trade crusade going? I do not think this is necessary and is entirely a waste of government money.

For example, here in this department, what I understand by entertainment and by goodwill, is when the citizens—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Is the hon. member saying that the women who were there that night are a lot of boozers?

Mr. Trotter: I have had Conservative women call me and say they were appalled at the government money that was spent on Tuesday night.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Is the hon. member saying—

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I sat quietly and listened to this man. I have the floor and I am going to hold it.

These items, Mr. Chairman, that are listed on page P-6 of the 1962 public accounts—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, can you keep order? Thank you.

These items that are being spent are far too lavish. I think the government should

cut back and even though it is an election year, I insist again that the reason why this government is spending money like drunken sailors is simply to use government funds for the next campaign. And to give you an example how they use this money for themselves, they tendered a banquet to curlers at Kitchener and they did not bother to invite the hon. leader of the Opposition. Here again; here is how the government push their own candidates, their own leaders in government. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is time the government stopped using public money—stopped using such high-cost entertainment.

Before I sit down, I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Secretary: would he be good enough to table in this House, the list of accounts?

You have a list of accounts amounting to \$35,000 that are buried. We do not know who got it. It could be spent for the benefit of the Tory party throughout. I am asking: would you table the list of these accounts totalling \$35,000?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will read the accounts, he will see, for example "American Association of Motor Vehicles Administrators: \$1,393.15." It is on page six. If you add up all these amounts under \$3,500 it will come out to \$35,515.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I understand all of these are listed; the entire \$35,000. May I ask one thing? You spent \$4,500 on the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, which is no doubt a very fine organization. But, I bet the men in that group would rather you gave them that money to do some research with instead of buying them a drink. You would be using your head if you spent the money that way. I suggest you give this type of thing some thought.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, if I may say so, I looked in at that meeting and dinner in the Royal York Hotel. I observed some 2,000 very fine ladies from this province, including some prominent women from my own city and district. I object strenuously to a member in this House standing up and saying there was excessive drinking going on at that meeting. I say there was nothing of that kind. He made the allegation that there was excessive drinking. I want it withdrawn. I was there myself and I assure you, Mr. Chairman, his allegation is untrue.

Mr. Trotter: I did not accuse anybody of excessive drinking. I said thousands of dollars were being spent; three or four bars were set up. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. Whicher: I would like to say something about this too. I am rather surprised when we read about the social times that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development is having around the province, that this \$45,000 is going to be enough.

Mr. Bryden: The economics department has its account too.

Mr. Whicher: I know that they have. In fact every department in the government has what they call their hospitality fund. These are not hospitality funds at all; they have turned out to be political funds. The other day I read with astonishment in one of the evening papers that \$17,000 was spent on the entertainment of 2,000 people in the Royal York Hotel, by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. One does not have to be an educated genius to understand this is a little bit more than \$8 a head.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I want to rise, on a point of order.

First of all that is quite irrelevant. The second point is the bill has not yet been received, and—just a moment, relax—the last dinner that was held was held in London, and it was on the basis of \$2.20 a person. There were some five or six hundred people to our Ontario Manufacturing Opportunity Show, I do not know yet what this one is. When the bill comes then I will know.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman if I may say—

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman. Just a minute, I had the floor. I would say this does not come under these estimates. We are dealing with the government hospitality fund. There was one mentioned in the paper the other day. I am quite willing to take the hon. Minister's word, of course, that he has not got the bill yet, but I hope with all sincerity it is not more than \$17,000. In any event, I would like to point out, if the paper was anywhere near correct the other day in suggesting that \$17,000 was spent, it would be over \$8 a head, and some of the Indians that the hon. member for St. George was speaking about this afternoon do not get \$8 per week in order to eat.

It seems to me this government is going a little bit too far, not only in this hospitality fund but in the many other hospitality funds

they have among the departments of government. We will show them to you as the various estimates come up. Sometimes we are asked on this side where we could economize when we take over, and this I think, Mr. Chairman, is one of the places where we will.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I will not take up the time of the House. There are listed here in the Public Accounts of Ontario, the names of all the individuals that received hospitality from the hospitality fund. I suggest to you that the amount of \$45,000 for a province, not for a city, is a very modest sum indeed. The hon. member for Wentworth used the term "hand-outs". The hon. member for Parkdale would like to know which of these people received hand-outs. The hon. member for Wentworth did not like it when I read a letter from a very high official from Italy who came here last year. We spent a few hundred dollars on his visit.

I will read out one of the most recent letters I have received, from the Assemblée Nationale:

Monsieur le Ministre,

De retour à Paris, je tiens à vous renouveler, au nom des membres de la délégation que j'avais l'honneur de présider et en mon nom, tous nos remerciements pour votre accueil.

Nous avons été très sensibles à la cordialité avec laquelle vous nous avez reçu et l'agréable déjeuner qui nous a réunis restera un des meilleurs souvenirs de notre voyage au Canada.

Je vous prie de croire, Monsieur le Ministre, avec l'expression renouvelée de mes remerciements, à l'assurance de ma haute considération et de mes sentiments les meilleurs.

CHARLES BOSSON
Député-Maire d'Annecy

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Chairman, isn't this a big deal?

You are buying everybody free food, and they are writing you notes to say thank you.

Let me tell you something. If you want to keep on handing out drinks and food, free, you will get letters from everybody, everywhere in the world, Polish, French, English, Irish, any place in the world. Because you are giving them everything free they will thank you. What a big deal that is.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I direct the hon. members to page 6: the President of Argentina, the President of Finland, the President of Iceland—

Mr. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, may I take a diametrically opposed view to those views that have come from across the aisle here today? May I say, I think some of the amounts spent by this government as a host province

to some of these groups, at some of these conventions, are pretty picayune?

For instance, Mr. Chairman, I think that an amount out of the hospitality fund of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association of \$137.80, for instance, is something that we, as members of this Legislature, belonging to the Canadian section of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, should all be rather ashamed of. That is one group, for instance, that I think we should have expended certainly a lot more on than that.

If I remember rightly, Mr. Chairman, we heard one of the hon. members opposite complaining that this government was not making its decent enough contribution to the Grey Cup Festival. I see that there is a contribution there of \$2,500.

Mr. Singer: Which one was it?

Mr. Lawrence: Well, if my memory is incorrect I am sure you will tell me so, but if my memory serves me right there was a complaint from the other side that this province was not doing enough as far as the Grey Cup Festival was concerned.

There are other groups in here, conventions and other worthy associations, and I think this province should be very proud to have conventions in the various convention cities of this province, such as Windsor, London, Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston, Kitchener and Ottawa. I think that, as a government, we have to expend certain funds to welcome these people and make sure they are going to come back, and I see nothing wrong with an economy and with a government and with a budget the size that we have here in Ontario to have expended for these purposes only \$45,000 last year. I say I think that is rather picayune.

I am firmly convinced that there are some municipalities in this province, not only the city of Toronto but also some of the suburban groups such as North York—I am sure the city of Windsor, for instance, has a hospitality fund of at least this amount, Mr. Chairman. My view is that if we expect these people to come back, if we expect to show them a good time and knowing that these conventions and these groups bring an awful lot of funds into this province—I think this amount should be increased and certainly not reduced.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask whether or not any of the monies that are being expended by The Department of Economics and Development and these various commissions are included in these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: No, no.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, that would answer the hon. Prime Minister's question about what other departments were spending it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why we see fit to spend this \$2,500 on the Grey Cup Festival and some of these other organizations. Upon looking down the list I do not see very much, for instance, for any of the organized labour groups. I do not know whether they have not made any—

Mr. Bryden: They buy their own drinks.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am wondering whether they have not made any requisitions to the hon. Minister or whether perhaps they have been turned down. I see, for instance, the chambers of commerce, and I see other organizations which represent a particular group of people. I am wondering on what basis these grants are paid out by The Department of the Provincial Secretary.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I think I indicated to the House, and if you read the names of the groups that received hospitality, that there is a general principle, a common factor, that there is either something international, or national, or on a provincial level, either from the group that is involved or from the individual concerned. Now, as to the Grey Cup Festival, the expenditure of hospitality is expended on those individuals from outside the province of Ontario who come to Ontario, at the luncheon which is being held. Residents of Ontario, even the members of the Board of Trade, the local members who sponsor and look after this, pay out of their own pocket. That is for people from outside of the province coming into Ontario.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, do I understand this Grey Cup Festival is for the year in which the Grey Cup was held here? I may be wrong in my memory but—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It is only for being held in Ontario.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: So when it is held out of Ontario it is not paid?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is right.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Now, one further question. Has any labour organization made request for money that has been accepted or turned down in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I do not recall that any—I have no details of any such request having been turned down.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I notice the Ontario Public Service Quarter Century Club. Have we just got the two branches in Ontario? From what I can see there are only two of them that got grants last year under this hospitality fund, the Lakehead branch and also the Toronto branch.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Well, actually the Toronto one is for everybody in the area, but one is held at the Lakehead in view of the long distance they would have to travel.

Mr. Whicher: Well, would there be one in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not to my knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Mr. Chairman, I might say a word on that. I was instrumental in getting the Civil Service Quarter Century Club organized at the Lakehead to take in the quarter century group in that area, due to the fact that we are 1,000 miles from Toronto where the big quarter century dinner is held. It was too costly for these retired civil servants in the northwest area to come as far as Toronto, so the department arranged to give them their party each year up in that area. That is why it is in the hospitality fund.

Mr. Whicher: Every year you have a party?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: I think it is every year. Am I right, Mr. Minister? That is right, the Quarter Century Club of Northwestern Ontario has a party once a year in the northern area.

Mr. Belanger: I just wanted to find out how much of these are grants that you are giving to various groups and how much of them are spent for entertainment. From looking at this I can see that perhaps some of them are given just to the association to carry on their work and others are for entertainment, and I feel that when you are entertaining apparently you seem to be inviting practically all the department heads of the province along with the hon. Ministers. For instance I see a group that is only getting \$200 or \$300 whereas others will be over \$1,000 and \$1,200 and \$1,500 and so forth.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, it is dependent upon the size of the gathering. Where specific details can be given by the organization we very often say we will pay

for the luncheon; that is, we pick up the whole bill, and that is why in some cases you will see these worked right down to the penny—the first one: \$1,393.15. We from experience know exactly the number of people who are going to be involved, and therefore we are able to sponsor the event. In other instances, because the association is not able to give us such figures, we say we will pay for the luncheon up to a certain amount, but if it goes over that amount you have to pick up the tab, and the variation in figures is a variation in the number of people participating in the event.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I have another question, not in reference to this but in regard to the citizenship branch. With regard to the courses given to the new citizens, is there any co-operation between The Department of Education and your department? In other words, these night classes that are being given to the new citizens teaching them English, teaching them various subjects, is this maintained by The Department of Education or is it maintained entirely by your department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I specified the types of classes that were held. There are the classes that are held by us in co-operation with local school boards; there are those which we hold directly ourselves; and there are those which are held by volunteer agencies. It is the department that deals with these three types of instruction. It is not The Department of Education, it is the local boards of education in the case of night classes.

Mr. Belanger: Well, you are the one that is paying whatever the cost is to the school board—you are paying the school boards?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We pay the teachers.

Mr. Belanger: Well, they are run by the school boards but you pay the teachers?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is right.

Mr. Belanger: I am wondering why this is not done by The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: When it did appear in The Department of Education it was part of a community programme branch, apart from the remainder of the educational system. When that section was transferred to The Department of the Provincial Secretary we continued that particular work.

Mr. Belanger: Does that come under The Department of Education entirely?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word on that. I am speaking particularly of when the hon. Minister referred to me making a remark to distinguish new citizens from the established citizens. I would feel that in principle the fact that you have established a separate citizenship department, and now you have moved and you are moving into broad citizenship activities, operating from your Community Programmes Division. There may be serious doubts that you are now emphasizing a citizenship area to people who are of other than Anglo-Saxon background. You are leaving the other activities you have had in your Community Programmes Division without a citizenship programme.

It seems to me that there should be consideration that if you are going to stress the broad aspect of citizenship, including community work and drawing people in to take responsibility in civic activities that perhaps you should think again about the fact of moving this wide citizenship programme again to the Community Programmes Division.

I am sure you gave it a great deal of thought when you moved it out; could you explain to us why you did this? Why you moved your Citizenship Branch away from your Community Programmes Division? Was it a dissatisfaction that it was being submerged under the broad approach that was taking place in the Community Programmes Division?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, there was not any dissatisfaction. It was just that the particular field was only being done on a sort of, roughly, 15 per cent basis by those in the Community Programmes Branch. It was felt that this should be developed—this phase of civic education—because it is not only teaching language, it is civic education—should be brought into the field. As I indicated at the close of my remarks, we are looking forward within the department to continuous expansion in civic and citizenship education on a broader field.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, but if I can just pursue this a little further, sir. In the Community Programmes Branch—which is under The Department of Education—on this broad field, it seems to me the purpose of the

Community Programmes Branch is to encourage young people, older people and others to get into discussion of community responsibility. They hold conferences, they draw people into civic affairs. But you, sir, state after forming the Citizenship Branch for a particular purpose, now you are widening this from a particular teaching language programme and are moving into the citizenship area. Surely then you would want to go back within the Community Programmes Division.

I do not follow why you do not go back into this broad department if you are trying to expand your programme unless you are duplicating and making two departments do the same work. Your Citizenship Branch, you say, is now going to go into a broad area—you are going to draw people into all kinds of citizenship responsibility. Unless I am completely wrong, sir, under the Community Programmes Branch that is their objective. It seems to me that the government again might be considered as they have been in the parks programme where in some other areas where you have had three or four departments. You could be in danger unless you watch it very carefully to find that your department is trying to claim the same objective, and if such is the case I wholeheartedly endorse the recommendation of the hon. member for Sudbury. We do not want duplication and extra expenses for the taxpayers.

Mr. Lavergne: We do not want repetition the way you have been putting it on for the last—

Mr. Thompson: Well, I am glad I have not put on anything like you have done, my friend.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1701 carried.

On vote 1702:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like under this vote to raise the question of a permanent Speaker for this House. This is a subject that everybody has been talking about for some substantial time but nobody seems to be doing anything about it.

Mr. Chairman: I would point out that there is a bill on the order paper.

Mr. Bryden: For that purpose? Well, I wish to deal with this, Mr. Chairman, in a different context and in different terms than the bill on the order paper—though I may make one very brief reference to the bill, if you will permit me.

I believe that this is the time when this matter should be dealt with. I think it is more than probable that before the estimates which are now before us have been fully spent there will be a general election in this province. I think we can all agree that that is more than probable.

I think it is desirable that the question of a permanent Speaker should be dealt with before an election rather than after. If we wait until after an election, then there will be an inherent implication that each party is holding back in the hope that it will secure a majority of the seats and thus be able to put its own man into the post of permanent Speaker. I think if this sort of jockeying goes on or appears to go on it will delay indefinitely this very desirable reform.

We have to start somewhere. We have to agree upon someone to be a permanent Speaker, and then we have to take steps to see that he obtains that position. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that you are in the chair and that the House is in committee at this stage, when I express the opinion that the present Speaker of this House would make an excellent permanent Speaker.

When he first undertook that very difficult responsibility he was, as is natural, somewhat uncertain. But over the four years he has held the office, he has grown in stature as a Speaker. I think he presides over this House with dignity and authority, and if he could be given the complete independence which a permanent appointment entails, I believe that his dignity and authority would be still further enhanced.

I am going to propose, Mr. Chairman, that the leaders of the three parties should get together before the conclusion of this session to discuss the question of a permanent Speaker. I am not trying to tell them how they should handle it. I have made a suggestion, that I think would be sensible, that they accept the person who now holds the post and is filling it with distinction. Let the leaders get together before this session comes to a conclusion and try to reach an agreement that can be implemented by legislation before the conclusion of the session.

There are, as I see it, two ways in which this matter could be handled. There is, on the one hand, the method that has been in effect in Britain for a great many years. That is a system under which the Speaker is completely removed from politics by virtue of the fact that there is agreement among all the parties that he will always receive acclamation in his constituency.

There was an occasion in the past in Britain where the Communists ran a candidate against the Speaker of the House. The way the problem was handled was for the leaders of all the other political parties, the Conservatives, the Labour party and the Liberal party, to go into the Speaker's constituency to campaign on his behalf. He himself stayed completely aloof from the campaign and refrained from involving himself in partisan controversy in any way.

Now, that is a good system that appears to have worked well in Britain. There is one difficulty with it, and that is that the voters in one constituency, as long as the permanent Speaker holds his post, never have an opportunity to pass judgment on the government of the day. That is a difficulty.

An alternative method, which I will not discuss in detail, Mr. Chairman, is proposed in a bill which my hon. leader has put on the order paper—that is that a special constituency should be set up as the constituency of Queen's Park to which the person who becomes Speaker would automatically be named.

There is one drawback in that method, too, and that is that the Speaker does not have then the independence which he has as long as he represents a genuine constituency in the House. As long as he represents a genuine constituency, he is always in the position where he can resign if he wishes and revert to the position of a private member. The method that my hon. leader proposes would not give him that independence.

So there are admittedly difficulties, there are disadvantages whichever way you approach this, but my submission, Mr. Chairman, is that the disadvantages, whatever they may be, are much more than offset by the advantages of having a Speaker who is completely independent, and can operate in a completely independent manner.

One condition, of course, is that all parties would agree that his rulings would never be challenged. If he is in the position where the majority in the House could overrule him then he loses his independence. I think that would be a minor hurdle to overcome.

The important thing is that the Speaker should be above political controversy of all kinds. He should be secure in his position and he should be able to carry on in a completely impartial manner and with a complete appearance of impartiality. Therefore, I would urge again that the leaders should consult and try to come up with a proposal that will be agreed to by all parties before

this House rises. I think it is particularly important for this to be done before the House rises, since this may very well be the last session of this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1702 agreed to.

On vote 1703:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on 1703—the hon. gentlemen opposite to me need to bother signalling to the clock to me, I can see that it is past 6 o'clock, but I do not control the procedures of this House and as long as the House is sitting I would like to raise some questions under vote 1703.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning we will proceed with the estimates.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if such be the case, that we conclude the estimates of the Provincial Secretary, what department does he intend to move to?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The Attorney-General's.

Mr. Oliver: Well, on that point I want to make a plea to the hon. Prime Minister not to take the Attorney-General's estimates tomorrow if he can avoid it at all. Several of my hon. colleagues have asked me to say to him, that manuscripts and briefs in connection with this department are not here, but at home, and it would be quite inconvenient for them, and almost impossible for them to criticize effectively tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: My problem, Mr. Speaker, is that I must have timetables for this. I will see what I can do, but I have to work out the schedule. I do not know whether I have another department where the Minister is ready, but I will see what I can do. I will accommodate if it is humanly possible.

Mr. Oliver: We might as well go on with that point a little further and discuss it. I think the hon. Prime Minister is a fair-minded man. Now, yesterday afternoon he said to us today we might well be into the estimates of The Department of the Attorney-General, one of the most important departments of government. Now, he says he has a timetable set up.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I said when we had finished the estimates of the Provincial Secretary, we would continue with the estimates of the Attorney-General.

Mr. Oliver: That does not alter what I am saying at all. What I am saying now to the hon. Prime Minister is, if he has a timetable set up surely he could give us more than one day's notice. I think we are entitled to three or four days' notice before the estimates of these important departments come up.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I mentioned it several days ago, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Oliver: The hon. Prime Minister did not mention it several days ago. He mentioned it yesterday for the first time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I said this is the order in which it would be taken. I have no way of knowing how much discussion there will be on any one of these estimates. How do I know whether we are going to finish, how can I tell what is going to happen on Monday until I find out what happens tomorrow?

Mr. Oliver: All right. All we are asking is the order.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, this is exactly what I have told the hon. member.

I recognize the hon. member's difficulty and I assure him that I will do everything in my power to accommodate myself to his wishes.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before we leave this—would it be possible for the hon. Prime Minister to give us the order in which he will call them? Our facilities are limited here. Some hon. members come down only each week. If we knew the week ahead—the reason I raise the question tonight is that if he would consider it we could at least have it for next week.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would be happy to attempt this, but I must point out there are

certain difficulties from our point of view, because not only do we sit in this Legislature, but we are administering the government. The hon. Ministers are busy and I attempt to suit their administrative duties as well as the time they must spend in this House.

I have absolutely no objection to naming departments in the order that I would presume to call them as long as I am left with the flexibility of altering this if circumstances

require, because if I am going to be held to it, I cannot give it. It is recognized that I must have flexibility in order to run the government.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.10 of the clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Friday, February 15, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963

CONTENTS

Friday, February 15, 1963

Statement re settlement of "bush strike", Mr. Rowntree	761
Statement re dairy industry, Mr. Stewart	762
Estimates, Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Mr. Yaremko, concluded	764
Estimates, Department of the Attorney-General, Mr. Cass	774
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	783

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1963

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery students from Lakeview Central Public School, Port Credit.

Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, may I make a statement before the orders of the day?

I should like to make a short statement on the settlement of the strike involving bush workers at Kapuskasing, Ontario, and Long Lac, Ontario. I am sure that every hon. member of the House will join with me in expressing relief that the situation has been resolved to the extent that normalcy can now be restored to the bargaining arrangements between the parties.

To me, as Minister of Labour, it is a sad situation to find that a company such as Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company Limited, which I consider has a fine reputation as an employer, should find itself in the unhappy position which has prevailed for the past month. Time is running out insofar as bush operations in the Kapuskasing area are concerned for this spring and I can only express the hope, which I am sure is echoed by all hon. members of the House, that we have seen the last of these troubles. The efforts which have been made in The Department of Labour have been strenuous and I can assure the House that they have told on me as Minister of Labour.

However, I am sure that the hon. members of the House will recognize that there is no magic formula in a situation; parties must solve the problems which confront them. The Department of Labour may assist, but it does

not have the power or the answer to any dispute. That must be supplied by the parties themselves.

One of the most important considerations in connection with collective bargaining is the attitude of the parties. If they are not prepared to co-operate and if they are not prepared to forget personal feelings then one can look for trouble in trying to bring about settlements of disputes. In the current situation, there were some people who thought that the government should resort to legislation. I want to say here and now that I have the gravest of doubts if legislation would have assisted in bringing about a solution to the problem. I think that we followed the proper course by bringing the parties in, sitting them down and entering into direct negotiation.

At this juncture, I cannot give details of the basis of settlement. These will be given to the members of the local unions first, tomorrow. This arrangement is part of the bargaining process.

Finally, I should like to say something about the negotiations of contracts for bush workers as an industrial group. There has been a lot of idle and irresponsible talk about the conduct of these negotiations. The fact of the matter is that they have moved at a pace set by the parties themselves. We had something in the order of 12 major employers involved in these negotiations. Seven of these situations have been resolved or are under arrangement. The remainder are in the process of orderly resolution.

No one more than I recognizes the fact that one must move with despatch to deal with these situations and that is what we have done. However, the pace at which negotiations proceed is in the hands of the parties and not in the hands of The Department of Labour.

When we look around the province of Ontario and see the vast industrial complex which is vital to the welfare of the people, surely we must recognize the fact that grave responsibility rests on labour and management to exercise restraint in dealing with each other. It is idle to say that In Ontario the

two parties at the bargaining table are not sophisticated. They are. Collective bargaining may not be an exact science, but it is a science. As such, because of its social implications, it deserves to be and must be practised by responsible people. The tragedy of irresponsibility is hardship and loss to our community.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that peace has been restored to our north country and that it will not be disrupted by loose talk and irresponsible conduct.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make an announcement in connection with the dairy industry in this province.

The provinces of Ontario and Quebec are about equal in importance in milk production and together produce slightly over 70 per cent of the milk produced in Canada. It has been realized for some time that the marketing policies of the dairy industry in these two provinces should complement each other in order to be truly effective. For some months periodic discussion with particular reference to the dairy industry has been held between senior officials of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and their counterparts in Quebec. I also have had personal discussions in connection with the dairy problems with the hon. Mr. Courey, Minister of Agriculture for that province.

Mr. Speaker, it is of extreme gratification to me to report to this House the very close bonds of friendship and understanding which now exists between the departments of agriculture of these two provinces insofar as our mutual agricultural considerations are concerned.

Producers generally in Ontario and the dairy industry leaders for some time have been giving much consideration to ways and means of co-ordinating and strengthening the milk marketing procedures in this province. One of the obstacles which has been encountered in discussions within Ontario was the question of policies which might be developed in the province of Quebec. Many dairy leaders have been of the opinion that without some co-ordination between these two major dairy provinces of Canada any workable solution would be impossible.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt the province of Quebec is as desirous of stabilizing and strengthening the dairy industry as is the province of Ontario. They too have realized that if conditions of sale and pricing of milk to distributors and processors in both

provinces do not have any similarity, then competition may develop between the provinces which could be detrimental to the dairy industry. Both provinces can benefit through co-ordination and co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the province of Quebec suggested that they were forming a special dairy committee which would concern itself with the marketing problems of the concentrated milk producer, the concentrated milk processor, the fluid milk producer and the fluid milk distributor. Since these two particular sections of the dairy industry both complemented and competed with each other with products and prices, they further suggested that the chairman of the Quebec committee would be a civil servant from their marketing administration.

The Quebec Department of Agriculture suggested that a similar committee be set up within the province of Ontario and that each committee be requested to meet within their respective province to discuss provincial problems and then hold joint meetings to discuss interprovincial problems with the idea of arriving at a solution which might be acceptable and beneficial to the dairy industry in both provinces.

We have been advised that the chairman of the Quebec committee is Jean-Marie Bovin, Director of Production and Marketing Products, Department of Agriculture and Colonization, province of Quebec. The Ontario committee as appointed by their respective organizations are the following: Mr. Emerson Farnsworth, Huntsville, Ontario Whole Milk Producers League; Mr. Orval Guy of Winchester, representing the Ontario Concentrated Milk Producers; Mr. Sam Ault of Winchester, representing the Concentrated Milk Manufacturers; and also Mr. K. E. Borden, who represents the Ontario Milk Distributors. Mr. J. L. Baker, Ontario Dairy Commissioner, has been appointed as chairman.

The provincial committee, as hon. members will note, includes both processor and producer. They will bring to the discussions the opinions and the desires of the organizations which they represent. It is felt by the industry apparently that in such discussions at this time consideration should be given to the problems of both the producing and processing sides of the industry.

The Ontario committee has already met. The first interprovincial committee meeting is planned after the dairy conference, which is to be held in Ottawa on February 21 and 22 next, convened by the Ontario Federation

of Agriculture. It was felt desirable that the committee meet following the Ottawa conference rather than before.

Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge this is the first time that a working agricultural committee with government sponsorship has been set up between the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec. We feel that the appointment of these committees marks a milestone in Ontario-Quebec co-operation, and that the two provinces will accomplish much for the benefit of the agricultural industry and the provincial economy, through this policy of mutual co-operation, discussion and understanding.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (York-Humber): May I ask the hon. Minister if the Ontario-Quebec co-operation will extend to coloured margarine?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, if that is not a serious question or if the hon. Minister is not going to answer it, may I ask a question? In trying to assess the exact function and objectives of this committee, would it be accurate to assume that this joint committee is going to pick up from where the provisional marketing board or committee of last fall left off when it bowed out of the picture in attempting to work out marketing procedures at the interprovincial level and from that back to the provincial level presumably?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is I think attempting to put words in my mouth.

Mr. MacDonald: Is it accurate to assume—I do not want to put words in the hon. Minister's mouth, I want him to explain so that I may not be misinformed.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have tried to make abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, in this statement, that the committees have been appointed by their respective organizations at the suggestion of The Quebec Department of Agriculture and our own, working together. These committees have been appointed to talk over their mutual problems within the province, their respective provinces, and then get together interprovincially and discuss how one problem affects another in each province.

What they will come up with, I have no idea; and I would not even presume to suggest that they are attempting to work out what might be described as a marketing programme. They are attempting to discuss their mutual problems.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the statement the hon. Minister has made. Of course, it is of interest to all dairymen in the province of Ontario that some stable board be set up to function. Might I ask the hon. Minister first how long this board will be operating, and to whom it will report? Will it report to the hon. Minister or to the department or to individual dairy groups?

I want to compliment the hon. Minister too for including the distributors in this group, because in the former arrangement with the four dairy groups there was no mention of taking the distributor into consideration. I am very happy that he has seen fit to take all facets of the industry into consideration; I would like to clarify those two questions, please.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I think there were three questions asked. As far as the time limit is concerned, there is no time limit in this committee. They were set up to do the job that they feel is necessary. What was the second question of the hon. member?

Mr. Innes: To whom do they report?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, yes, I recall now—do they report to their departments or their respective groups? I would say that it would be to all three. There are representatives of the fluid trade, both from the producer and the distributor side; representatives from the concentrated industry, both from the producer and the manufacturing level; and also both committees are chaired by the commissioner of dairying in each province. So I would think that they would be expected to report to all three segments; we are all interested in it.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before calling the orders of the day, late last evening we discussed the proposed order of business and I said that I would attempt to accommodate myself to the wishes of the official Opposition as expressed by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). I have checked through and it is impossible for me today to rearrange the order of business I had planned.

On the other hand, I have spoken to the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) and if his estimates are reached this morning, regardless of what votes are taken, we will undertake that any matter can be reopened; because I very much doubt if his estimates would be completed today in any event. Any of the hon. members who may be away today can put their questions some time later.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): On any vote?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, on any vote.

Then before the House rises I will also give you a forecast—if I may put it that way—of the departmental estimates coming up, with the proviso I made last night, that if the exigencies of government make it necessary, I may have to move them around. I will attempt not to have to do that, however.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. K. Brown in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF
PROVINCIAL SECRETARY
AND CITIZENSHIP
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1703:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I rise at the outset on a question of personal privilege. Unfortunately I had to be out of the House yesterday for a commitment which was entered into before the Legislature resumed after the holiday recess. In reading the paper this morning I find that there was further discussion on the question of racing charters, in the course of which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) made the statement that I felt that everybody involved were crooks.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I think this is both unfair and inaccurate. I am very sorry that the hon. Prime Minister made this statement, because I would like to say that he has made a commendable departure up until now from a practice on the other side of the House of indulging in these wild statements when rather serious issues are raised on which the government is vulnerable.

What I did state is to pinpoint certain instances of affidavits in which it is my belief, on investigations which I have made—and I am sure if the government makes them they will find it the same—that these affidavits were not accurate, that there were no meetings held. I am not describing everybody as crooks; I am inviting the hon. Prime Minister and government to investigate this practice and I named one or two specifically. Mr. Chairman, that is all I want to say on that.

I would like, if I am not too much out of order, to ask the hon. Prime Minister one question arising from yesterday. If the newspaper reports are accurate, that the hon. Prime Minister decided last June, upon

examining this practice of reviving racing charters as a result of the debate which took place in the House in March or April, that this was to be stopped, can he explain to the House why, two months later, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) was still engaging in this practice, and revived the charters for the group headed by W. Earl Rowe?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, there are two points involved. I am delighted to have the hon. member for York South say that he was not accusing these people of some dishonest action but this is the general inference I got from the remarks, as it was in the newspaper. Certainly if he says this was not what he intended, that this was not the impression he intended to convey, then I am delighted to hear his explanation and certainly I will withdraw anything I said that he may find offensive.

The other point—in checking my records, as I had very brief opportunity to do last night—when this whole question of racing charters came up and was considered by me it was subsequent to the close of the House last year and I find I had a member of my staff check the situation in the state of New York and the state of Ohio to see how they dealt with it.

Over a period of time there was some investigation made on this whole question. When I asked the hon. Provincial Secretary not to grant any more charters, in view of the fact this had been a legal procedure in this province, there was one of three alternatives, but apparently one that suited some people, in view of the fact that there had been charters revived, which carried with them the right to race and many of them are used by organizations as well as by individuals. I suggested that those who had applications under way and had been dealing with the department and were going ahead with this procedure, that those should be dealt with, but the position we would take, as a government, would be that we would not entertain any more applications in this regard. That was the position that I took at that time.

To be quite frank with hon. members, I did not know who had applications before the hon. Provincial Secretary. As I pointed out to the House yesterday when the hon. member for York South was not here, this appeared to me to be more of an administrative problem than a policy one. The fact of the matter of whether one is going to allow betting in the province perhaps is policy; how one gets into

the position where one does bet is, perhaps, a matter of administration and perhaps I did not attach as much importance to this as has been generated in the debates here.

So there were three ways it could be done within our province. There is the matter of the criminal code which involves the federal government and I simply said: Well, this does not appear to be a satisfactory way, particularly when there is an alternative, there is no change in legislation required, so we will just stop doing it one way and leave the other avenues open to the public who might want to do this.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if I may just make this further comment. I am very glad to learn that the hon. Prime Minister was not aware from whom the applications were being made. But the fact of the matter is that the official order for revival of these companies was passed at a shareholders' meeting on September 4, some two to three months after the hon. Prime Minister communicated this, and by coincidence, three days before the racing commission also acted on it to give them their racing days.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think I could point this out, too, Mr. Chairman, just to get this date—I believe that the affidavit the hon. member has questioned was taken some time in May—

Mr. MacDonald: Now, if the hon. Prime Minister is talking about the affidavit I questioned, it was an affidavit back in May with regard to the alleged meetings that had been held in May to revive the company—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The point I make is this, and I think the hon. member is fair enough to see it. While the actual order of revivor might be dated such and such a date subsequent, the point is that the men involved—not only this group, but I understand there are other groups, a group from Hamilton were seeking to revive certain charters, and I believe within my own riding the Western Fair Association, through their solicitor, were attempting to revive. I believe I am correct in this statement.

The work done up to the date of official revivor might extend over a period of months. In other words, these various bodies, groups of men who were interested in it and had started, I said they were following a policy that had been recognized by the government, and I felt it would be unfair to them to say this is the end. The actual date of revivor is not the actual date—as a matter of fact, that is the culmination of the activity.

Now this is the attitude I took with these people who had started this course of action, which had been up to this time an acceptable course of action, a legal course of action—granted, very technical, very legalistic, but nonetheless legal under our Corporations Act—that they should be permitted to follow through. As I pointed out, the mere possession of one of these charters does not automatically give the right to conduct betting, because it is necessary to obtain racing days from the racing commission before, of course, it can be exercised.

Mr. MacDonald: They had no difficulty in getting those.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is simply a question of how much racing we want in our province and this is the function and responsibility of the racing commission.

Mr. MacDonald: It is unfortunate that—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Vote 1703.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some inquiries under vote 1703.

In view of the distinct possibility that there may be a general election before the end of the fiscal year to which these estimates apply, I would like to find out what steps the government has taken or will be taking to conduct the election in an orderly and efficient manner. The point in which I am most interested, Mr. Chairman, is the question of the appointment of returning officers.

Now I do not know if this is a question that is properly directed to the hon. Provincial Secretary—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I believe this comes within the jurisdiction of The Department of the Attorney-General.

Mr. Bryden: No, it comes right under this vote, chief election officer.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The chief election officer?

Mr. Bryden: It is the chief election officer who conducts the elections.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Election Act comes under the authority of The Department of the Attorney-General.

Mr. Bryden: May I ask the hon. Minister for the specific vote it comes under just so I will be warned and will not miss it when it comes up?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that we thrashed out before. I am advised that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) introduces the amendments to The Election Act, but the appointment of returning officers is a matter which is done by order-in-council. This is a matter which would come within the jurisdiction of, and I imagine, directed to the hon. Prime Minister. They do not come within the scope of the Provincial Secretary's department.

Mr. Bryden: Well, now, Mr. Chairman, let us get down to some facts. It is being seriously suggested that the issue of orders-in-council, or policies they may represent, are not subject to review in this House at any stage. I do not care under what vote this matter is to be dealt with, but it certainly has to be dealt with under some vote. I am not going to let this one go by, if I can help it, until I am assured that there will be some place where we can raise the matter.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, you have an order No. 23, second reading of a bill to amend The Election Act. It is my intention to call these—

An hon. member: The hon. Prime Minister might not call—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am just saying it is my intention to call. I would not call it today, I would give some notice of when it is to be called.

Mr. Bryden: That bill, Mr. Chairman, does not deal with the matter that I am trying to inquire about at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, it certainly is never our intent to limit debate in this House, and if it is difficult to find another place to make comments, I am perfectly prepared to hear them this morning.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister. I am not necessarily making comments, I may make one or two, but I am more interested in getting information. I do not care which hon. Minister of the Crown is able to give me the information, but I would like to know, with regard to the conduct of the next election campaign, if any steps have been taken as yet to appoint returning officers for the various constituencies; and if not, does the government have any plans to appoint them prior to the issue of the writ?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any returning officers have been

appointed, but they will be appointed in due course when this whole question of the election, which is such a preoccupation with the Opposition benches, is dealt with by the government.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think the matter of the conduct of a general election, the basic democratic proceeding in the province, should be a matter of preoccupation with everybody. I think the proper conduct of the election, which is all I am concerned about at the moment, is a matter of the utmost importance.

I do not wish to provoke any hassle, but I would like to call certain matters to the attention of the government, if they are not already familiar with them, which I think may be helpful in conducting the election in a more orderly fashion than has been possible in the past. I think one of the most important matters in this regard is the early appointment of returning officers. In previous elections—certainly in my own constituency, and I have no doubt the same has been true in most of them—returning officers have not been appointed officially and certainly the public at large has not known who they were, including candidates for anything but the government party, until after the writ was issued. I would like to suggest to the government, Mr. Chairman, that this is a most undesirable procedure, one that makes for substantial inefficiency, avoidable inefficiency, in the conduct of the campaign.

The election is called on one day; yet it is not until the next day, or even two or three days after, that the returning officer gets his authority to act. He is immediately faced with the very difficult job of conducting the enumeration. He has no time whatever to get properly organized, to have things set down in an orderly fashion.

In my own constituency, we are still using or were using, up to and including the last provincial election, the polling subdivision boundaries that were the municipal subdivision boundaries in the city of Toronto in the 1920's. I do not blame the succeeding returning officers—all of whom I may say were good Tories or most of them anyway in the last 20 years—for this ridiculous situation. When they were pushed into the job, or when they got into it, they simply did not have time to sit down and do a rational job in redrawing the polling subdivision boundaries. I will not go into the details, but one could hardly conceive a greater mess than the mess we have in my constituency with regard to polling subdivision boundaries.

I would like to make the suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister, constructively and in good will, that that sort of thing can be avoided if steps could be taken—it may be necessary to amend the legislation, I am not sure—to appoint returning officers at an early date so that they can sit down, review the situation, familiarize themselves with their responsibilities, look over their polling subdivision boundaries, bring them up to date and rationalize them where it is necessary. And it is certainly necessary in many constituencies. All that, I think, would be constructive and useful and helpful to the public, to the returning officers themselves, and to all candidates regardless of party.

I do not think this is a partisan matter at all: I think all candidates want fair play and a proper conduct of the election. There is all the difference in the world between the conduct of federal elections and provincial elections in this province. The permanent federal returning officers—I suppose they are political appointees originally, but they remove themselves from politics—are available at all times to discuss problems.

In my own constituency, at the federal end, the returning officer notified us two or three months ago of revisions that he had made in the polling subdivisions. He notified us recently of further revisions. The day the election was called, he had his polling subdivisions all set; all the parties knew what they were; everybody was able to proceed in a business-like way into the very difficult job of enumeration, which is the first challenge which faces you.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): It looks like the Tory appointee did a good job! Then—

Mr. Bryden: Well, all right. I am just suggesting we get the same thing at the provincial level. It has nothing to do with the man. I have never had any objection to any returning officer I have worked with. I have always found them co-operative. It is the system that makes it impossible for them to do an efficient job and I would make a plea to the government that they take steps to improve the system prior to the forthcoming election.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a little word about this Election Act. We have had a vacancy in this House for some time now, since the member for Halton (Mr. Hall) died. The same weaknesses in our legislation exist, and I suggest that The Election Act should be

amended so that we cannot be denied, a large number of voters cannot be denied, the right to vote.

There is a famous English case—I believe it is *White versus Ashby*—where an individual who had the right to vote was denied the right to vote. In giving judgment for the plaintiff in saying that the plaintiff had the right to vote, Chief Justice Holt said—and I think what he said should be taken to heart by this government because throughout the world today there is too much dictation, too much of this one-party system. In a province where we have had one party in power for 20 years, I think we should look carefully into this matter where constituencies are left vacant.

But Chief Justice Holt said this:

A right that a man has to give his vote at the election of a person to represent him in Parliament, there to concur to the making of laws which are to bind his liberty and property is a most transcendent thing and of a high nature, and the law takes notice of it as such in divers laws. If the plaintiff has a right he must of necessity have a means to vindicate and maintain it and a remedy if he is not to be injured in the exercise or enjoyment of it. And indeed it is a vain thing to imagine a right without a remedy for want of right and want of remedy are equal.

Well now, unless this Election Act is amended, you are literally saying a person has a right to vote. In such a constituency as Halton today the people in theory have a right, but in practice have no right whatsoever.

I suggest this, Mr. Chairman, and I say this briefly. An amendment to The Election Act should be as follows: Where an election is to be held the Lieutenant-Governor in council or any other persons authorized to issue a writ of election may appoint a day for the nomination of a candidate, which day shall be a day not more than 60 and not less than 23 days after the date of the writs of election where the nomination day appointed is in the months from April to October inclusive. Or (b) not more than 60 or not less than 30 days after the date of the writs of election where the nomination day appointed is in the months from November to March inclusive.

In other words, you should by law have the writ issued certainly what in 60 days amounts to approximately two months.

Then the next problem is that the government does not have returning officers. One of the weaknesses of our legislation in this province is that you issue the writ—two

members can go to the Speaker and insist that a writ be issued—but there is no person on whom it is to be served because, according to our law, it must be served on the returning officer.

Years ago, before our present legislation, it was the law that if a returning officer was not appointed, then it could be served upon the sheriff. I suggest that our Election Act be amended so that in the event there is no returning officer we should have something as follows: If there is no returning officer for an electoral district, the writ of election may be addressed and directed to the sheriff of any county in which any portion of an electoral district is located, and the sheriff shall thereupon assume all the duties of a returning officer.

I think by using—actually it is reviving an ancient law—by serving the election writ on a sheriff where a returning officer does not exist, it would then be possible for members in this House to force a by-election in some area where the member has been deceased for two and, let us say, not more than three months.

This weakness in our legislation, I think, is a serious weakness that should be overcome. The government has been aware of it, and some of we members on this side of the House tried to force a by-election some time ago. We could not do it legally but finally the government, as a result of public pressure, and this being brought to the attention of the press and to the public, finally acceded.

There is one obvious reason why the government does not change the law: It is afraid of by-elections. It has been getting defeated at practically every by-election that has been held. You are denying—you are a party in power for 20 years—yet you are denying people the right to vote simply because you are afraid to face them. You are like this big-shot senator from Bay Street. He is afraid to seek a seat in the House of Commons. He wants power but he is afraid to face the people.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the hon. Minister this is in his estimates and he should see to it that something is done about it by the next sitting.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my support to the hon. member for Parkdale in his plea that we should cease playing politics with the basic rights of the people to have a representative in the Legislature. That is what it is; pure, plain and simple!

I think his suggestion that we should have amendments to the Act is completely valid

because that is the only way we are going to cope with the situation. The only thing that intrigues me, Mr. Chairman, is this: the Liberal Party out of office always talk differently than when in power.

The last time we had a Liberal government in power, it was not four or five or six months—I am speaking from memory now—but I think it was two years, in which there were no by-elections called and people beat their heads against the stone walls to have the government act. This case of the pot calling the kettle black is an old story, but Liberals always talk differently in Opposition than when they get into power.

The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) got up before the election in a meeting in St. Catharines in the 1959 election, and it is on record, saying that if he ever got into power he would see that the funds used in elections would be revealed. He has already repudiated that, because he thinks he is going to get power some day. This is a very good proposal, but I draw to your attention it is a proposal that the Liberals have never put into being when they had a chance to do something about it, instead of talking.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, we have never seen any more genuine demonstration of insincerity than that demonstrated by the hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

Mr. MacDonald: I rise on a question of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, no member in this House has the right to get up and question the sincerity and the motives of another member.

I have just spoken very firmly in terms of the record of the Liberals: that no Liberal government has ever done this while in power. I submit that the hon. leader of the Opposition deal with the facts instead of imputing motives.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I take not a word back because what I said is that this man was insincere in making the statement he made. He referred, he suggested, that I am taking the position that in power we would act differently about this matter than what we are suggesting now.

Mr. MacDonald: I said in the past.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now just a moment, Mr. Chairman, the time comes for genuineness here. This man plays more petty politics than anybody I know. It is the simple fact. And the simple fact, sir, is this, that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member for Parkdale has said is true and if the hon. member for York South would only support him and help in bringing about the change of legislation, we would get somewhere.

Mr. MacDonald: I did.

Mr. Wintermeyer: But now by getting into pettiness, he offers the opportunity to the government to evade its obvious responsibility to this Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: Nonsense!

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, let him do as he wishes. I say to you that every hon. member of this Legislature is shirking his democratic responsibility if he permits this session to go by without those two by-elections being called, or whatever number they be.

Mr. MacDonald: He will be fighting for them, too.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility, actually, in conscience. Because if we are going to allow a situation to be perpetuated that in fact existed before the hon. Prime Minister took office, and which he, in fact, corrected by calling a series of by-elections, then I say that we are avoiding the responsibility that is inherent here.

I am not talking platitudinously at all. I am talking determinedly. I think it is wrong, and any amount of inconclusiveness or any amount of political manoeuvring here will not avoid the obvious responsibility that every hon. member of every side of the House has to assure that legislative enactment and legislation does in fact guarantee the right that we all platitudinously suggest the people of this province of Ontario have.

I say to you, sir, and I am not making this in a partisan way, we all have a joint responsibility.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I am not being self-righteous at all.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member across has had no change of ideas for the last 30 years and his doctrine is so—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the hon. leader of the Opposition certainly has had a change of ideas.

Hon. members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, there is a responsibility on our part to do something about this legislation.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. leader said that before.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South—Mr. Chairman, here is a man; and I will tell you the reason he is so upset. His basic supporters are vacating him, and he is upset about that fact.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what the hon. leader of the Opposition thinks.

Mr. Wintermeyer: That is what is hurting him and that is what is irritating him. Sir, I put my case to you—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I appeal to you as a member of this Legislature and, sir, as chairman of this committee, to make it your responsibility to assist us, to assure that legislation is brought in in this session to correct and to translate the intent that has been expressed on all sides of the House that within a specific period of time vacancies in this House must and should be filled.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): I am sure that all hon. members of the House are somewhat amused by the antics of the hon. member for York South this morning, because when he is calling for by-elections I cannot really understand why he wants any, because he never runs anybody there anyway. I remember the last opportunity that he had, Mr. Chairman, the last chance he had—

Mr. MacDonald: Where was the hon. member in 1951 in Timiskaming?

Mr. Whicher: I was overseas, where was the hon. member?

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member for York South had the opportunity to fight a by-election only a few months ago, one that he was calling for for many months,

what happened to him? He did not even step into the riding, he did not have a candidate and the reason he did not have a candidate was because he could not get anybody to run for him.

Mr. Chairman: This is not on the estimates.

Mr. Whicher: Yes, it is on by-elections and this is what we are talking about. Everybody else has talked about it and I intend to do it.

I want to say this, that in the ridings where he did run in the last four or five by-elections, he came third in every one. The only reason he did not come lower than that was because that was all the candidates that were running.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for York South had better be careful about suggesting by-elections in this House. Of course we want by-elections, because the facts and figures prove that when they are called we win them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Whicher: We want the opportunity of letting the people of these ridings have a voice in the affairs of the province, and particularly do we want them because there is every indication that we will be winning.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, a comment on this question, because really with this great display of righteousness on the part of the Opposition I would like to point out the following facts. It is this government and this administration that called five by-elections just about a year ago. And it is this government, the first government in all the history of this province, that appointed a Royal commission to deal with the representation the people of this province will have in this Legislature. So that it is very difficult for me to sit here and pay too much attention, or listen too closely, when we are criticized for not calling by-elections.

Now let us take a look at the by-elections. I grant you that the riding of Halton was vacated last August and at that time we had a Royal commission sitting, dealing with the whole question of representation in this Legislature on a province-wide basis. And that riding happens to be one in which the population has increased very considerably and I think you would agree with me that it would be perhaps unfair to the parties concerned—your party, my party, and to the people of the area—if we were to make all

kinds of arrangements and have them then destroyed by the report of the Royal commission.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Oh, nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Now just listen for a minute. I recognize you are all also aware of the fact that the law of this province provides that no by-election may be called while the House is in session. Some of the present vacancies—well, the one in Hamilton Centre, which is another largely populated one—that riding became vacant, I believe, a day or two days before this House opened. Nickel Belt became vacant within the last week and a half.

I can assure you that my concern about representation in this House is equal to or greater than that of anyone else. At least I have a record of performance I can speak about to support what I say, because I called the last series of by-elections and I certainly did not look upon the results of those as any astonishing win for my hon. friends opposite. They made a lot of these by-elections at the time; they took one seat from us. That is the fact. Big deal, the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) says.

But I will reiterate, and I want it made very clear, that this government appointed a Royal commission to deal with the representation the people of the province will have in this House and no such thing has ever been done by any Liberal administration as far as I know. The New Democratic Party have never had an opportunity to do it, and if I have my way they never will have an opportunity.

Mr. MacDonald: Unfortunately the hon. Prime Minister is inaccurate, the Campbell administration did the very same thing in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: All right, I thank the hon. member for that correction: In any event in Ontario during the many years the Liberal Party had power here, and certainly in their many years federally, they certainly played an awful lot of politics with redistribution on the national basis. I am not going to go into that because it does not concern us, but I am not going to sit here and not leave it recorded that it is this government and this administration which have taken the steps I have outlined.

Mr. Wintermeyer: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether he is satisfied with

the legislation that we have in the province of Ontario at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I am not, Mr. Chairman. But these things are taken in stages. We still have a Royal commission sitting dealing with this phase of the problem. I want to see what it says. Of course I am not satisfied; I doubt if there is really any legislation in this province with which I could say I was completely satisfied. This matter will be studied and reviewed, as it is being at the present time.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether the Royal commission has any authority whatsoever to make recommendations in respect to the thing we are talking about now?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Redistribution?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Exactly!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Which representation is the hon. leader of the Opposition speaking about, Mr. Chairman, of the people in the province or in this legislation?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Oh well, no, no, no! Mr. Chairman, and without taking too much of your time, the thing that I thought we were talking about is something entirely different. What we are talking about on this side of the House, sir, is this simple proposition: that The Legislative Assembly Act provides that within a period of, I believe it is, 90 days, after the death of a member the Clerk of this House has an obligation under the terms of the legislation to issue a—whatever it is called—a writ of election.

Sir, the only reason that that legislation cannot be implemented is that The Election Act is inconsistent with the provisions of The Legislative Assembly Act and The Election Act, sir, requires that before any election is held in Ontario a returning officer be appointed. Now the only institution we have for the appointment of a returning officer is the Cabinet and the Cabinet has within its sole discretion the determination of whether or not any area in this province will be denied representation in this House for any extended period of time. We in this House do not think that the people of Ontario should or should not be given the opportunity of representation at the whim of the Cabinet. That is our position, sir.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I thought that the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister were deliberately calculated to take up the line

laid down by his predecessor. When the member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Frost) was asked in days gone by why there were not those five by-elections that the hon. Prime Minister so proudly boasts about today, he said: Well, there is the question of redistribution coming up and we really cannot call those by-elections until this is determined. We hear the same line from the present hon. Prime Minister today.

I would refer to the hon. Prime Minister's particular attention a bill that was introduced into the House by himself, and it is Bill No. 44. In section 3 of that bill it says this: "This Act comes into force and has effect from and after the dissolution or end of the present Legislature."

Now, Mr. Chairman, in what clearer language could it be set up that this is not to deal with the representation in this Legislature, but it is to deal with the representation in the next Legislature? And the hon. Prime Minister is hoisted on his own petard, obviously he is using the same old gimmick that was used by the old master and he is not using it nearly as well as the old master was able to do.

I do not blame the hon. Prime Minister for not being interested in this, it is embarrassing.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this same matter is this: does the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) want to say something, does he have a speech to make on something other than his own estimates, that his deputy has written for him?

Go on, get up and make a speech off the cuff. It would be very fascinating, Mr. Chairman, to hear the hon. Minister of Public Welfare make a speech on something like election laws.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): I do not believe in wasting time around this House.

Mr. Singer: Are you all through over there now?

An hon. member: Who is the hon. leader over there now, Bob is gone too.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with these election matters, it is very difficult, really, to get these points across. We have no one here who is prepared to assume any responsibility. The hon. Provincial Secretary begged off this morning. He said: "It really is not my job." The—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There is nothing within the estimates of the department and I came here to discuss the orders of the day, that is, the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary. The hon. Prime Minister is so kind to the Opposition he permits them to run all over the lot. Be that as it may, all I do is make a point of order. I came here to answer for my responsibilities.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is a pity that the hon. Minister is quite so sensitive. The point being made yesterday, and it is being made again here today, is that there are certain facets of this government for which there must be ministerial responsibilities and it is no excuse to have Minister after Minister, sir, including the hon. Prime Minister and including this hon. Minister, who just was on his feet, get up and say: "Really, we have nothing to do with it, so we shouldn't discuss it". That is what they are saying. They do not want these matters discussed in the House and they are embarrassed when they are discussed in the House.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the whole conduct of elections, I thought it might be of interest to read into the record an editorial that recently appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* about election procedures. Granted this is addressed to federal election procedures but it applies equally here in the province.

WASTEFUL

Once again the public purse, although it is less and less able to afford it, is to bear the cost of a federal election. Less than a year after spending about \$10.5 million in this way, the taxpayers have to do it again. What is more, the country has to go through the two months of uncertainty involved in an election campaign.

These of course are not reasons for abandoning democracy, but to say that the freedom of elections are worth any financial cost is not to say that the cost cannot be reduced.

The obvious way to reduce it, although it is too late—

and it is too late in the federal sense, but not too late in the provincial sense:

—now to improve things for this year is through a permanent voters' list.

Last year 67,000 enumerators went on their rounds to list an estimated 9,800,000 voters. For this they received a basic allowance of \$25 plus 10 cents for each name properly registered. Added to the money paid to them is the money spent on other

election purposes—printing, organization, returning officers, and so on. The cost of enumeration is one important argument for a permanent voters' list.

There are others. Last year there were several irregularities. Persons who had no right to vote were listed; officials conceded that it was not always possible to train enumerators properly. The difficulty of training plus the incentive that their remuneration system places on getting as many names on the list as possible constitutes a serious weakness.

A permanent voters' list would go a long way towards solving such a problem. A change to such a system would probably permit a considerable reduction in the length of election campaigns.

Well, the plea here, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is what you call an "off-the-cuff" speech.

Mr. Singer: No, it is the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. I really do not understand the hon. Provincial Secretary's interjection. It makes as much sense as his estimates have made in the last three days.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the point is that our electoral laws are substantially out of date. The point is raised here in this *Toronto Globe and Mail* editorial is that there must be better methods of conducting elections. We have time to do it.

The hon. Prime Minister stands up and beats his breast with pride, saying: "We brought in this Royal commission." There were orders on the order paper asking that the matter be debated. Public discussion had reached such a tempo that even this Prime Minister could not resist it; and I say it is no matter to which he can attach great personal pride because he merely bowed to what was so obviously great public pressure directed at him. If he wanted to be bold, if he wanted to be imaginative, he would pay some attention to suggestions such as these.

But what happens, Mr. Chairman? In elections called under The Liquor Licence Act, in the township of North York, there is one scheduled to be held on March 27. Had the normal procedures as set out taken place next Monday two sets of enumerators would be falling over each other's feet, one to take a voting list for the liquor licence purposes, and the others to collect a voting list for federal purposes. Fortunately, somewhere along the line somebody did put a section into The Liquor Licence Act which allows a discretion and that discretion was used. I

commend those people who made the decision to use it, because there was some good common sense in that.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that there still is great and fantastic confusion. The job of the municipal clerk, who is the returning officer, is to co-ordinate now the efforts of three federal returning officers, to make sure that the subdivisions are such that they can be co-related in a reasonable fashion, that the lists can be brought together. The end result is that the cost of this ridiculous voting system is going to be very substantially levied on the voters in this municipality.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Half of what it would have been.

Mr. Singer: Yes, half of what it would have been. Half of \$150,000 is approximately \$75,000. So it makes good sense to spend \$75,000 on a system that really does not make sense to begin with?

What is going to happen, Mr. Chairman, as a result of our up-to-date voting procedures is that on March 27 next, the voters of the township of North York are going to be asked to come to the polls to vote on the liquor question. I do not know how many are going to show up, perhaps 20,000 or 30,000. Of the 30,000 who come I would suggest that perhaps 6,000 would be in favour of liquor and perhaps 4,000 or 5,000 be against it, but the balance of them, Mr. Chairman, the great majority, will come to vote against Rt. Hon. Mr. Diefenbaker, and they are not going to have the opportunity on that day.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the time has come that our election procedures should be brought up to date, that we should not have built into our system under these electoral laws for electing members to this Legislature, under our electoral laws for determining methods such as liquor licensing, systems that are going to put on the taxpayers of the various municipalities an intolerable burden in connection with matters in which really they have no interest.

This liquor licence vote in the township of North York was brought about really by the efforts of the builders of a motel at the corner of Leslie Street and Eglinton Avenue. There is not a home within perhaps a mile of this location and as a result of what these people did—and they built a very lovely motel and they plan to open it some time this spring—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: May I interrupt for a moment? I would like to point out that this

is the inevitable result of a departure from fairly strict interpretation of the rules of this House. We are now debating or discussing liquor licence matters. I said yesterday I would put the report of the Liquor Licence Board on the order paper for discussion. It is on the order paper this morning.

I would only point out to the hon. members of the House when they become a little impatient at my endeavours to keep the discussion within the limits and within the formalities of what we are doing in the House, that this is a glowing example of what happens when you depart from that.

Now, sir, we agreed to discuss a matter the hon. member for Woodbine wanted to discuss concerning elections; we have gone through The Election Act, by-elections, and now into votes under The Liquor Licence Act. May I suggest that this discussion be held until that order is called? It has been put on the order paper for the specific purpose of permitting a discussion of this type if any of the hon. members wish so to do.

Mr. Singer: Well, I will go along, Mr. Chairman, with what the hon. Prime Minister says. This is a subject that deserves substantial discussion. The voting procedures are intermingled with it and I will just leave it at this: The voting procedures in this province are behind the times; they involve very substantial expense to the voters of the province, to the municipal voters. The people of four constituencies in this House are being denied representation.

The hon. Prime Minister points out that the statute does not allow an election to be called while the House is in session. With the 65 members he has, if he wanted to call by-elections he could change the statute in as little time as it would take to write it down. Obviously he does not want to do it and this is why there is not proper representation of all sections of the province.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, just before we leave it and I will not say very much. I wonder if there is any room, while we are discussing this full problem, to make a plea to the hon. Prime Minister and the Cabinet that out of all this discussion that this be approached now in, if you will, a non-political manner.

I think that it has been very well pointed out today that there are discrepancies, that there is the possibility for people in this province to be unrepresented in this Legislature. There still is time, during this government, to bring changes forward in the form of legislation which would correct this situation.

I am not going to get into by-elections or any of the implications of who won them or why they should not have won them. But certainly there must be some place in this Legislature where you can make a plea and where reason will prevail. The remarks have been kicked backward and forward as to which party was the most ineffective or the most inefficient in calling these by-elections, but surely the time has come when we can make a reasonable plea to the government to have some changes made in The Election Act which will correct this situation and eliminate this needless debate in the House. I make that plea to the hon. Prime Minister before we leave the subject.

Vote 1703 agreed to.

Vote 1704 agreed to.

Vote 1705 agreed to.

On vote 1706:

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1706 there is just one question that I would like to ask. I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister would tell us, Mr. Chairman: Is this where the money for the pension fund is distributed from, is this the department that makes payments into that fund? I am speaking of the members' pension fund which was set up a couple of years ago.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it is in The Treasury Department, it is not in The Provincial Secretary's Department.

Vote 1706 agreed to.

Vote 1707 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: That completes the estimates of The Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, are you going to put the estimates of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass)? May I make this submission to you, sir? It does seem to me that it is understandable, the difficulties that we got into in respect to the hon. Provincial Secretary's (Mr. Yaremko's) estimates as they relate to matters that might touch upon, or not touch upon, the Roach report. Now we, on this side, maybe inadvisedly, did not make the argument that these estimates should be postponed

until after the Roach report. Personally, I bear full responsibility myself, for not insisting that those estimates be withheld until the Roach report was filed. But now we have a further illustration of the inadvisability of proceeding with estimates of this House that will more directly touch upon the Roach report.

Sir, it does seem to me that it is not only inadvisable, but it is inexcusable, to permit the estimates of The Department of the Attorney-General to proceed at a time when the Roach report is expected momentarily.

Sir, we are a constitutional form of Legislature. We have a responsibility on this side to oppose intelligently and effectively as we best see how. Surely, sir, one of the things that we would be expected to talk about in conjunction with The Attorney-General's Department normally would be the administration of that department in respect to the various matters that were investigated in the Roach report. We can only suggest, sir, that these estimates should not be brought forward at this time.

I can foresee now that if they are brought forward there will be unnecessary and ineffective references to the Roach report. I personally have refrained from any comments on the report. I do not think we should be commenting on it, but, sir, I point out to you that by bringing forward these reports you put the Opposition into an impossible position. We have the responsibility of talking intelligently about the administration of justice in this province and I suggest to you that that very important subject can hardly be discussed without reference to the Roach report. On the other side of the picture, sir, is the fact that it is not advisable, in my opinion, to talk about the Roach report and its ramifications until after it is formally submitted and publicized.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly about this. I do not want to put this, as somebody said, self-righteously. I do not feel that way at all. I am very determined about this, sir, and I do not want to be emotional in any way. It is a mistake to bring forward these estimates at this time. I cannot put it any simpler than that.

It will redound to the discredit of all of us, because what we will be accused of, all of us on all sides of the House, is an effort to bring forward estimates that should not involve the discussion of the Roach report, and estimates that will be finalized before the report comes down. And after it is down there will be no opportunity to effectively discuss the administration of justice under

The Attorney-General's Department in respect to those things that are reported on in the report itself.

Sir, I do not have to elaborate on this. You know it, I know it, everybody knows it. I suggest to you that it is a mistake and that we in this House must determinedly object to the hon. Attorney-General's estimates coming forward at this time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I have two comments to make about this. One is, I gave notice that these estimates would be brought forward some days ago and there was no mention made of this objection and frankly—to produce it at this stage when the estimates are called! We had a discussion about the estimates last night before the House rose and there was no mention of this point at that time.

As a matter of fact, I was asked to postpone the estimates then because some of the hon. members who wanted to speak on them were not ready to proceed, or their material was not available. In any event, I was prepared to accommodate the Opposition in this regard. Earlier this morning, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the hon. leader of the Opposition was in his seat at the time, I said that any vote we were to take this morning would not be considered a final vote from the point of view of eliminating any further discussion of that point.

Now, I do not agree with the position taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition in this matter. I think we can deal with these estimates of the hon. Attorney-General. After all, there are a great many matters in these estimates that certainly will never be touched upon in the Roach report. There is a whole series. We need only look at them to see such things as division court judges, the Supreme Court of Ontario, the Master of the Supreme Court, the Registrar of the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court reporters. These are all votes that will come up.

The accountant of the Supreme Court, legislative council, registrar of regulations, the laboratory, probation services, fire marshal, the Ontario Securities Commission, inspector of legal offices, master of titles, director of titles, the entire question of emergency measures, emergency orders in the province—I am just going right through the estimates—coroner, official guardian, public trustee. All these things are in the estimates and I doubt they will be touched upon in the Roach report.

Then the other point I make is this: I do not know when the Roach report will be

ready. This House may be in session when it comes in and it may not. I have been given no indication. The hearings ended last October, we are now into mid-February, I have no guarantee.

Now what I do suggest to the hon. members—is a Royal commission appointed by the Legislature which is dealing with this matter—the report will of course have to come into this House and the hon. leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do that every single thing he wants debated will be debated at that time. That report has to come into this House in due course, Mr. Chairman, because the Royal commission was appointed from here.

It will come in, and there will be a complete opportunity to debate this matter. So as far as the government is concerned, we have given this a good deal of thought and we are of the opinion that we can proceed in the same manner as with all other estimates in the government and then when the report comes in the matters which it contains will be dealt with at that time.

Mr. Wintermeyer: In reply to the hon. Prime Minister, I would say first, that this is the first occasion, very frankly, that I have had—and I realize I was absent yesterday—that I have heard that the hon. Attorney-General's estimates would come forward at this time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It was mentioned the day before.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, maybe the hon. Prime Minister did. It may well be, but, frankly, I did not realize it. Secondly, sir, we have I do not know how many estimates; we have the estimates of all the departments. I think that it is quite intelligible, quite feasible and, I think, the part of prudence to hold back these estimates until we determine whether or not the conditions about which the hon. Prime Minister is concerned do in fact arise.

It may well be that the report does not come in. I have no idea when it is due. The hon. Prime Minister, in all probability, knows more than I about when it will come, but there have been many newspaper reports that it is expected momentarily. In view of that it would seem to me that the part of prudence—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, those reports have been current, I mean, I am not criticizing the commissioner, but there have been reports for months—

Mr. Wintermeyer: I quite agree. All I say, in view of those, is that it would seem to be the part of prudence to hold back these estimates. Go on with the other estimates that are before us and then, if necessary, in order to conclude the business of this session, it is important that these estimates come forward. But at this early date in the estimates—I have never known the estimates of the Department of the Attorney-General to come forward this early in the consideration of the budget estimates.

Invariably they have been during the latter part of the debate, or in the latter part of the consideration of the estimates. I think it is most unusual that they are brought forward at this time. I feel very strongly about this. I have no authority other than to voice my objection and that I have done. I do so in full conviction that this House would be better advised to withhold these estimates until later on.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only assure you, Mr. Chairman, and all the hon. members of this House, that dealing with these estimates will in no way, in any way whatsoever, limit the free and untrammelled discussion of any recommendations that may be contained in the Roach report.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 201:

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, before I embark on the few remarks which I am prepared to make at this time, I would like to join the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, in my capacity as the Minister in charge of the department whose estimates are now before the committee of supply, in saying first of all that I am well aware of the situation that was in debate here a few moments ago. I am advised and my own opinion is, after going over the matter, that there are a great many branches of my department which require funds and which have no connection whatsoever with the matter in controversy.

I come to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. members of this House with my estimates, quite prepared to have those which may have some connotation with the commission report, left open to be considered at a later time, as the hon. Prime Minister has promised. I also say to the hon. members of this House that those, such as the official guardian to take one example, which have no connection whatsoever with the matter in controversy, should be dealt with fully at this time when the estimates are going through, and should be passed and should be con-

sidered passed unless there is something in the report to come which would indicate that they should be reopened.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to speak at any length now before the committee begins its consideration of the estimates of my department. Rather, I thought it might be useful for me to deal very briefly with the duties and responsibilities of the department as a prelude to the detailed examination of the various items which the hon. members will undoubtedly wish to make. I wish to leave as much time as possible, and there is all the time available to this House for questions and answers concerning individual items.

I do not intend at this point at least to place on *Hansard* figures of numbers of people, fees collected, cases with which the various branches have had to deal, or other similar statistics which appear in their proper places in the annual reports of the branches in the public accounts of this province.

As my predecessor has often stated, as we are all aware, the historic basis of The Department of the Attorney-General has been that of a legal department. I may say now that the Attorney-General's department is one of the large service departments of government which has become, over the years, a complex department because its services embrace so many different elements of government. Many of them are completely unrelated to one another and are in themselves complete entities—in fact, what might almost be described as semi-autonomous services from the administrative point of view.

The point I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, however, is that they are all very essential services. They have been grouped in the Attorney-General's department because in one way or another they are all legal or quasi-legal in nature.

The basic functions of the department are twofold, of course. Enforcement of federal and provincial laws requiring enforcement at provincial level, and the furnishing of legal advice to Ministers of the Crown and their department officials. This is, of course, an oversimplification of the department's responsibilities, as the hon. members know from their perusal of the various estimates of the department now before them.

The main office of the Attorney-General's department has its criminal, civil and constitutional responsibilities which are carried out in the form of prosecutions, appeals, opinions, and civil litigation. The Legislative Council and staff, whose original responsibility was the drafting of statutes, have had added to their duties and responsibilities

a great body of delegated legislation which comes under The Regulations Act.

The Inspector of Legal Offices, of course, is responsible for the various officials of the courts, the registry offices, the land titles offices, and other related offices spread throughout the province.

With respect to the probation services branch of the department I may say, as we all realize, it has grown since its inception a few years ago until today the staff comprises over 200 persons and we propose to increase the staff in the coming fiscal year.

The fire marshal, with his staff of inspectors and investigators and the very fine new Ontario Fire College at Gravenhurst, plays a more and more important role in the general improvement of firefighting facilities and techniques throughout the province, as well as a gratifying reduction in the incidence of fires through the long-term fire safety programme for examining plans of buildings before they are constructed.

The operations of the fire marshal's office are also linked and interrelated with those of the Emergency Measures Organization which, as the hon. members know, and the hon. Prime Minister has pointed out, is a combined Dominion-provincial institution and a branch of The Department of the Attorney-General.

The Ontario Securities Commission has very heavy responsibilities, and the loss of its chairman, the late Oswald E. Lennox, Q.C., a very senior and valued civil servant, has placed a very great load on the vice-chairman and other members of this commission.

The Public Trustee, whose main volume of work relates to the estates of mental patients, and the Official Guardian, who safeguards the rights of infants, of course, are branches of my department.

The crime laboratory, which is located in the Ontario Provincial Police building here in Toronto, is responsible directly to the Attorney-General. In it we have an arm of law enforcement of which we may well be proud. Under its director, one of the most highly respected men in these very specialized and important fields of crime detection, we are fortunate in having a laboratory that is rated one of the finest in the world, providing scientific services that not only help convict the guilty but also to acquit the innocent. For a fuller view of the work of the laboratory I would refer the hon. members to the words of the then hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts) in this House last year on April 2 when the estimates of this department were being considered.

The supervising coroner who was appointed a year ago has proved to be a very good appointment and the initial year's operations indicate that this officer is filling a definite need. He and his executive officer have travelled separately and jointly the length and breadth of our province and have organized and conducted satisfactorily large numbers of instructional courses for coroners in all parts of the province.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, the operations of each branch of my department, and that of each adjunct thereto, can be fully explored as we discuss the various votes in the estimates of the department which I would now propose to do.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Sir, I was sorry to see that there was not in the estimates of the hon. Attorney-General's department a sum of money for a public defender. We have brought up this problem of a public defender, that is a general term that can be used, but some system where an accused is assured of a proper defence. I realize we have here, in the county of York, the legal aid society which certainly is of some help, but I do not believe that an accused person today is getting a proper defence.

Since this House last sat we had what I think was the shocking case of Robert Roberts. This arose simply because the person in this province who does not have sufficient funds, or does not have friends who have sufficient knowledge, simply does not get a proper defence. The magistrates may do their best, but here in a large city such as Toronto there are so many accused in our courts that it is a mass of people going before the magistrates.

Since 1914, in many states of the United States there has existed an office similar to a public defender, and it is high time that we did the same thing here. It stands to reason that in an area like Toronto, where we do not have proper court facilities, where we have a shortage of magistrates and, even going on into the higher realms of the law, a shortage of judges, the accused is not getting a proper trial.

There have been too many instances where you get remand after remand of individuals who are held in the Don Gaol until the time of trial; and the worst cases, the most flagrant cases, are where the accused did not have a lawyer. He either could not afford one or did not have the knowledge how to obtain one.

Certainly with the number of people held in the Don Gaol many people can sit there

indefinitely; and even if you have a conscientious administration of justice the number of people simply overwhelms the most conscientious officer of the law. So if we are going to see to it that we have in this province British justice, British justice which we often brag about but which we do not always carry out, we are going to have to have not only better court facilities and more officers as magistrates and judges, but we should have a public defender.

Today our system of Crown attorneys weights the whole case, I say, in favour of the Crown. For example, we do not pay a Crown attorney a sufficient amount of money. As a result, you have a Crown attorney working for you who is maybe getting his training so that he can become a top-notch criminal lawyer.

While he is learning his trade, learning his profession for a number of years, he is taking advice from the police who have investigated the case. You have a system where in effect the police are not only the people who have done the arresting and got the facts but the police are the ones who are also in some cases completely guiding a Crown attorney until the Crown attorney has had more experience.

But as soon as that Crown attorney becomes experienced and can earn more money he is off on his own where he can earn at least twice as much if not more. It is true that some of our most distinguished men at the bar have been at some time in their life a Crown attorney, which shows what a wonderful training ground it is. But if you are going to get top men to be Crown attorneys you are going to have to pay them a sufficient amount of money. Because of this one weakness it is another reason why the individual, once he is in the coils of the law, should have a public defender.

I think such distinguished magistrates as Glenn Strike have recommended that we should have an individual. I know I have sat in court myself and seen instances where, if there had been an individual on hand to speak up for the accused, that sentence may not have been so severe or certainly different proceedings could have been taken where the accused person could have had a fairer trial.

Also, if we had a public defender he could emphasize the importance of having case reports, a history report on an accused. Many men, I feel, if the circumstances of their lives were brought before the magistrate, would be put on probation instead of going to jail. There is a lot that could be done

in this respect that the government has refused to do.

There is one other item that I would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, and that is: Surely we can put teeth in the law? Surely we can find some way in our administration of justice to prosecute some of these people who hound many innocent people who do not understand their rights? I want to give you an exact example.

We often hear much of these people who are selling contracts where you buy magazines, where people sign documents and then are more or less pressured into believing that they are bound by some of these documents. Many cases come to mind. One case came to my attention recently about which I feel our administration of justice should be able to do something about.

There is in this city an organization called the Family Publication Services of Canada Limited. They have men going door to door trying to sell a magazine, say five magazines, for a term of three years at so much money; only you just put a dollar or two down. They are usually high pressure people.

In this example I have in mind, an 80-year-old woman who lives on an old age pension who signed this paper; and even by her signature it was obvious it was a person who was old and had a very shaky hand. This company makes continual demands on this woman to pay up. Then comes a series of threatening letters, then a letter that it is going to be turned over to a lawyer. In the course of a week, or two weeks, about six or seven letters come along. Then they proceed to phone this woman at midnight saying if you do not pay up we are going to get the police or the authorities after you.

They have no right to do this, but certainly this is being done. I think it is an instance where the authorities should, if they cannot find a law or statute today, enforce some type of legislation to see to it that people who normally do not understand their rights will not be harassed by some of these publication services.

This type of thing has been mentioned by columnists in newspapers. It continues to go on. I think it is done on a vast scale in a large city of this type, and these people are only stopped when some authority lets them know that action will be taken.

This example that I have given has happened recently. I know there have been many more than have been brought to my attention but I think the hon. Attorney-General's office should do something to protect these people who do not know or understand

their rights. I feel that I would like to hear from the hon. Attorney-General if he cannot make it possible to give some protection to these people who sign these documents, so-called contracts, and then are subject to pressure over a large period of time.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Sir, I would like to make a few preliminary comments with regard to the estimates of the hon. Attorney-General developing the theme that has been introduced by the hon. member for Parkdale, with particular reference to a public defender and certain other ancillary matters.

I think that legislatures and the public at large, should be giving much greater consideration than they are at the present time to what happens to the individual, particularly to the individual who may not be too well educated and perhaps not too intelligent, in this increasingly complex society. Our society is necessarily complex. As it becomes complex it tends to become bureaucratic. We cannot reverse the trend towards complexity but I think we can offset the trend towards bureaucracy, because bureaucracy usually ends up with some person, usually a little fellow, being trampled in the dirt.

My observation as a layman—I make that reservation advisedly, because I do not purport to be an expert in these matters—nevertheless the layman, the non-expert, sometimes has an interesting point of view, too, because he is on the receiving end of some of these procedures. Not that I have personally any complaints about any unjust treatment but I have constituents who, in my opinion, have been unjustly treated, whose rights have not been properly considered.

I say, as a layman, that we have developed in our complex society, and I am thinking now particularly of the city of Toronto where our society is more complex than anywhere else, a sausage machine system of justice. Men are pushed through the police courts and measured out in lengths. They go in and are out almost before they know it, usually on fairly minor charges which do not carry with them too severe penalties, but penalties nevertheless. The accused go through the court and come out just like sausages out of a machine, with some sort of rough-and-ready justice applied to them without any real consideration of the problem of the whole man or any real effort to see that his point of view is placed before the court.

I said that this usually happens on relatively minor charges, but we know in the case of Robin Roberts that something similar happened in a very serious charge, and a man

landed in penitentiary in the first instance, I think, with a 21-year sentence—a 24-year sentence, rather—when clearly the man ought to have gone to a mental hospital. He clearly ought to be in a mental hospital right now and not in a penitentiary.

There was some minor rectification made of the gross injustice done to this man. I may say that this man happens to have been a constituent of mine, although I do not think that is relevant. I think all hon. members are interested in injustice regardless of where it happens. But the rectification was very minor indeed, indicating the gross inadequacy of the law.

I do not criticize the courts; they have to administer the law as it is. But I do criticize the law that still permits a man in the condition of this man to be in a penitentiary instead of a mental hospital.

One of the difficulties that the courts, in this city particularly, and in the province generally, are up against is the very large number of cases they have to deal with. One obvious remedy to this problem is to have more court facilities and more judges and magistrates.

I would suggest in the city of Toronto, with which I am more familiar, there simply is no excuse for the poor facilities, the atrociously poor facilities, particularly in the police courts, and the inadequate number of magistrates that are available to deal with cases. The magistrates cannot do anything much more than dispense sausage machine justice because they have so many cases coming before them. And it is true, I believe, in the higher courts also that the docket is so long that it is very difficult for the judges to dispense justice with the sort of expedition which is necessary. There is an old saying that justice delayed is justice denied. The docket of cases is now so heavy that it is inevitable that, in some cases at least, justice will be delayed.

I would suggest as a step that could be taken almost immediately to at least alleviate the situation, that we should do something about our whole approach to automobile insurance cases. One of the major reasons, as far as I can see why the higher courts are so cluttered up with cases and so unable to deal with many cases with reasonable despatch is that they have so many automobile accident insurance claims before them. Those cases are not dealt with adequately; as my authority on that I will cite the Chief Justice of the High Court. The fact that there are so many of them means that other cases are not dealt with with reasonable despatch either.

If we followed a modern, up-to-date procedure and set up a system of public automobile accident insurance—and I will not under this vote go into the details of that—so that only a very small minority of these cases went to the courts, then we would not only be doing something that would be most useful and necessary with regard to auto accidents, but we would also be taking a very important step towards relieving the burden of the overall case-load in the courts at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing this general question of the rights of the individual and the fact that there is not adequate protection for them at the present time, I would like to refer to one or two other matters.

The problems the individual is up against in this complex bureaucratic society not only relate to what may happen to him if he is haled into court, and fortunately it is only a minority of us who ever get haled into court on criminal charges, but he also has serious problems in just finding his way through all the complexity of government machinery. I am not objecting to the complexity of government machinery, I think we should always try to avoid complexity where we can, but in this complex world government machinery is inevitably going to be complex; otherwise, we cannot deal with the problems that exist. The point is the average man has very great difficulty finding his way around and in asserting rights that are clearly his.

Many individuals fail to assert their rights because they do not know what to do. To a certain degree the private member of the Legislature is able to be helpful, and I have no doubt every hon. member of this Legislature is in the same position that I am, where every day he is trying to help a constituent find this way through the red tape that develops in the administration of complicated operations. But I think we should not rely entirely on the member of the Legislature to assist the constituent. I am not suggesting the member of the Legislature should not be prepared to do it and should not consider it his duty to do so, but I think we should have something in the nature of the institution which started in Scandinavian countries and is now slowly spreading to other countries and is described by the Scandinavian word "ombudsman". As I understand it this is an official of government, paid out of public funds but independent of the government in something the same way as the provincial auditor is independent of the government, accountable to the legislative assembly rather than to the

government, whose job it is to see that the citizen is protected against arbitrary or unjust exercise of power by any government official.

My information is that the existence of an "ombudsman" in Scandinavian countries has meant that the "ombudsman" has not really had too much work to do, because his very existence is a restraining influence. All officials are human, after all, and an official who may be tempted to cut a corner by acting in an arbitrary manner, pauses when he thinks of the "ombudsman" who may be asking to see his files at some future date. He is less likely to act in an arbitrary manner and is more likely to act in a manner that takes into account the human rights and the needs of the individual with whom he is dealing.

I do think that this sort of institution is desirable in this province and I raise it at this time because if we established it, I think it would probably be covered by the estimates of the hon. Attorney-General's department, even though the "ombudsman" would be independent of the Attorney-General and of the government.

Another reform that I would suggest, which I think could be instituted almost immediately, would be to establish a procedure whereby the police are required, whenever they arrest a person, to provide him with a short simple statement of his rights in printed form. They should not be permitted to question him or do anything with him, other than to put him into custody, if that is necessary, until he has been given this statement and has had an opportunity to study it and appreciate its significance. I think such a statement should be available in several different languages and it should be provided to a person who is arrested in the language which he most readily understands. I do not think any citizen should be arrested, or any non-citizen for that matter, without being immediately advised of his rights, and in very simple language so that people with the most limited education can understand what is being put before them.

There is another matter I would like to refer to, although I hope to deal with it in somewhat greater detail under the estimates of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). I think it may be under those estimates that it is most appropriate, but I will mention it here too since it affects civil liberties. From some of the situations I have observed up to now I have developed a concern over a procedure which sometimes takes place, of committing a person to a mental hospital without him ever having an opportunity to

be tried on an offence with which he is charged.

Now, of course, if the person pleads incapacity or his counsel pleads incapacity to stand trial, naturally he should be committed to a hospital or dealt with in some other appropriate manner. But this sort of procedure can take place over the objection of the person charged, so that the result is he is denied a trial when he is charged with an offence. He is unable to clear himself of this charge, and he is in effect penalized because he is placed in custody and deprived of his liberty, without ever having an opportunity to face his accusers in an open court. I realize that there may be difficulties in this matter, and a man who is clearly quite insane probably has to be committed to an institution whether or not he agrees to it or pleads insanity. But I was talking to a man just yesterday who was charged with an offence and ended up in the Ontario Hospital at Mimico without being tried. It appeared to me—I am no expert in these matters—the man was quite capable of standing trial and he wanted to stand trial. He wanted to face his accusers, he wanted the court to make a finding on the charge against him, but he was denied that opportunity because he was committed against his will to a mental hospital. Now I think this is a matter that requires some study and review.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a suggestion to the hon. Attorney-General that we should establish in this province some sort of committee of review, if one wants to call it that, that would consist of one or two representatives of the judiciary, representatives of the legal profession and also representatives of the public who are, shall we say, the consumers of justice. This would be a permanent committee regularly reviewing our judicial procedures and facilities in the province to discover inadequacies in them as they develop and not wait until they have become crying scandals. It would regularly advise both the hon. Minister and the public as to inadequacies in procedures and facilities, so that remedial action could be taken at an early date rather than after a situation had become so scandalous that action had become imperative.

I myself believe that the court situation in the city of Toronto has already reached scandalous proportions, and it reached those proportions some time ago. I would like to see that sort of situation corrected as quickly as possible. I would also like some sort of body, such as the committee of review I have suggested, that would continuously re-

view the situation to ensure that such problems would not become acute in the future.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Sir, I was a little disappointed in hearing the remarks of the hon. Attorney-General in introducing the estimates of this department. Over the past few years I have come to know him reasonably well and I recognize him as a man of substantial energy and some pretty fair organizational ability.

In the several months since he has taken over his office, according to the rumours that you pick up in the corridor outside, there have been all sorts of things happening in the hon. Attorney-General's department and I thought we would be given a pretty good idea of some of his new organizational plans and some of the new trends, some of the innovations that he was going to bring about to this department. But unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, all we heard today was just a very brief summary of what the department does, various heads that are set out in the estimates, and most of us are able to read these heads anyway and have some idea of the sub-departments that The Attorney-General's Department looks after.

I thought really that we would get a new look at what an Attorney-General's department in Ontario should do. So I say, Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed in the new hon. Attorney-General, because he has not come into this House and told us he is going to change things. Apparently we are going to have more of the same. He is making notes, since the hon. member for Parkdale and the hon. member for Woodbine made comments, Mr. Chairman, and I gather, of course, he is going to reply to these things. But I was expecting from this new hon. Attorney-General something more, something substantial, that would indicate he was really going to get down to business and do a job in this new portfolio.

One matter that he did mention, Mr. Chairman, was the function that he has of the enforcement of the laws of the province of Ontario. I think perhaps the time has come to talk about the very tragic events that took place in Kapuskasing.

Certainly we all are pleased that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) was able to throw some hope on the situation this morning and indicate that perhaps a solution might be forthcoming in that very difficult situation within a short time.

But the thing, Mr. Chairman, that I think we must pay very careful attention to is the tragedy that took place in the town of

Kapuskasing. Three men were killed and nine men were injured. There was a responsibility on the law enforcement officials of the province of Ontario to see that this sort of thing, within the limits of their ability, should not happen.

A strike took place. Without discussing the merits of the strike at all, without discussing whether the company was right or the union was right, it was obvious that a situation had occurred—and it should have been obvious to the people in charge of the law enforcement in this province some 30-odd days ago—that this was a situation that was fraught with danger.

Because what exists up there? Anyone who is familiar with this area at all knows that there is a union which works for the company and there are a group of independent contractors who work for themselves. Mr. Chairman, anyone must have known, if they paid any attention to it—and I suggest the hon. Attorney-General is the man who should have been paying attention to it—that if in the mid-winter you cut off from the independent contractors their ability to earn a living, their ability to feed their families, their ability to provide heat and light and fuel and all the things that are necessary to live with, if that ability is taken away from them, that many men and their families are going to be in desperate conditions.

Mr. Chairman, it should have been equally obvious that the union were determined that they, by their striking, were going to try to bring about in the minds of the company the carrying out of their will. Surely it must follow that these two groups are going to come into headlong collision. And surely it must follow, as you know these men, the union men and the independent contractors, that if they come into violent collision there is serious danger of strike, there is serious danger of law breaking, there is serious danger of violence, destruction of property, there is serious danger that people are going to be injured, seriously injured, and serious danger that people are going to be killed.

This was not a quiet strike. Men were beaten up, people were hauled out of automobiles, trucks were overturned, lumber was dispersed. And this is not a case, Mr. Chairman, where there was not ample warning that this was an explosive situation. Unfortunately, events had to move to the point where three men were killed, nine others injured, and 19 men arrested and charged with non-capital murder, before methods were found whereby 200 provincial policemen could be sent into the area.

Mr. Chairman, had anyone listened to the voices of the people of the north, to the mayor of Kapuskasing who said weeks ago that there would be violence and danger, then proper steps would have to be taken, could have been taken, and should have been taken to prevent this tragedy having happened in this province.

Without taking sides in this labour dispute at all, I merely say, Mr. Chairman, that there was a responsibility on this government to have recognized the violent explosive nature of this problem, to have recognized that when many men had their means of livelihood taken away from them and were faced with the problem of starvation for themselves and their families, violence was bound to result. When warnings came out of the north something should have been done about it. And nothing was done about it until three men were killed and nine men were injured.

Then, Mr. Chairman, it was found possible to send up 200 policemen, senior police officers, and order was restored.

It is unfortunate that, in a case like this, the barn door is locked after the horse is gone. It is unfortunate, in a case like this, that the lesson was only learned by the government of Ontario after three men were killed, nine men were wounded, 19 charges of non-capital murder laid, and some 230 or 240-odd men from the union charged with riot.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that had the government been aware of what its responsibilities were, enough policemen would have been on the spot very shortly after the strike had started to make sure that this sort of rioting, this sort of law-breaking, did not take place. I say that the government stands condemned and must stand condemned in the eyes of the people of Ontario for not having taken these steps in connection with this most serious matter.

I turn now to another topic, Mr. Chairman. In the *Toronto Globe and Mail* for a series of days a lady named Ruth Worth has been writing columns in connection with the administration of justice and courtrooms, particularly concentrating on the Metropolitan Toronto area.

I would have thought that the hon. Attorney-General would have had something to say about these articles. I am very glad that these articles have been written. The system of courts in Metropolitan Toronto has been a tragedy over many years. It has been talked about, by newspapers, by members of this assembly, by municipal councillors and so on, but one of the most advanced steps

that we got from this government was a year ago when the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Haskett) gave the jails and the courts back to the municipalities instead of giving more responsibility to the province.

Just a paragraph out of this article this morning which is the last of a series of articles. She says:

Provincial patronage still exists in the appointments of sheriffs, their deputies, court clerks and other court officers. The result is that these officials seem to be imbued with a deep fear of rocking the boat. They will seldom innovate and usually will resist change. One example of this is the archaic design of the prisoner's docks.

I do not know if the hon. Attorney-General has seen any of our courtrooms in the city hall but if he has not already, I suggest that he should take a look.

In Chicago courts a man steps forward to be arraigned and a guard stands behind him. When his case is being heard he sits at the counsel table with his lawyer. Here, and it happens every day in the city hall in Toronto, the prisoners are herded together in the dock and must beckon or summon their counsel with a stage whisper. Some prisoner's docks have the added refinement of wire netting across the top to further the courtroom's resemblance to a zoo.

This is absolutely correct! It is just a hideous thing. How anyone can believe that justice is really going to be done—even though it is done—but can believe that the appearance of justice is being given out of these courtrooms is just beyond belief, Mr. Chairman.

An accused person on bail may, however, sit in a chair placed behind a stand.

And Miss Worth concludes with this:

Surely those accused of criminal offences in Chicago are no less dangerous than those arrested in Toronto, yet those who will never think of removing the wire netting are the same group who deliver and listen to countless self-congratulatory after-dinner—

and might I interpolate there, during the course of the Legislature, after or during estimate speeches, self-congratulatory ones:

—extolling the quality of British justice dispensed every year in the law courts of Metropolitan Toronto.

And this, Mr. Chairman, is why I say I was most disappointed in the opening remarks of the hon. Attorney-General in connection with the introduction of these estimates. I would have thought from a man who has indicated to me, in any event, a substantial energy and real organizational ability, that we would have heard that he was really going to do something about the system of administering justice in this province; but we have not heard a single word from him.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, it is the hour of 1 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on Monday the estimates of the hon. Attorney-General and, as I said I would do last night, the next department to be dealt with will be Lands and Forests, and following that will be The Department of Agriculture. Now it is not possible for me to forecast the verbosity of the Opposition and I cannot tell you on what day these will be reached, but they will be taken in that order.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Monday, February 18, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963

CONTENTS

Monday, February 18, 1963

Reading and receiving petitions	787
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	787
Estimates, Department of the Attorney-General, Mr. Cass, continued	787
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	819

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1963

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the west gallery, students from St. Francis of Assisi Separate School, Toronto and Fonthill Public School, Welland.

Presenting petitions.

Receiving petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the Public School Board S.S. No. 1, Leduc township, Thunder Bay, praying that an Act may pass authorizing debentures for school construction and equipment.

Of the Municipal Clerks and Financial Officers Association of Ontario praying that an Act may pass authorizing and restricting the use of the initials "D.M.F.A." signifying "Diploma in Municipal Finance and Administration".

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following:

1. The annual report of The Ontario Department of Transport for 1961-62.

2. The 7th annual report of the Ontario Highway Transport Board of the province of Ontario for the year ending December 31, 1962.

3. Report of the Provincial Auditor on the Public Service Retirement Fund for the year ending March 31, 1962.

4. Report of the Provincial Auditor on the Public Service Superannuation Fund for the year ended March 31, 1962.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Twentieth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. K. Brown in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 201:

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, at adjournment time, Friday, I was asking a series of questions of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) and I hope that during the course of these estimates we are going to get a series of answers.

It seems on Friday I was dealing with the situation in Metropolitan Toronto courts. Just today, Mr. Chairman, my eye was caught by an article in today's issue of the *Toronto Telegram* written by a man named Peter Reilly. I thought this article set out enough of the difficulty involved in the situation in the courts that a portion of it should be read into the record. Under the heading of "Tried, convicted and sentenced in minutes without legal aid," Mr. Reilly has this to say:

When his name was called, the young man stood up and looked uncertainly towards the front of the court where a black-robed magistrate sat surrounded by clerks, reporters and policemen.

How do you intend to plead to this charge, he was asked. Guilty or not guilty?

He hesitated a moment, and then as the magistrate fidgeted impatiently he mumbled, 'Guilty'.

Within a frighteningly few minutes the charge had been read, a detective sergeant had read the arresting officer's report, the magistrate had imposed the sentence and the young man was off to jail.

All the legal amenities had been observed. The young man had been asked whether he wished to proceed that day. He had been allowed to testify on his own behalf. Everything was neat and tidy.

But there was no one there to help him, no one to advise him how to plead, no one to tell his side of the story clearly and concisely. If there had been, he might not have gone to jail.

The young man—and his name does not matter—is just one of the hundreds of examples of why Ontario's approach to legal

help for poor people is getting some long second looks after 11 years' operation.

The mid-winter meeting of the Canadian Bar Association — Ontario Branch — was asked recently to scrap the system in favour of public defenders. But the resolution calling for it was shelved.

Now, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the remarks made by my hon. colleague from Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) deserve the serious attention of this House, and deserve the serious attention of the hon. Attorney-General, because the system of legal aid in this province is simply disgraceful.

The young man had been arrested the night before and left overnight in a police cell, three paces long and a pace wide with a toilet, and a DDT-sprinkled metal slab ostensibly for sleeping on.

He had been collected early in the morning, driven to a tank near the main courtroom and left for two hours with about 30 other prisoners, mostly time-toughened cons for company. If he had some money, he could have bought some rolls and coffee at highly inflated prices from the cell guards.

I think the hon. Attorney-General should have a look at the cell guards' traffic in food which they sell at highly inflated prices to prisoners, as Mr. Reilly suggests. It seems a very important question.

But he was broke, so he went without.

So, tired, frightened and confused, he appeared for a very important episode in his life, unshaven, rumpled and lightly spotted with DDT powder—already the perfect image of a derelict—a sorry sight beside the clear-eyed clean-shaven court officials.

All he could think of was getting it over with. Maybe they'd go easy with him if he pleaded guilty. A policeman had given him that advice.

And this happens far, far too often.

He went to jail, and in the process acquired a record that would follow him wherever he went for the rest of his life.

This happens every day in Toronto's magistrates' courts.

If the same young man had contracted a serious disease the community would have roared with indignation had proper medical treatment not been provided.

But few people pay much attention to the goings-on in the courts, except when there's a sensational murder trial. They aren't aware of the dreary procession of

men and women—as many as 300 in a single day—who file in and out of Toronto's magistrates' courts, or of what happens to them.

What does happen to them is often depressing to watch and is becoming a serious concern to lawyers, magistrates, welfare workers and others who watch it every day.

And the article goes on.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these matters that Mr. Reilly writes about are no secret to anyone, and least of all should not be a secret to the hon. Attorney-General. As I said in my remarks on Friday, I had hoped that when this hon. Attorney-General took over the department we would see a new approach to this serious sort of problem. But we have not seen a thing that is new; just more of the same old nonsense and more of these tragedies that Mr. Reilly writes about.

Enough for that point, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General is going to tell us anything about this new police commission. We recall a year ago that his hon. predecessor (Mr. Roberts) introduced Bill No. 24 and talked about the police commission, Mr. Chairman. He said The Police Act as it now stands—I am referring now not to the amendment but to the Act as it then stood—makes provision for police commissions at a local level.

Mr. Chairman: Order. This will come under vote 224.

Mr. Singer: I think, Mr. Chairman, with great respect, that at this stage we should be entitled to talk generally about the affairs of the Attorney-General's department, and certainly policing has got something to do with the Attorney-General's department. I think it is time that we got some of this on to the record. Some of the details can be dealt with a little later on, things like salaries and uniforms.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Could I just ask, Mr. Chairman: Is not the hon. gentleman the first speaker on behalf of the—

Mr. Singer: No, I am not.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I think it has been pretty well understood in the House that each party speaks once generally to the estimates and then we speak specifically to each estimate as it comes up.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, there has been no such ruling in this session of the House,

and if the hon. House leader had been observing the procedures with the earlier estimates he would notice that there were as many speakers when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) was leading the House. He apparently has a different set of rules to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. There were as many speeches made as the Opposition wanted to make, and for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I propose to continue.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Then, Mr. Chairman, we will have to rise to a point of order and put it to a vote. This is a matter of procedure that was adopted two or three years ago in the House and I do not think there is any reason to change it now.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why the hon. Minister of Economics and Development in his usual peevish nature tries to make over the rules of the House and run it differently to what the hon. Prime Minister does.

Mr. Chairman: This comes under vote 224, the Ontario Police Commission.

Mr. Singer: No, this is part of the general remarks in connection with the performance of the Attorney-General's department, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Parkdale—

Mr. Singer: What about the hon. member for Parkdale other than he is a fine man?

Mr. Chairman: He made the general remarks for the Opposition.

Mr. Singer: He made the first remarks, that is true. But in the other debates, the debates on Travel and Publicity, in the debates of all the departments that have been called heretofore, the rules were different and there is no reason why they should be changed this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, Mr. Chairman, if there is a point of order before the House I want to speak to it. We have tried for a number of years now to get established the practice that one person from each of the Opposition parties leads off and any subsequent speaker is going to deal with items in the estimates. As far as I am concerned I am willing to live by that. The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) led off for my group—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): You represent five members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute, just a minute. Whether I represent five members, Mr. Chairman, surely is completely irrelevant. We are dealing with principles here.

An hon. member: It is not a principle.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a principle. We are trying to get the business of this House on an orderly businesslike basis—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. I have every desire to join forces with the Liberals fighting the government this afternoon on a lot of issues, but let us see if we can get this clarified.

The point of order is that somebody leads off for each of the Opposition parties and subsequent speakers deal with specific items. As far as I am concerned I repeat I am willing to live by that. The hon. member for Woodbine led off for us.

We are going to be dealing with issues, and I would submit on this particular point, that the hon. member for York Centre is on weak ground, Mr. Chairman, because there is an estimate dealing with a police commission. But I want to get clarification on this point. For example, where do you put a discussion, a further discussion, of public defender? Does it come under the main estimate?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: It comes under the main estimate. In other words, after we have finished the introductory comment. Presumably we are at the main estimate now.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think this has clarified a single thing. I spoke for 20-odd minutes on Friday when these estimates were first introduced.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Singer: Now, without the chorus from over there. Surely Mr. Chairman and I can have a discussion on rules of order without any help from these—

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. Singer:—authorities on rules of order of the House. I spoke for 20 minutes on Friday generally on the Attorney-General's department and nobody, including the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, or the hon. member for York South, saw fit to rise and call me to order. That is what I am continuing to do. Surely we do not change the rules half way through the estimates?

Mr. Chairman: You were speaking on vote 201 at that time.

Mr. Singer: All right. Well, I will go back. If you say I cannot speak about the police commission now, I will save it for a little later.

Mr. Chairman: The police commission comes under vote 224. The member can speak at that time.

Mr. Singer: All right, can I talk about policemen then other than police commissions? I think I will have a talk about that, Mr. Chairman. Let me talk about policemen for a bit.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 201.

Mr. Singer: Vote 201, yes. All right, now let me talk about policemen for a while. I noticed in the press the other day, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Attorney-General had had something to say to the association of rural municipalities about salaries that are going to be paid or should be paid to policemen. The hon. Attorney-General was espousing the idea that policemen should be paid more in these rural municipalities. This is a very good idea, but I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General during his short stop in The Department of Municipal Affairs bothered to look at the—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: On a point of order.

Mr. Singer: Oh, Mr. Chairman, I wish these fellows would—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Policemen and police salaries come under vote 222, the Ontario provincial police. There is no question about the hon. member not being able to give his speech, he should just give it in the proper place, that is all.

Mr. Singer: That is provincial police, Mr. Chairman. These are just ordinary policemen in municipalities.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What do you say all these people go down to the Royal York?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: We have had enough rude remarks for one day. Let us get on with the estimates.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me get back to these policemen and the remarks of the hon. Attorney-General. The hon. Attorney-General was saying to this association of rural municipalities that in his opinion policemen should be paid more. I presume by that this was an effort, and a worthwhile effort, to try to raise the standards of police service and the capabilities of policemen, and that sort of thing.

But the point occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, and I wonder that it did not occur to the hon. Attorney-General during his short stop in The Department of Municipal Affairs on the way by, that if he wants rural municipalities to pay more to policemen there should be some greater tax base available to those rural municipalities. There should be more assessment available to them, and there should be some more dollars available to them to properly pay all of their civil servants, including the policemen.

I wondered if the hon. Attorney-General should not have paused to think about the present structure of the municipal organization in this province, the fact that we have a thousand municipalities, and the fact that he was wasting the time of the association when he suggested that they should take this step on their own.

Because, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Attorney-General had been serious about this at all, either he or someone in his department would have come forward long ago with some method of providing proper police service for these smaller municipalities where presently there is not any method available to pay these men.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, when the small municipalities want a police chief or a new policeman, and so many of them just have one officer, or one officer and an assistant, they draw on the big city police forces. So often they take a constable from the big city police forces and make him their chief. He has one or two men underneath him, and this is all they can get.

I am not running down the ability of these men they take to be the local chiefs, but this is all they can get because they cannot afford to pay these men proper salaries.

I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that there would have been some real merit if the hon. Attorney-General, when he made this speech suggesting that there be some sort of consolidation of local police forces, that the

units be combined so that there could be a bigger unit, with a broader tax base, so that there would have been an ability to attract better trained police officers and to bring them into these smaller communities and provide a proper sort of police force.

But that is not what we got. This group had a lecture from the hon. Attorney-General and the lecture was directed at better pay for policemen in rural municipalities or in small municipalities.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. member whether he read the speech or whether he is quoting from a newspaper?

Mr. Singer: I have not had the privilege of reading the speech.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Then might I suggest to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that before he speaks further he read the speech because he will find in it many of the things he is talking about which are very good and very definitely part of the policy.

Mr. Singer: Well, I would think, Mr. Chairman, perhaps this touches the point. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. Attorney-General did deal with some of these things in his speech he should have made this information available to the House. If he was dissatisfied with the way the press reported his speech, the House has been in session for quite some considerable period of time—

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am not dissatisfied. The hon. member is the man who is dissatisfied.

Mr. Singer: He could have risen on a point of privilege and tabled his speech or brought it to the attention of the other hon. members of the House. We really have not the time to follow each hon. member around and listen to each speech given by each member of the Cabinet. If there is important information in it, the hon. Attorney-General should have made it available to all hon. members of the House. All we had to go on were the press reports. And if the press report was not fair to the hon. Attorney-General—and I do not know whether he is suggesting that or not—if he was unfairly treated by the press, then we should have had word about it before. And if it is not too late, let us hear about it later today.

Well, Mr. Chairman, within the bounds which now have apparently been laid down, I will later join in some remarks about the Ontario Provincial Police and the Police Commission and I also have some remarks

I want to make about the Emergency Measures Organization, and some remarks as well about the Securities Commission.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to say very much about the estimates of the hon. Attorney-General, because not being a barrister, there are many in the House I feel are more qualified than I. However, there is a subject which has bothered me for some years now, and it was emphasized the other day when I was reading the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, of February 4, 1963, in connection with the meeting of the Law Society of Upper Canada in the city of Windsor, Ontario. In connection with this meeting, Mr. Sedgwick, who, I understand, is the treasurer of the compensation fund of the Ontario branch of the Canadian Bar Association, pointed out the fact that the claims of this particular fund have been staggering in the last year or so.

To quote him, from the paper:

"Some of them are really staggering," the treasurer said. There was one for \$225,000 and others for \$83,000, \$57,000 and \$48,000, total claims amounting to \$566,000. Mr. Sedgwick said not all the claims will be honoured. And he added, "If you want to reduce the claims and minimize the criticisms made of our profession, it is your duty, distasteful though it may be, to inform us of a colleague in trouble."

Mr. Chairman, what Mr. Sedgwick has said here is that there are going to be clients of lawyers in the province of Ontario today who, through dishonesty on the part of a very few lawyers in the province, are going to lose large sums of money.

We do not really say it is being stolen from them—that is not the way it is described in the paper—when we are talking about the great legal profession. But the fact is, as far as the client is concerned, that funds which have been put in lawyers' hands for trust have been stolen from them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to my own position in life as a dairy distributor. All dairy distributors in the province of Ontario are bonded. One could readily see how a little dairy operator such as myself should be bonded, but on the other hand we have huge business enterprises such as Silverwood Dairies, Borden Dairies, Acme Farmers Dairies, who, to use a slang phrase, are million-dollar outfits. These dairies are all bonded, too, and I am sure that they are just as capable of paying their producers—that is, the people who supply milk to the

dairies, so it may be bottled and distributed to the public—they are just as capable of being able to guarantee the claims that any producer may have against them, as any of the legal profession in the province of Ontario. All of us are bonded.

I fail to see, inasmuch as some members of the public are losing money through dishonest lawyers, why, lawyers in the province of Ontario should not be bonded, too. I am sure that there are other examples in the province of Ontario where many people are bonded—treasurers of municipalities, treasurers of companies and many besides my own dairy business. Many of these are bonded by insurance companies so that any client, in my particular instance the producer of milk who supplies milk to my dairy, is always paid if I should become bankrupt.

My claim, Mr. Chairman, is this: If the lawyer should happen to go bankrupt, then his clients should always be paid, too. As was pointed out by Mr. Sedgwick, who is certainly a well-known lawyer in this province, there are lawyers' clients in this province today who are not going to be paid.

Some time in the estimates, when the hon. Attorney-General is speaking, I would like to have him mention this subject as to just why it is—I am sure he has thought about it before—that lawyers cannot be bonded, too, so that their clients do not lose funds because of dishonesty by a very small percentage of their profession.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, the point which has been brought up by the hon. member for Bruce is one that distresses me as well as any other member of the legal profession. I am sure that when these things happen in other businesses or professions, those other honest and hard-working members of that business or profession are equally embarrassed and equally anxious to try to find a solution.

I may say, sir, that the legal profession not only in Ontario but in other common law countries—and I cannot speak any wider than that—have been faced with this problem in increasing measure in the past few years. In Ontario it has become a very great problem.

I am advised by colleagues of mine who are members of the governing body of the Law Society, which is the governing and licensing body for lawyers, that very careful investigation has been made with respect to bonding. It has been found that the cost of bonding lawyers could not be compared to, shall we say, the cost of bonding a dairy operator; in fact it is prohibitive. I also am

advised—and this is a matter which concerns each one of us who practises, as well as each one of us who makes use of a lawyer—on good authority that this matter is not one which is just left until there is a defalcation such as mentioned by the hon. member, and then suddenly appears in the newspaper. I am well advised, sir, that this matter is under constant study by the governing body of the Law Society. Certainly in the department we are anxious to give such assistance as we may.

I do not know, human nature being what it is, any solution other than some form of insurance or bonding or compensation fund such as the Law Society has. I do not know any place, Mr. Chairman, where there has been a successful scheme which has prevented people from being mulcted of their moneys, not only by lawyers but by other people who have been placed in positions of trust.

I can assure the House, Mr. Chairman, as well as the hon. member for Bruce, that this is a matter of great concern. At the moment it would not appear to lie within the legislative duties of my department to introduce any legislation on it. I do not think that is necessary. I do think that there is progress being made.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, and I think everyone here, sir—certainly those who are lawyers, barristers and solicitors—are well aware of it, because each year they produce from their own pocket a very substantial sum of money to help make up the defalcations. I will say that the compensation fund, while it does not pay 100 per cent where there are huge sums stolen, such as mentioned in the press clipping of the hon. member, in most cases does make up the loss of the ordinary man who has lost a few thousand dollars.

No fund that we know of has ever been able to face serious and heavy losses. It is a matter of professional ethics, it is a matter of professional discipline, and it is one on which I know the legal profession is very seriously working. I think that this matter will undoubtedly arise in another year, and I should hope by then there will be some further progress, apart from the compensation fund and the pious wishes of all those who belong to the profession that the answer will be found.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this but I would just like to say this to the hon. Attorney-General: He mentioned the fact that in his opinion and the opinion of his staff probably, that the cost of bonding would be prohibitive. I agree that if this were done on an individual basis, the

cost of bonding probably would be staggering for the individual lawyer. I would suggest that, with the number of lawyers we have in the province of Ontario, if we approached insurance companies and a master bond were drawn up, something could be worked out.

I do not know exactly what it is that lawyers have at the present time—\$55 to the compensation fund. Mr. Sedgwick points out here that the large amount of money that was stolen last year is going to be paid back. I do not think he gives the percentage, but there is \$349,000 on hand and the claims against it are \$566,000. I suggest—it is a straight case of mathematics—that if the lawyers had paid \$110 per person for a bond this year, instead of the \$55, you would have had twice as much money in the fund—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Unless we had twice as many defalcations.

Mr. Whicher: Defalcations—well, unless you did; then we would have to put it up to \$200 or \$300 per lawyer. The point is that the public deserves to be protected; and it is our job, I should say to the hon. Attorney-General, as the members of this House, to see that the public is protected. Therefore, I suggest, not as a lawyer but just as a layman, that this matter should not be taken too casually, but seriously investigated.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would not like the hon. member for Bruce to think that there are not as keen businessmen in the legal profession as in the milk marketing profession. I can assure him, from my own personal experience, that the matters which he has mentioned have been well and truly considered. They are not the answer yet and there will be an answer found. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, my deputy Minister, who is a member of the governing body of the Law Society advises me that just this last year—and those who are members of the society will know this—there has been a system of spot checks on lawyers' trust accounts by an independent auditor hired by the Law Society. We hope this will go some way to remedy the situation.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, there are perhaps two or three other things that should be said about this that have not been said. Let me put my remarks in the proper parenthesis in dealing with this very important subject, being very conscious of its interest to the public. I might say the keen interest of the public has been enlivened by the re-

cent notoriety that has been given about defalcations by lawyers.

The parenthesis I would like to put it in is to say that anything I say I say for myself; I speak for myself in saying it, as well as I recognize that the hon. member for Bruce spoke for himself when he spoke. I take it that his remarks, if we advocate the bonding of lawyers, are not the official policy of his party.

It ought to be said that, in relation to the defalcations, I might say we have had some rather scandalous ones of gigantic proportion in northern Ontario, though not in the city of Sudbury I hasten to add. They have occurred a little bit farther west, where some stupendous sums were made off with; and the Crown then made off with those responsible to a certain place of retreat down in eastern Ontario.

The number of lawyers, my hon. friend from Bruce will appreciate, who are involved is a very small, even minuscule percentage of those practising at the bar in Ontario. Just as in every barrel of apples that comes out of Bruce county there are bound to be a couple of rotten ones, so it happens that in the legal profession, if they may be analogized to apples, there are a few bad ones. I should have used the analogy of milk, referring to my hon. friend.

That is one thing. The second thing that ought to be underlined is that we lawyers, in making a contribution to a fund which increased from the lowly pittance of \$10 per annum to the now quite respectable figure of \$55 per year, have demonstrated vis-à-vis the public that we are our brother's keeper; we accept his default, in being responsible to repay the loss or damage that one of our brothers has caused.

The third thing that should be borne in mind, and the hon. member for Bruce will no doubt have seen this in the press, is that the Law Society which administers this fund draws a very rigid distinction between default of moneys which result from the relationship of solicitor and client, which is our true relationship. That is our valid, our eternal, our almost sacred relationship to the public, that of solicitor and client. The public come to us, seek our advice and assistance, and retain us for our skills, our knowledge and our ability to advance the interest that they want to advance. That is the real job of the lawyer.

To get back to the distinction the Law Society draws between that relationship and the relationship of partner and lawyer or customer and lawyer. In the latter case it

envelops such things as the person coming to the lawyer and depositing with him in his trust account a certain sum of money, for which the lawyer is then to find a place for investment at a rate of interest that is stipulated by the customer. The lawyer, according to practice, gets a percentage of the amount of reward, the fruits of the capital. In that sense he becomes a partner with the individual who has deposited the money with him.

That is not the true relationship of solicitor and client. The lawyer then has left his historic and honourable role of advocate and advisor; he has left that role and has become a business man. To do that, to find places to invest capital, is not peculiarly the role of the lawyer.

A dairyman in Wiarton could do that, if somebody left money with him. Any person could do it. It does not have to be a lawyer.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): He invests his own money.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, he invests his own money. He does not go to a lawyer. But the hon. member for Bruce will appreciate that distinction. The Law Society in every case, when he speaks, he puts the figures on the floor of the House, where there are so many claims being advanced and there is so much money in the treasury to pay them.

So far as I am aware, and I follow these things closely, in every case where there was a breach of the trust of solicitor and client, the Law Society has paid. They have entertained those claims and made them good. But in the other case, where it was purely a business relationship, many of these have been rejected. And I daresay I would be entitled to assume, if such is not the case, I can assure my hon. friend from Bruce that if the fund were in deficit in paying those claims that are created by the solicitor and client relationship, then we lawyers would come forward and truly demonstrate that we are our brother's keeper.

To sum it all up it is my opinion, and I am sure I speak for the great majority of the honourable profession of law, that because there are a few bad ones in the province it would be a great mistake to stain the whole of the profession by requiring the profession to be bonded. My hon. friend from Bruce will fully appreciate that the moment you require lawyers to be bonded, then presumably if the person who seeks to hang out his shingle, who holds himself qualified to advise the public and be an advocate on behalf of members of the public, is the acquisition of a bond, then it is the bonding companies that are determin-

ing who shall practise law in the province and who shall not; and that is wrong.

That is entirely wrong. It should be the Law Society of Upper Canada, the academic people of fine institutions of legal training that exist in this province—and more of them are appearing every day—who should make that determination.

I just want to add a remark. I think one of the most important ways of weeding out those people who are unsuitable to practise law is to have smaller law schools; to have fewer students so that the academic people who are training and fitting those people to practise law can pick out the bad apples—perhaps they can see them in the classroom—and those people will not be foisted off on the public.

I am not going to go any further than that for fear of offending the sensibilities of some people in this province, but I would like to see law schools come down to about 200 or 250 students maximum. There are now—well, I hesitate to count them. Hon. members of the House will be surprised to learn, no doubt, that it is only in the last decade that law schools were started at Toronto, Queen's, Western and the University of Ottawa. We now have five in the province, whereas a decade or so ago we had but one.

The hon. Attorney-General, sir, is reported in his remarks as saying, and I quote: "As my predecessor has often stated, as we are all aware, the historic basis of The Department of the Attorney-General has been that of a legal department." There endeth the lesson, Mr. Chairman.

"As my predecessor has often stated"—I doubt whether his predecessor ever said that. The hon. Attorney-General must be misquoting.

"As we are all aware", he goes on to say, "the historic basis of The Department of the Attorney-General has been that of a legal department." If he means the member for Sudbury in that "as we are all aware", I beg to be excluded from it. The historic basis of The Department of the Attorney-General—and here I run the risk of indulging in a polemic—is not that of a legal department at all.

The historic basis of the Attorney-General's department is that of the role of the guardian of the public interest—the guardian of the public interest. Let us underline the words. Attorneys for the king—*attornatus regis*—are first spoken of the law in 1253, but presumably they had existed for a long period before that. When the king was sending his law officers out into the counties to assume control of the manorial courts, it did not take

him long to employ people trained in the law to prosecute his cases in the seigniorial courts, the feudal courts as it were.

That was one of the ways in which the king got control of the law. It was not till 1472 we read of the actual title, Attorney-General. From that time on the department gained in its influence and scope but always the basis of the department was the concept that the Attorney-General acted for the whole of the public in the protection of the public against wrongdoing to it. It was said: "What is everyone's business is no one's business except the business of the Attorney-General". If it was everyone's business, in other words, then no one person could complain that he had been wronged in himself any more than any other member of the public; therefore, in the courts, he could not bring an action to stop the wrong.

For example, the creation of a public nuisance, the obstruction of a highway, the wrongful encroachment on the common pasture grounds were some examples. Historically it became the duty of the Attorney-General to right that wrong and to act in the name of the whole of the public.

In fact, as late as the 19th century there were many, Mr. Chairman, who felt that the Attorney-General ought not to be a member of the Cabinet at all because he was in the position of the defender of the public interest. It was felt by many that that impartial and independent responsibility, girded as he was with many great powers, should not be put in the position of a partisan member of the Cabinet required to defend government policy.

It is interesting to note, in fact, some of the distinctions between the office of the Attorney-General in Great Britain, even to this day, and the office of the Attorney-General as it developed in the Canadian provinces and the Minister of Justice at Ottawa.

One of the great distinctions was that the Attorney-General in Britain always employed a number of counsel to act for him. Full-time servants, they were called "Treasury counsel". A person sought a career and he became, in the words of the phraseology, "of Treasury counsel". Treasury counsel, it seemed up to the 19th century—perhaps it still exists—had the pre-eminent right to go to the bench. When a vacancy occurred on the bench, the vacancy was filled, particularly in the court of criminal appeal, from the ranks of the Treasury counsel.

Sir Travers Humphrey speaks in his autobiography of coming to the point in his life where he had to decide between taking silk,

that is to say, becoming one of Her Majesty's counsel, or going to the bench. He made that decision by accepting an appointment to the bench.

During the last few days in Ontario, one picks up the papers and one reads of the horrors of appointing politicians to high judicial offices. As recently as Saturday, I think, there is an editorial on the subject and about a politician, who, it is reported, is on the verge of being appointed to a high judicial office. Again by way of contrast, in Great Britain it was the right, the absolute right, not written in a statute but the right by custom, which is often stronger, for the Attorney-General to accept the appointment of Lord Chancellor of England if he wanted it. He had the first refusal.

When a vacancy occurred on the Woolsack the Attorney-General of the day presumably could go to the Prime Minister and say: "I will take the Lord Chancellorship". It was remarked during the first world war that the first time that right and custom was departed from was in the case of Sir Rufus Isaacs who at that time—1917, I believe—was Attorney-General of England. He had fallen out with Lloyd George—I think it was Lloyd George—and Lloyd George refused to appoint him. The highest judicial office in England was until that time and has been since filled by a politician.

It is true the Lord Chancellorship of England is something more than a judicial office. It is an office with political connotations. The political connotations are not much; they are not much. Essentially he is a law officer or a law lord who sits in the House of Lords.

I will leave that departure into history. I make no apologies for it.

When he spoke of his predecessor, however, it is very apt to comment that his predecessor said something more than what the hon. Attorney-General of this day credits him with saying.

Attorney-General Kelso Roberts last night suggested that the Attorney-General's department be revamped to permit it to concentrate on law enforcement and administration.

The suggestion was made before members of the Kingsway Business Men's Association meeting in Colonel Streight Legion Hall after Mr. Roberts compared his office with those in England and the United States.

He said the Ontario Attorney-General has many of the responsibilities shared in

Great Britain by the Home Office, the Attorney-General and the Lord Chancellor.

"In Ontario, from time to time, additional branches have been added to the office of the Attorney-General, sometimes for rather local reasons, sometimes as a matter of expediency and sometimes because of the availability in that department of skilled legal personnel," he said.

He cited the placing of the Emergency Measures Organization under the Attorney-General as the most recent example of the trend. He said EMO is not only a full-time job, but one that taxes a man's energies to the full.

In an interview he gave the duties of the Public Trustee, the Ontario Securities Commission, the Official Guardian and the inspection of registry offices as further examples of the administrative entanglement of the Attorney-General. "You really have to be an IBM machine."

Well, let me interpolate here. I never thought of the distinguished predecessor of the hon. Attorney-General as an IBM machine. I had thought of him in other connotations but not that. I never thought that he was either as exact or as exacting as an IBM machine.

I go on with the direct quotation:

"They keep tossing everything at you and expect you to spit out the answers," he said.

He told the businessmen that in England the Attorney-General takes many of the serious cases and actually prosecutes at the trial level as well as in higher courts.

"Here in Ontario, by virtue of all the administrative and desk work and travelling across this vast province that is required to be done, the appearances in court by the Attorney-General are much more limited," he said.

Mr. Roberts said he has appeared in appeal courts on constitutional questions but never at the trial level, "nor can I recall any of my predecessors within the last 25 years so appearing."

He said he thought Ontario had gone too far in assigning work to the Attorney-General. "I think a pause should be taken and perhaps some of those administrative duties transferred to other departments and the Attorney-General be given more time and better services to enable him to deal more exclusively with the varying problems of law administration and law enforcement."

Mr. Roberts said he would like to see

the Attorney-General given the opportunity to appear more in court.

He said he would also like to see the Attorney-General freed from the time-consuming jobs required of him as a member of the Cabinet, often in unrelated fields.

"In Great Britain, he is not a member of the inner Cabinet and he does not sit regularly in Cabinet but only attends when he is required and when he is dealing with matters pertaining particularly to his department," said Mr. Roberts.

There endeth the quotation.

If I may be permitted to say so, Mr. Chairman, that very enlightening review of what the predecessor of the hon. Attorney-General said is pertinent with scope for inquiry. I had adverted to some of it where the former Attorney-General referred to the fact of the demands of sitting in Cabinet upon him but he also gives rise to very interesting speculation about the effect on the advancement of law if the Attorney-General were to appear more often in the courts than he does.

Mr. W. M. Nickle (Kingston): Why?

Mr. Sopha: You will have to go along with me. I will tell you but you will have to do it in my time.

The former Attorney-General said that he has appeared in appeal courts in relation to constitutional questions but never at the trial level. I try to follow the law reports rather closely, and I can recall only one time when the former Attorney-General appeared in court on a constitutional question.

Interesting to speculate how he came to be there that time: He was supporting an absolutely indefensible proposition, and he got short shrift from the court of appeal that heard it. That was in relation to his protestation that the statute passed by this Legislature which gave the Master of the Supreme Court powers to hear mechanics lien actions was within the powers of this legislative assembly. It is a wonder that he did not hire a constitutional expert to advance that very interesting proposition but as I say it got very short shrift in the Appeal Court.

The statute was defeated and I believe I am correct in saying that it was not appealed to a higher court. It never went to the Supreme Court of Canada, which lawyers will recognize immediately is some corroboration for the statement that if it is a valid constitutional point, it is always taken to the highest court of judicature, to have a final determination on it.

I know of no other venture of the former Attorney-General into the courts than that. He might in his own time at some later time tell us about some of his forays into the practical workaday world of the law.

An hon. member: He's in a foray now—he is in Lands and Forays!

Mr. Sopha: Yes. However, I merely sum it up by stating to you, Mr. Chairman, that it might be of some use to put this little polemic of the former Attorney-General into the record because all those things are very interesting. Practically all of them are of the type that will promote the public good from the point of view of the administration of justice and law enforcement. It is worthwhile to note that the new hon. Attorney-General, the new broom supposedly, made no reference to those things at all.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): He swept them under the rug, no doubt.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member for Nipissing, who has a very sharp and penetrating wit, says that he has swept them under the rug, no doubt.

Mr. Nickle: Who said that?

Mr. Sopha: My hon. friend from Nipissing.

Mr. Nickle: That does not account for anything.

An hon. member: Apparently the people up in Nipissing think so.

Another hon. member: I am surprised at the hon. member for Kingston.

Mr. Nickle: You will have to do better than that to make your case.

Mr. Sopha: The next matter I would like to draw the attention of the House to, Mr. Chairman, is one that I have referred to previously, but I wanted to deal with it in just a little more prolix fashion this afternoon. That is The Proceedings Against the Crown Act, which I assume to properly come within the four corners of this estimate, since there is no provision in the estimates for defending any proceedings against the Crown, for the good reason that no proceedings against the Crown are allowed. And it is necessary to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: It is necessary to furnish a little background. I am told from sources that are considered to be reliable that over in The

Department of Highways, Mr. Chairman, they have an organization that, I believe is known as the independent claims committee, or the claims committee.

This organization exists by appointment of the department of the Minister of Highways. Its job is simply that when, in a contract between a contractor and The Department of Highways, there is a dispute about the amount of money owing to the contractor then this independent body that has been appointed by the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a proper matter for The Department of Highways estimates.

Mr. Sopha: It has nothing to do with it. It demonstrates the inability of the hon. Attorney-General to understand what is truly legal when he gets up and makes what I submit to be such a silly intervention as that.

I am speaking about The Proceedings Against the Crown Act.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Under what estimates does this come?

Mr. Sopha: Under the first estimate.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, I think, with respect, there is an Act passed which related, some years ago, to proceeding against the Crown, that is the time on which the argument took place and should have taken place. If the hon. member wants to bring that into question, he should put an order on the order paper or alternatively either speak on the budget or the Throne debate; but there is no allowance in vote 201 in respect of that. I would respectfully submit that the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: I submit that I am not, Mr. Chairman, and I wish to address a bit of argument to you on that score. Both the hon. Attorney-General and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development are Her Majesty's counsel; they know very well that it is within the scope of the Attorney-General to determine on the validity of a petition of right addressed to the Attorney-General. They know that very well, sir. When the Lieutenant-Governor puts his fiat on petition of right he does it on the advice of the Attorney-General. Even laymen know that.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, with great respect that argument of the hon. member did not add any reason to the point before the House, which is at the moment where is the item from item 1 to 16 in

vote 201 related to proceedings against the Crown? Now if it is there, this is the place to talk about it; if it is not there, this is not the place to talk about it.

Mr. Sopha: It might very well fall, Mr. Chairman, under Crown counsel. But let us turn to The Department of Economics and Development, Mr. Chairman, and will you show me where in The Department of Economics and Development comes that little bash they just had in Toronto that cost \$17,000? Everything, Mr. Chairman, does not need to be spelled out.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, we will deal with that when the estimates of the department come forward. In the meantime, if there is not an item on this vote, I respectfully submit that this is out of order. Let us get on with the points which are in order.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, this deals with the exercise of the functions of the hon. Attorney-General. This deals with the duties of the hon. Attorney-General. Now where else am I going to discuss it, except under this vote?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. member can discuss it by putting an order on the order paper or in the speech from the Throne or in the budget debate. These particular items are designed to decide whether these amounts of money are to be voted for the respective departments. That is the issue before the House.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, are you going to be coerced by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development in this? Are you going to be bulldozed by him?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: I suggest he go downtown with some people he can bulldoze at the Royal York—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: —instead of trying it with us.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Chairman, I want to bring up a point here about uniformity of the law concerning the operation of raffles and bingos. Now whether that would come under this vote—if the hon. Minister will tell me under what item I can bring that up—I will be happy to talk on it. I would like to know whether I can speak here?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member can, if he wishes, discuss this one under Crown counsel prosecutions or under the OPP vote, whichever he wishes.

Mr. Sopha: I had not relinquished the floor, Mr. Chairman, I was turning to another thing. I wanted to say this: This statute, Proceedings Against The Crown Act, has been on the books since 1952. Every other civilized jurisdiction in the western world has a comparable statute, except the province of Ontario.

It is simply a case of this—and I have to restrict my remarks, I will put this on the record—that if the hon. Attorney-General's department was really interested in expanding the role of the administration of justice co-extensive with growing government functions, then it demands that this statute be proclaimed. But there it has sat, Mr. Chairman, since 1952, as chapter 78 of the revised statutes and never at any time has the hon. Attorney-General gone to Cabinet and suggested to them that they get into line with other jurisdictions in the western world and give the subject the right to bring his action against the state if he has been wronged.

What is there about government that makes it different from any other organization? If the government does wrong, then let this subject come into the court and have his remedy against the government. Abolish this foolish archaic practice of the petition of right where each claim must be dealt with separately, where it is open to discretion, open to the caprice of the person who recommends to the Lieutenant-Governor whether this person shall have his remedy in the courts and another will be denied.

The next thing with which I wanted to deal, Mr. Chairman—and we might as well have the argument with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development at the outset, I will not try to slide it in, I will tell him what my next step is going to be and get his ruling. The next one I intended to deal with was the indefensible practice—and I use colourable words, but they are valid—the indefensible and abominable practice of allowing magistrates to sit on police commissions in this province.

I assume it is all right, Mr. Chairman. We do not have a section for magistrates anywhere there.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I think the real problem here is that the hon. member was not here to present the general observations of the Liberal Party on the department of the hon. Attorney-General. What he could not do

with the right hand directly, he is now trying to do indirectly.

We have some rules around this House and, frankly, they are designed for everybody's convenience and, I think, so we can get along with the affairs of the House. One of them is that each party shall speak generally about these things and then specifically to the vote. If Mr. Chairman rules that this is under this vote, then let us proceed with it.

Mr. Sopha: I agree almost entirely with the remarks made by—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, this might very well come under vote 215, item 6, magistrates and juvenile courts, I would think.

Mr. Sopha: This has nothing to do with magistrates' courts, it has to do with police commissions.

Hon. Mr. Cass: This says magistrates and juvenile courts.

Mr. Sopha: Well, we will leave it. Fine!

Now I will try the next one. Unfortunately this next one is irritatingly non-controversial, Mr. Chairman, because I am going to refer to item 4 in the vote. I am almost disappointed that I will not meet with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development about whether I have the right to speak on this one.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: It is a little early yet to know.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister will think up a rule; he will invent another one.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I looked through the remarks of the hon. Attorney-General late on Friday, a copy of which I was furnished prior to today's sittings, and I do not see in those remarks where he makes any explanation of what this item 4 is—Crown counsel prosecutions. I presume that it makes reference to the employment of private individuals to conduct prosecutions on behalf of the Crown.

That gives rise, Mr. Chairman, to some memory of the order for return that was made to a question last year—I think the question was addressed by the hon. member for York Centre, Mr. Chairman, or I might have been the author of the question—if I was last year then he asked the question the year before—the last day of the session I believe it was, we got the return to that question in which it set out in great detail the employment of legal services by every department of this government. It told us the nature of the service rendered, the amount of the fee bill and the

amount of the fee eventually paid. And one could see from that that the amount of legal service that is purchased by this government and by this department is extremely substantial.

My hon. friend from York Centre and I looked with some horror on the itemization of the services hired of a firm in New York by the department of the hon. Attorney-General where it was sought, sir, to extradite a person being an American citizen under the extradition treaty that exists between the government of the United States and that of Canada in relation to certain charges that had been levied against him concerning the manipulation of corporate stock in a company. As I said, that person was an American citizen. The hon. Attorney-General's department, in the public interest, had a New York firm institute proceedings to extradite that person back into Ontario.

My hon. friend from York Centre and I who looked at that—both of us have an extremely moderate practice—were somewhat shocked when we saw the size of the bill. Speaking from memory I believe the cost of the extradition of that individual, who incidentally eventually was acquitted, came to some \$27,500. One would think that within the four corners of an extradition treaty it is something like appearing before the planning board, let us say the planning board of North York.

It is a question of this: Either you have the right to extradite an individual or you do not have the right. The issue is a pretty narrow one, exceedingly narrow. I have never appeared before an extradition court to ask that anyone be extradited but I think, and I think it is an educated guess, it would be an extremely narrow issue and the court could make up its mind rather hurriedly whether the person could be extradited or not.

I do not see in the wide world as a member of this Legislature, and I do not see as a person who has some knowledge of these things, that any account of \$27,500 for such a service could ever possibly be justified. Apparently The Department of the Attorney-General in this case did not take any steps to (a) have that New York firm reduce its account, or (b) take any steps within the laws of the state of New York to have the account taxed, that is to say to have it reviewed. It gladly paid that vast sum.

There were others I cannot mention at this point, but I will mention it later under Legislative Council, and if you will remind me, Mr. Chairman, if you will be sure and remind me, we will get into the question of

drafting of statutes and how much is paid the downtown firms to draft statutes. Under this one, Crown counsel prosecution, one wonders and one invites some comment from the hon. Attorney-General to tell us why it is necessary to set aside a sum, and it is not a large sum, in these estimates for the employment of such people.

One would think that we had got around to an enlightened age in the administration of justice in this province where we have in every sector, every county and every district, full-time Crown attorneys. We have provided them with assistants where the pressure of work is too great for one person, and one wonders why this practice of employing private counsel continues apace. One is entitled to reflect, indeed, Mr. Chairman, one should reflect upon some of the results of some of these employments of people carrying on a private practice of law, and some of the results or the failure to achieve results that have been encountered in their employer-employee relationship.

Mr. Nickle: What does the hon. member mean by that?

Mr. Sopha: What do I mean by that? I refer specifically to the case against Wright, Feeley and McDermott. The Wright, Feeley and McDermott case, where at one trial all three of them, I think, were acquitted. The Attorney-General, your former colleague in the Cabinet, now the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, went down and employed a lawyer down on Bay Street, and that lawyer took the case to court. But I do say this: I will go out on a limb and say, and I measure my words carefully, that a great many law students would not have made the mistakes he did. By tendering the diary kept by the officer Scott—he tendered the diary in the Crown's case—he made it possible for the three accused to fail to take the witness box.

Mr. Nickle: I think this has to do with the Roach report.

Mr. Sopha: No, this has nothing to do with the Roach report at all.

The three accused did not take the witness box. Then, after their acquittal by the jury, this special prosecutor who had been employed by this government announced that he had recommended to the Attorney-General that they take an appeal to the Court of Appeal. Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General, within the proper time allowed, agreed an appeal should be prosecuted. The public and those interested waited for a long

time to see whether that appeal was going to be perfected or not.

My hon. friend from Kingston knows what I mean by perfecting the appeal. Eventually came an announcement from the former Attorney-General that on the advice of this special counsel the appeal was going to be dropped. Weeks and weeks of trial had been wasted—weeks and weeks. Then came this false step of “we will take it to the Court of Appeal and we will rectify it.” This should have been done in the first instance. Presumably that gentleman was paid a handsome sum of money, they always are.

It moves one to point out in that regard that when you put this item 4 in here, the full-time solicitors employed by this government, especially in The Department of the Attorney-General, are normally paid a niggardly pittance. They are paid a niggardly pittance.

Mr. Nickle: Does the hon. member object to that?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I do. They are underpaid, and as a result a goodly number of them treat the department under review as a mere stopping-off place to get a few years' experience, and training under their belts.

Mr. Troy: Halfway house.

Mr. Sopha: Halfway house, indeed. The Attorney-General's Department of Ontario is a halfway house for legal training. I think if you looked you would find that many of their wives have to work to help out. Having withstood the penury then they go out into the world into better positions. One city solicitor at Port Arthur recently left and joined a downtown law firm. The Queen's Proctor himself left; now he is practising down on Richmond Street.

Mr. Nickle: Down my way they stay put.

Mr. Sopha: My hon. friend from Kingston, whom I much admire and respect, able pillar of the bar as he is, the gift of Osgoode Hall to Kingston and the Islands, is practising law in the great and noble tradition of his father. As my hon. friend says, he is no longer sitting in seat number two. A new order reigneth. He knows, my hon. friend—

Mr. Nickle: Who is he? Me?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, he is my hon. friend, I shall always esteem him as such. He and I, if we were in the Speaker's corridor, could say it to each other, but he had better not agree with me in here. He knows that this

department, if it really promoted the public interest, would pay reasonable salaries in order to attract good and able men within its confines and would attempt to keep them.

Mr. Nickle: Down my way we charge \$2 for a letter and \$1 for a probate. What does the hon. member charge?

Mr. Sopha: It is well known that the cost of living north of the French is higher and our fees have to be adjusted.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us get back—

Mr. Chairman: Order. I wonder if the member would get back to the item on which he was speaking.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I had barely left it. I had barely left it.

Mr. Chairman: Try to get back on it.

Mr. Sopha: I do not know. The last man in the House that should become waspish is the hon. member for York South, the very last man, when we always treat his remarks with the greatest amount of attention, if not respect.

Well there is the problem and I hope I have done something to bare it.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: It is a shame, as I see this progression of fine young men stopping off down the hall here. I just get to know them a little bit and they are gone, they are gone. The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund should be singled out. It is now called the Motor Vehicle Accident Compensation Fund. It seemed that they could barely keep one for more than a few months.

And so it goes throughout the whole of the government, because they will not recognize the simple truth of it—to borrow a phrase often used by my hon. leader (Mr. Wintermeyer). The simple truth of it is that you have to pay a reasonable amount to attract these people, to attract able people and to keep them.

Yet, the hon. Attorney-General goes and tells rural municipalities to pay policemen more when he pays a niggardly pittance himself.

I think perhaps I would address—with your permission, Mr. Chairman, and the permission of anybody else who wants to grant it—a few remarks about number 13, Royal commissions, which I believe is a new one in this. If it is not new this year, it was new last year.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Third year.

Mr. Sopha: And I want to put it in this background. Presumably this is to be the department to which in any degree the term is apt at all—Royal commissions, appointed to inquire into the affairs of this province—will be responsible. Now having said that, that is a terrible sentence. I lost myself in that.

Royal commissions, I take it, are to be responsible to the Attorney-General's department and a small grant of \$5,000 is put in and that can only be a token grant. The hon. Attorney-General did not explain this, but if any Royal commissions are appointed at all then \$5,000 is not going to cover the cost of it. It is not going to cover the cost of one like the Roach commission, the one which has only recently concluded here. Presumably any moneys that have to be voted will be voted by special warrant, Treasury order or some other mechanics because \$5,000 would not get a Royal commission off the ground.

And there is this distinction to be drawn also: Apparently in some cases, some Royal commissioners charge the government for their services and others do not. We had two in a row where there was no charge made: The commission of Mr. Justice McGillivray inquiring into the Sarnia land transaction—that should not activate the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, should it?

Mr. Singer: Well, it did before. He never answered the question.

Mr. Sopha: And the late Mr. Justice Morden made the inquiry into fluoridation. And I think I am correct in saying that neither of those commissioners charged the government a penny. Other commissioners presumably will tender a bill.

I would think in the interest of every person in the province that there should be some attempt to fix some sort of standard rate. I am not suggesting that it be a limited one but a fair and equitable one, and the commissioners be paid that rate for their services, and it not be left up to them whether they will send a bill to the government or whether they will forego it.

To be fair, and we always want to be fair, it ought to be added that many of these Royal commissioners are judges, and they feel that since they are paid their judicial salary that it would be inequitable for them to tender a bill, or an account I should say, for work they have performed when they were not required to perform their judicial work. In

other words, they were not sitting on the Bench, they were being active in a Royal commission and they were being paid anyway for sitting on the Bench.

Mr. Nickle: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Mr. Nickle: I would direct my question to the hon. member for Sudbury in connection with a remark made by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) when he was the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. member made some remark in this House about Royal commissioners. He said they gave him a pain in the neck, and they give me one, too. Now would you go on from there, please?

An hon. member: What is the question?

Mr. Nickle: The question is: Do they give you a pain in the neck?

Mr. Sopha: Well, within the context of the day, place and hour in which he said it, it was probably a very pithy and penetrating remark.

Mr. Nickle: To which I agree—

Mr. Sopha: I would not be at all surprised that after Mr. Justice Roach reports you will hear a repetition of the same remark.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): From the other side of the House.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, from the other side of the House. Well, I do not want to go on with this and I would exacerbate my listeners if I did, but that is the way I see it. A realistic attempt should be put in these estimates to cover the cost of Royal commissions if we are going to have a number of them, and some formula should be arrived at whereby they are paid a certain fixed amount and everyone is required to take this.

No doubt someone of more talents than I could devote several hours to item 16, which is a very challenging thing indeed—fees and sundry rewards! But I will not attempt to handle that one. It only deals with \$3,000.

Mr. Singer: Not as much as a good dinner at the Royal York.

Mr. Sopha: So, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the patience you have demonstrated for me. As we work our way through these estimates I will be calling upon your indulgence

and good nature, sir, from time to time to address a few additional remarks.

Mr. Chairman: Shall 201 carry?

Several hon. members: No.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I would like to set the record straight with respect to certain of the remarks made by the hon. member, particularly with respect to the extradition case, as he called it. I would draw to your attention that there were two men involved, that the cases went twice to the Supreme Court of the United States and were on their way a third time when the men in question, along with another one, were tried and acquitted. And I am advised at the present time that against some of them at least there are now other proceedings in the courts.

I would also like to say with respect to Crown counsel that I realize the difficulty which the former Attorney-General has had—which governments have in general—if people like the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Gould) will insist on enticing away experienced counsel from my department. I can only wish them well and know that the lawyer in question is receiving a good man to be with him. We give our people good training, we are proud to have them go out, and we know that they will give good value for whatever larger salary they may be able to collect elsewhere.

So far as the token amount for Royal commissions is concerned, I would say that the hon. member for Sudbury has expressed the intent of this particular item. I would say to him that I do not, and I am sure he does not, know how a formula could be arrived at which would allow us to obtain, which we must always obtain, the services of the best qualified person to be a Royal commissioner or to be on a Royal commission.

Justices of the High Court, of course, normally do not charge. They are federal civil servants. They are paid their expenses. People such as H. Carl Goldenberg, who has been a very important and successful commissioner in this province and many other provinces, have it as their vocation and profession, and of course they charge and they are entitled to, and they produce results equal to the charges which they make.

I would say, sir, that my Scottish conscience would not allow me to make any estimate which would encourage anyone to charge a higher fee than they might otherwise. Perhaps the \$5,000 limit might be a very good

ceiling to work under, and on that basis I bring it to the hon. members of this House, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have one small item in this first estimate on which I would like to ask a question of the hon. Attorney-General. As a layman I pose it to him.

I have not yet had an opportunity to read the report of the Royal commission covering Rabbi Leiner, but I understand in the course of that report that there was quite an extensive discussion of the question of what is described as holding charges, warrants for holding charges; and that the Royal commissioner said in effect that there was no legal basis for such. That report no sooner became public property than within a week, in the instance of the trouble we have had up in the north this past week, according to the *Toronto Telegram* on February 12, the hon. Attorney-General emphasized that the intent to wound charges were merely holding charges; and then the story goes on. I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would clarify at least his own view on this question of holding charges and their legal validity.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I would be glad, Mr. Chairman, to do that with particular reference to the instance quoted by him.

I do not think we should make too much a point of it, but the situation in northern Ontario eight or nine days ago was a very serious one. Tempers were very high, we had a number of people who had been killed, we had a number of people who had fled for their lives because they felt that they might have some responsibility and thought that there were a large number of people who might hold them responsible.

It was essential that those people be apprehended and placed in custody for two reasons: one is for their own safety, of course; and the second was to enforce the laws of this land. At that time it was not possible, as is often the case in criminal charges of a serious nature, to lay the appropriate charge. In this case I would merely point out, Mr. Chairman, those who are lawyers will understand it, it was not possible to decide what charge should be laid until certain information from post-mortems, certain information from those investigating the matter on the field were available. Consequently it was quite obvious that the charge that was laid was a charge which would very easily fit the circumstances, but might not be the proper charge when all

the facts were known. It was a nominal charge.

Perhaps if I had said "nominal" rather than "holding" I might not have been involved in this particular question and answer. But in this particular instance it was necessary to apprehend and place in custody certain people for the two reasons I mentioned.

With respect to holding charges generally, I must say that I disapprove and I am sure all lawyers and officers of the Crown disapprove of that as an expedient. There are times, such as the time I have mentioned, Mr. Chairman, when a nominal charge, or if you wish to call it a holding charge, has been laid and has to be laid, because not always are the full circumstances of any facts available at the time a person is taken into custody.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, as we all know, one cannot be held in custody indefinitely without having a charge brought against him so that he may know what he has to face.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): It depends how slow the courts are.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, that is a very interesting observation. I do not think, in fact I am sure, the courts are not nearly as slow as some people writing would lead us to believe, or some people on the floor of this House would lead us to believe. I will say here and I might just as well now, this is as good a place as any, that in Metropolitan Toronto even the situation is not nearly as bad as would appear. Of course we all realize, those of us who live here or work here, that the problem in Metropolitan Toronto is now on its way to solution with a new city hall, the armouries being acquired and the new Metro courthouse coming along. Until that happens, it would appear there is not too much the metropolitan authorities can do.

It is their problem and we are helping all we can. Certainly the judiciary, the Crown counsel, lawyers generally, counsel generally, are doing everything they can to co-operate.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I say again that a nominal or a holding charge, so-called, is very necessary under certain circumstances. But it is not a practice to be carried out in all cases and perhaps in many of the cases where it is now used.

Mr. Trotter: That is a pretty poor answer.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): I have two questions I would like to ask concerning door-to-door salesmen. Can the hon. Attorney-General tell me which vote that would come under?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I doubt if it comes under any vote here, I think it comes under licensing, which is Municipal Affairs, but I would be glad to discuss it at this point if the hon. member wishes.

Mr. Davison: Well, one of the problems—

Mr. Chairman: What is the question on?

Mr. Davison: On door-to-door salesmen.

Mr. Chairman: I think that would come under Municipal Affairs, would it not?

Mr. Davison: I think the time has come when something has to be done about the problem that has developed, especially in the cities today with door-to-door salesmen. I think it must come under the department of the hon. Attorney-General.

We have at the present time in Hamilton a group of people coming around from door to door and as a rule they try to make out they are selling nothing at all. A lady called me the other day and said she spent half an hour with this gentleman and then finally discovered that all he was doing was selling magazines.

When he first came to the door he was representing a progress research group. He asked to come in and he wanted all this information, such as how long you had lived in the home, how many children you had, did you own your own home, nothing on the form at all about selling anything. After about half an hour or so—

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member for Hamilton East would bring this matter up under licensing when we are dealing with the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs?

Mr. Davison: We also had the problem of telephone canvasses, which does not come under licensing at all.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, it does not come under here.

Mr. Davison: Will you tell me under what department I will be able to bring it up?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Generally it is done by putting an order on the throne paper, in the budget or Throne debate, this is the place.

Mr. Davison: It is the same old story. These are problems within the province of Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, the part of the estimates we are debating is the voting of money for specific objectives.

Mr. Chairman: It does not come under this vote and I would say it comes under licensing in The Department of Municipal Affairs, because we have been dealing with that this summer in the municipal committee.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Sandwich has the floor.

Mr. Belanger: If I remember correctly, just a little while ago the hon. Attorney-General did say that he would allow these questions to be put under this vote because it has to do with the uniformity of law. I mentioned the fact it had to do with bingos and raffles. As the chief enforcement law officer of the province, my hon. colleague from Sudbury called him "the guardian of the public."

I would like to know why he allows certain irregularities of the law to occur in some localities and not in others. We in the city of Windsor are demanding to know why we are not permitted to hold raffles when they are allowed in other sections of the province. We do know that service clubs, parent groups, fraternal groups and many other organizations depend on this revenue to carry on their charitable work. This is their main channel of revenue and they are deprived.

Some time ago we were banned from holding bingos, the chief magistrate called a halt to it and we were stopped for a period of over three months. Now they do allow them every other week, but only with certain limitations concerning the prizes. We have a test case that is going on in the courts and I would like to read this article here:

BINGO CASE POSTPONED

CLUB CHAIRMAN APPEARS MARCH 1

Richard Dawson, chairman of the Windsor Kinsmen Club Bingo Committee, was remanded to March 1 for trial and pleaded not guilty to a charge of conducting a lottery. A test case was launched a week ago after an investigation was conducted into the home bingo games sponsored by the club.

Home bingo games are played with cards purchased from various merchants around town with numbers supplied by the club through the newspapers. Players check these numbers against those on their card. When the correct combination of numbers on a card is checked off, the participants contact the club's bingo committee to collect their prize. This practice has been carried on in other Ontario

centres but was halted when the club involved was warned by the Attorney-General to stop conducting these games.

I would like to say to the hon. Attorney-General that if this is stopped, we do not want it to be stopped just in the city of Windsor, we want it to be stopped throughout the whole of this province. I would like to know what will happen in the future to these groups. Are they going to turn over to the municipalities or to the province or to social agencies the work that they do, thereby increasing the cost to the province of the work that they are doing? Because they do perform quite a bit of charitable work.

Therefore, I would like to obtain from the hon. Attorney-General his views in this respect. I have some other points to bring up, but I will wait until later on in the estimates. But we are quite concerned about this.

Hon. Mr. Cass: All right, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to give the hon. member my views with respect to the matter.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will realize as we all do that the laws in question are federal laws.

Mr. Belanger: That is true.

Hon. Mr. Cass: They are parts of the Criminal Code and the only responsibility that the provincial government has and exercises is the enforcement of these laws. If the law is not correct or is not considered correct in the first instance, any correction must be made by the senior level of government.

The next is this: It is my view, Mr. Chairman, also, that there should be uniformity in this particular connection. I agree with the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich that so far as possible our people from north to south in the province should be treated alike when it comes to matters of gambling, bingos and what have you.

I have already, Mr. Chairman, had a conversation with the association of police chiefs of Ontario to discuss this particular problem, because it bothers and affects them very greatly. If one municipality is a wide-open bingo town and the next one is not, then, of course, it is not a very happy situation for the police and other law enforcement officers in the town or city which is not allowing them to operate.

There is one governing rule, Mr. Chairman, which law enforcement officers of this province and other provinces, I am quite sure,

agree with. There is one overriding rule and that is that if the enterprise in question is a commercial enterprise or can be so considered. In other words, if there are regular bingos or other events held, and if it is conducted by an entrepreneur, even though in the name of a church or service club or some similar organization, then it is very definitely open to prosecution across this province. These operations are being prosecuted.

On the other hand, I believe, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that in those municipalities where the events are occasional, where there is no private profit motive, when the real operator is a church or a service club or organization, he will find there is little interference with this particular mode of operating.

Mr. Chairman, I think that that is by and large a fair way. I would say this, that like many other things which will be debated during these estimates, there is no way that I or anyone else under the present law can ensure that this particular rule of thumb will be followed, but it seems to me essentially reasonable. It seems to me that it will do the trick which the hon. member is mentioning. And that is allow service clubs, churches and other organizations to have occasional bingos and other such evenings of enjoyment to swell their coffers for religious and charitable purposes.

Mr. Belanger: What did the hon. Attorney-General say about raffles? I know it comes under the criminal code—

Hon. Mr. Cass: What did I say about it? Raffles and bingos both come under the criminal code.

Mr. Belanger: So therefore raffles are at the discretion again of the enforcement officer there.

Hon. Mr. Cass: That is right.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the hon. Minister had any comments to make about the public defender? This was mentioned by at least two speakers at the last sitting on Friday.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, as far as possible I try to observe the rules of this House. When we discuss the matter of legal aid, which is vote 215, sub item 10, I have a good many remarks which I wish to make.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Attorney-General

advise me whether or not his committee on obscene literature comes under this vote?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am sorry, I did not get it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The committee on obscene literature, is this where I might discuss it?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I know the hon. member said that, but would he ask the hon. Minister of Economics and Development?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: We are being so careful of the rules, I wanted to make sure I was in order, sir.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, this is a good place to discuss it, as it would come under Crown counsel prosecutions; it would arise out of that.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would advise us whether or not this committee is still operating?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Yes.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Minister have a report on the number of publications that they checked last year?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): Which ones were helped to success by being banned?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I have what I think is an exceedingly good report from the committee and I think perhaps if I read it, it might answer the hon. member's question and also give this House information as to how well this committee is operating.

This committee, as you may know, sir, has an advisory panel which acts almost automatically on matters referred to it from The Attorney-General's Department. It consists of Professor B. W. Jackson of McMaster University in Hamilton; Mr. R. B. Porter, the chief librarian at the Peterborough Public Library at Peterborough; Dr. J. W. Moore, forensic division, Toronto Psychiatric Hospital, Toronto, and the secretary of the panel, Mr. David A. Coon, a barrister and solicitor of Stouffville, Ontario. Mr. Coon has given me, under date of January 23, 1963, the following report addressed to me through the deputy Minister. It says:

Dear Mr. Common:

I beg to report on the activities of the above panel subsequent to my report of November 2, 1962, to the present time.

And we can go back to the report before.

Since that date the panel has met on two occasions to review publications submitted and I personally have attended on two occasions with Inspector Thurston of the Metropolitan Toronto police force in addition to the usual meetings. Although the number of publications submitted by individuals has lessened during the last three months, the Metropolitan Toronto police are continuing their activities and there have been, to the writer's knowledge, about four prosecutions during this period in which the panel was asked prior advice. There has also been a fairly heavy demand by the various police departments throughout Ontario for a representative list of publications which this panel considers obscene. Where requested, I have forwarded such a list and I have also advised the police departments that the publications mentioned on the list are not banned books, so to speak, but merely a representative number of magazines and pocket books which this panel thinks could be successfully prosecuted under section 150 of the code.

I have also received considerable correspondence from the solicitor for the publishers of some of the magazines which we have previously considered to be obscene and I hope to be meeting with him in the near future to discuss the reasons why we feel his clients' publications do offend the code. It is my understanding that after our meeting he will advise his client who intends to revise these publications to be distributed in Ontario so that they are in accordance with the criminal code.

I do not wish to get into too much detail in this brief report. However, I would like to mention our activities concerning a publication called *Eros*. In late November several Members of Parliament and three members of the public wrote either directly to this office or to The Department of the Attorney-General complaining about promotional literature they had received in the mail concerning this magazine and in almost every case they asked that something be done in response to their objections. Accordingly I wrote to the publisher of this magazine who carries on business in New York city and set out the terms of section 150 of our criminal code, advising him that he should be aware of these provisions before circulating a publication in Ontario.

I also wrote to The Post Office Department and received a long reply from the Hon. Ellen Fairclough. She stated, in

effect that The Post Office Department was reluctant to enter into the field of censorship and she felt that such matters as this should be left to the law courts. I also received word that The Department of National Revenue had reviewed this publication and they did not find it offensive and so the matter ended.

I might also mention that there is a movement in British Columbia to organize a similar advisory panel and I have been receiving considerable correspondence from the British Columbia Parent-Teacher Federation requesting information and assistance as to how such a panel can be established. Since November 2, 1962—

That was after the prior report:

—we have received approximately 100 publications and approximately 20 movie reels and in each case we have advised as to our findings. In practically all of these cases the publications were submitted by the Metropolitan Toronto police and those publications that we considered to be obscene are merely later editions of the same magazines that are contained in my report of February 8, and November 2, 1962. I am enclosing herewith copies of previous reports.

I hope this brief report contains sufficient information and if there is anything, any further information you would like or you would like to have any matter clarified, please do not hesitate to call me at any time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I read that so that the House may have some idea of the operation of this committee. I would not propose to read the names of these books but if the hon. member would give me a moment I will count the pocket books that were checked last year. Ten pocket books.

They received 100 publications from February to November last year, they received 100 publications, there were ten pocket books found to be obscene, in their opinion, and 20 magazines. Does that go far enough?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell me whether or not any of the magazines that I submitted in this House last year were submitted to this committee?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Yes, they were all submitted.

Mr. Troy: All found okay?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to locate and let the hon. member know.

I have seen it. I know they were all submitted, but I just do not have it at my fingertip here what the result is—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to pursue it unduly, but I think it is a very important matter. I would like to know whether or not they were obscene because there are some further questions I should like to ask the hon. Attorney-General arising out of that submission.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, just half a minute. I am sorry I will have to advise the hon. member that while I have seen that, I am not able to locate it with the material I have with me now, and I will have to locate it for him.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Attorney-General advise me whether or not any of these books were considered obscene by the committee?

Hon. Mr. Cass: My memory, Mr. Chairman, does not serve me well enough to say that. I thought I had it here at hand.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: It seems somewhat unusual, Mr. Chairman, that books that were tabled in this Legislature under this very department last year, the hon. Attorney-General cannot even tell me whether or not a report was obtained from the committee that is responsible for judging whether or not they were obscene. I hope it is not indicative of the attitude of the department, sir, because I think it is a very serious matter. I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would endeavour to get that information for me, and give it to me at a later date.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I agree, and I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I did have the common sense to check the debates of last year and I certainly noticed that these matters were there and I thought I was equipped with that information when I came to the House today, but apparently I am not.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Might I have the information at a later date, sir?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Indeed.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Might I have the opportunity to discuss it?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Surely, indeed.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would advise me whether or not the committee that is checking these

magazines had checked the magazines upon which there is a report in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of December 21, 1962? I understand at that time that 53 of these magazines were picked up by the Metropolitan Police force, I believe in co-operation with one of the other police forces. They were submitted and the judge ruled them not obscene at that time. Is the hon. Attorney-General aware of that situation, and would he advise me whether or not any of the publications that were checked by his committee were included in this list upon which charges were made?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, as I understand the question, it is practically impossible to answer at the moment but I would be glad to locate that. My recollection is that they were checked, I think all of them. I think the Metropolitan Police checked them all and some of them were indicated by the committee to be obscene I think but were found otherwise by the magistrate.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Then would the same gentleman advise me whether or not his department will appeal the decision that was made—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, my advice from the legal officers of the Crown was and is that this is a question of fact and not of law, and therefore no appeal will be made.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Then I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this committee in fact is not accomplishing what it should be. We have a committee which looks over these magazines, the hon. Attorney-General advises on one hand that he believes it is a good report, this committee is supposedly in fact determining for his department which magazines are, in their opinion, obscene and which ones can be prosecuted. Now it seems that the committee which advises us that these magazines are obscene, when it comes to a court and a magistrate rules that they are not, there is no determination on the part of the department to follow up further and find out whether or not they are, in fact, obscene. I think it is a serious situation, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, the determination by the court is a determination as to whether the material is obscene or not. To substitute the discretion of even this very excellent committee for the discretion of a member of the judiciary at any level would, in my opinion, be an unthinkable invasion of the rights of any of our citizens.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I am a layman and I do not profess to be a lawyer in this matter—but it seems to me to be common sense that if on the advice of this committee we lay charges, then certainly it would not be usual to stop at the lowest level. Surely these things can be appealed.

I would remind the hon. Attorney-General that one of the hon. members of my party did a few years ago lay some charges as a result of allegations that were made in this House when the Attorney-General refused to do so and told him he could do so on his own. These charges were laid and the magistrate registered a conviction and that conviction was appealed and the result was changed. Now surely, when the shoe is on the other foot, if this department is sincere in its desire to rid our newsstands of this obscene literature that it would be reasonable to appeal this decision and find out whether a higher court would indeed reverse that decision.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I have now located the answer to the question, I knew I had it here, so that we may close this particular matter out.

This is a letter addressed to the former Attorney-General from Mr. Coon, dated April 5, 1962, and it says:

Dear Sir:

At your request this panel has reviewed the following magazines which were tabled in the House of Assembly on April the 3rd, 1962 [and he lists them]. It is our respectful opinion that each of the above-named magazines are so similar in content and purpose that it does not seem necessary to give an individual appraisal of each publication. It is our respectful opinion that these magazines are not obscene within the definition of section 150, subsection 8, of The Criminal Code of Canada.

We would also suggest with the utmost respect that the above magazines are representative of a great number of marginal publications intended to appeal to the male reader and there is no doubt that sex is one of the main characteristics of such magazines. However, we do not feel that the publication of female nudity can constitute obscenity by itself. We find in some cases that the nude photographs are in bad taste, but not so as to constitute obscenity.

As far as the pocket book which was tabled—certain pocket books are concerned, I would be glad to furnish the hon. member with the name—we did not have an oppor-

tunity of reviewing this publication. However, we will attempt to obtain the book and do so and report at a later date.

The later report indicates that it too was not considered to be obscene within the opinion of the members of the committee.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, if that is the opinion of the committee I do not know what these magazines were like that were obscene. In my opinion they were pretty marginal, I do not know what to do at this point. I have had a new group submitted to me, sir, and I am almost tempted to table those but perhaps the same decision would come back.

I would draw the attention of the hon. Attorney-General to an advertisement which appears in the paper. Might I say at the outset I am not concerned particularly about what magazine an adult reads. I think he is old enough to have made his decision, and I do not think they are going to have any effect on him. But I am concerned when these magazines, these lewd magazines, are displayed and offered for sale at the newsstands to any youth or young person who cares to buy them.

I now find that some of these magazines are being offered for sale through advertisements in the press. I would just like to read to the hon. Attorney-General one of the advertisements. It is entitled **UNRETOUCHED EUROPEAN NUDIST MAGAZINES**, special selection, \$2.98, supply limited. Now certainly if this type of magazine is being offered for sale in this manner, it is possible for any youth or young person regardless of their age, providing they are able to obtain the \$2.98 to write away and get them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have had a couple of these magazines submitted to me which are available through this source and I am prepared to go on record and say that in my opinion they are certainly not fit magazines to be freely publicized to the youth of our country.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Would the hon. member permit a question? Has he seen any of these advertised magazines?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Are those the magazines he has?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I have some magazines similar to the ones that are being sold in this—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Might I ask the hon. member if he got them by answering that advertisement or how does he know they are similar?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have not been around too long but I do not think it helps to cloud the issue. I think the principle is that it is the responsibility of the hon. Attorney-General's department to look into these advertisements. I do not think it is up to me to stand here and make charges. It is also noticeable here that the hon. Attorney-General has been careful not to include any ladies on the committee he has working for him. Now I think the magazines that have been submitted to me are such that—

Hon. Mr. Cass: If the hon. member would allow me to read the full committee list, that is the advisory panel. The full committee list which was established in 1956 includes: Mr. Sidney Hermant of Toronto, Mr. Arthur Widnall of Fort William, Mr. John K. Elliott of London, Mr. Arnold Edinborough of Toronto, Mrs. James Freeman of Blenheim, Mrs. Roy Donaldson of Ottawa, Mrs. Ward Markle of Toronto, Mrs. W. H. Downe of Sudbury, Mr. Common, the deputy Attorney-General.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I draw it to his attention, he is the man who must bear the responsibility for what will be displayed to the youth of our country. He is the man who is charged with this responsibility. All I wanted to say is these magazines, some of the 53 which the Metropolitan Police force apparently thought were obscene, were submitted. I think it is his responsibility to determine in a higher court whether or not these publications are in fact obscene.

On one hand, his committee advises him that some of these are in their opinion obscene—this very special committee which apparently is familiar with the law, I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General feels that a magistrate in the court would be able to fully observe 53 magazines in the same detailed way as a special committee might be able to do. I hardly think the magistrate would have time to do that. It may be that he would, and I suppose it is in order for one to disagree with the opinion of a learned magistrate. I certainly disagree.

Some of these books are imported. I doubt if they would be allowed to be printed in this country. They are published under the guise of nudism and nudist camps. I doubt whether the hon. Attorney-General would allow such

camps to exist if he knew they were in existence in this province. Yet at the same time these things are freely available on the newsstands to our youth.

Now, sir, the hon. Minister from St. Andrew makes the point, and I think he makes it very well when he said that mentioning of these banned books only helps their circulation. I certainly have no intention of increasing that circulation. I am going to submit these books to the hon. Attorney-General. I think he is wrong when he suggests that he will not appeal the decisions simply because a magistrate feels that they are not obscene. He does not take the same attitude on other matters which he considers of more serious consequence. This department has in other years appealed decisions of lower courts and to simply accept one court as a final answer and not another because it suits his purpose is, in my opinion, improper. I still feel that the department is only using this committee as a guise to get rid of the responsibility of the books in the province. I think they should take a more serious look at them.

Mr. Sopha: I was very curious to hear this letter written by the secretary of the committee, if I am correct, to the publisher in New York. If I understand it correctly that committee or the advisory committee, I got kind of lost, looked at a publication—if I heard it right, it was *Eros*—and then having looked at the publication the secretary wrote to the publisher in New York and reproduced in his letter section 150 of The Criminal Code of Canada. Ostensibly the secretary pointed out to him the possibilities that might befall him if he continued to circulate that magazine. Now I assume that is the context.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, in order that I might bring the hon. member for Sudbury into the picture, I would like to say that this particular magazine is not for sale on the newsstands in Ontario. It is completely a mail promotion so far as I have been able to ascertain. In the letter which I read, promotional literature was referred to. The only promotional literature read here came through the mails. There apparently has been no sign of the magazine or the publication itself.

Certainly the committee has not seen it and none have been referred to me, although I have had copies of the promotional literature. Actually there have been no such publications in Ontario. So far as we know there was no action that could be taken. But the committee and my department were quite

anxious that it should not come into Ontario and so these were the steps we thought should be taken; that is, write to the publisher, get in touch with The Post Office Department and try the revenue people. I read in the letter from Mr. Coon the result of those efforts. So far as I know, because I have not had a copy sent to me yet, no copies have come into the hands of anyone in Ontario. At least no one has brought it to the attention of the department.

Mr. Sopha: Well, presumably it came into the hands of the committee?

Hon. Mr. Cass: No, only promotional material.

Mr. Sopha: I see. Well, may I suggest most respectfully in the future that when some opinion is given on the laws of Ontario or of Canada, that the chief law officer of the Crown himself give the opinion in writing to a foreign country? We are trying to create good relationships. It should not be left to a lieutenant to write and say these are the laws which you face in Ontario.

The very valid point was being made by the hon. member for Wentworth that a great many people in this province are concerned about very recent crimes of violence involving teenagers.

Now I would be the last to say that teenagers are getting any worse than they were a generation ago, or any worse than they were five or ten years ago. I am not suggesting that. But what I point to is that there have been recently some very shocking crimes in this province involving teenagers. Those crimes have accumulated in death in two or three of the cases. The hon. member for Wentworth, all he means, and all we mean in relation to raising this subject, is that if there be any relationship in the titillation of improper impulses created by this trash, then it should be looked into.

If any of these things that we have to face in this province involving our young people—and waywardness and even leading to the most shocking crimes of violence, are created by this—then let that committee get activated and pursue the matter in the courts if necessary. I am not entirely satisfied that the law of obscenity is most properly handled by giving it to a committee, however respectable and however able the individual members of that committee are. I make no comment about their competence at all. I do not know that the chief law officer of the Crown carries out his responsibilities as head of the department by setting up a committee and saying

to that committee: You make the determination if a crime has been committed, it is up to you.

If I understand parliamentary constitutional government and if I have any knowledge about the hon. Attorney-General's department at all, that responsibility falls on the chief law enforcement officer of the Crown, the man who is responsible to this Legislature and not to some other committee.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I have supported in the past the hon. member for Wentworth and I do support him again, and I certainly think that when this committee decides that a magazine or these publications are not obscene, they are looking at it from their own point of view. Surely they must see to it that these sordid things are not permitted. A magistrate in Toronto not very long ago ruled that those laid before him were fit for general use. I think you should have him examined. I think certainly, sir, that as the hon. member for Wentworth pointed out, there should be further consideration given to that case and possibly to appeal that acquittal, because there is no question about it to my mind that they are filthy. The strange fact is that these things are up on the racks in the stores in plain view, and some of them under the racks. On that sort of filth you do not have to pay any sales tax.

That case before the magistrate was the opportunity for one of the metropolitan dailies to talk about "these reactionaries," and freedom of choice. Surely there must be some leadership taken. I do not know if the women on that committee on obscene literature saw those magazines. Certainly as everybody knows the female form is beautiful but it is not the beauty of the female form that these magazines are trying to present to you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Careful, careful now.

Mr. Troy: You know it very well. Its only purpose is to excite and, to use the word of my hon. friend from Sudbury, to "tintillate"—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Tintillate?

Mr. Troy: It is all right to talk about people who are adults but you and I know there are all kinds of people that are adults in age but certainly they are far away from being adult in mentality. Then these youngsters, too, get all these magazines. It is similar to areas in the cities where you have pushers for narcotics. These youngsters are becoming pushers for this absolute filth, and, as I said before, I am no puritan. I think those publications are absolutely filthy. If

you had seen some of the pictures that I had seen youngsters carry in their little notebooks or in their wallets it would make you almost, well, retch, absolutely retch.

They were found, after they forgot them in dressing rooms. I certainly think it is a very serious matter and I congratulate the hon. member for Wentworth on his presentation.

By the way, was that case against Prestige Products—who were convicted—and of course, again, one of the metropolitan dailies again was the champion—ever appealed? I notice it mentioned in the newspapers that Mr. Martin was going to be the counsel for Prestige Products. Was it appealed?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, it has been appealed but my deputy has not any information on the appeal. We will find out and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Troy: Thank you. The newspaper said it was all above board, but the unfortunate part about it was, the things that were passing through the mails were picked up by children.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, do I understand the case that the hon. member for Nipissing was just mentioning is one that was appealed by the hon. Attorney-General's department?

Hon. Mr. Cass: No, there was a conviction.

Mr. Troy: The conviction is to be appealed by the accused.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Does the hon. Attorney-General's department enter into the original charges on any of these magazines or is it strictly a local matter?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I am advised, as I thought, these matters are strictly a local prosecution but that undoubtedly in many instances the local Crown Attorney who is a part of this department is consulted and in some cases prosecutes.

Mr. Sopha: Local prosecutions must vary because recently on defending a tribe of Indians on Manitoulin Island in comes this special prosecutor. Where is the discrimination? I am defending an Indian for netting herring in Lake Mindemoya but the local prosecutor does not prosecute the case, in comes an able competent one. Is it just because I am on the case or is there some special consideration? What are the ground rules here?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Would that be a federal prosecution?

Mr. Sopha: No, it is not a federal prosecution. We were caught with three dead, stinking herring in a gill net.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: There is another question I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General. I am particularly concerned with a situation which took place in my own home town when some several years ago one of the local constables commandeered an automobile for the purpose of pursuing a person, and in the resulting chase that automobile was damaged. Consequently the owner of the automobile was unable to collect the cost of his automobile back again.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Could the hon. member tell me what vote this falls under because I am completely lost. That sounds like—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, I would have thought that it may have come under the statutes of Ontario and that if it did not come under the statutes of Ontario possibly statutes could be framed which would take care of the situation. Now, I may be incorrect.

Hon. Mr. Cass: This would not be the place, Mr. Chairman, to discuss that.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, would you advise me what would be the proper place to discuss it? I would think a serious matter like this would be of concern to the hon. Attorney-General rather than trying to duck the question.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this has risen a number of times this afternoon and I might draw to the attention of the House that there is an order paper on which questions can be put or orders can be put so that when they are called they can be debated. There is also a place in a speech from the Throne and in a speech on the budget and that is what these are generally provided for so that hon. members in the House can speak on these things that do not come specifically under the estimates.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: May I ask a question? Could The Police Act be amended to take care of this situation?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Propose an amendment.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Surely I am entitled to an answer, Mr. Chairman. Sir Lancelot sits over there on his stool and just tries to stifle debate on this side. Surely I am entitled to an answer to the question.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, it certainly appears to me that if the hon. member wishes to introduce a bill to amend The Police Act that would be his prerogative. As to what the government or I as a Minister of the government presently seized with The Police Act would do, I would not know. I would be glad to discuss it with the hon. member if he would come to my office in the morning before the House sits or at some other time.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this is the place I might discuss The Unconscionable Transactions Act, or would the hon. Minister of Energy prefer I do that somewhere else?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: No, this is not the place to discuss The Unconscionable Transactions Act.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: This is the place we discussed it last year, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That may be, but this is not the place to discuss it this year.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Is the hon. Minister now setting his own rules to tell us where we shall and where we shall not discuss things?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: There is no vote allowed for that Act.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I might point out, so that the hon. member will not feel he is being taken advantage of: At the present time there is an appeal with respect to that matter pending before the Supreme Court of Canada, and certainly it is my feeling as a member of the bar, and I am sure that my hon. friends who are also lawyers on the other side of the House will agree with me, this is not the time. It may be the place but this is not the time to discuss that particular matter.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Perhaps the hon. Attorney-General might advise the hon. Minister of Energy that this is the place so that if I wish to bring it up next year I might have the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, there is another matter which is of considerable significance. That

is the position of some finance companies in the province who apparently at the present time are advertising 10 per cent money in the press and are encouraging some considerable amount of money into their coffers.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would strongly suggest to the hon. member that that would be a matter for The Department of Insurance. I can tell him that the matter is under very careful scrutiny by myself and the superintendent of insurance, but the estimates for The Department of Insurance do not fall within those of The Department of the Attorney-General, which we are now debating and discussing.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I shall try to abide by the rules. It is unfortunate that the opportunity has passed. I will take advantage of the opportunity to bring it up again.

Now mention has been made this afternoon about the case of Rabbi Leiner. This case came to the attention of the courts and a Royal commission was established because of the stature of the individual concerned. And for this I think he is to be commended.

I was particularly interested in a CHUM radio news editorial wherein they point out that this is the first independent inquiry in some several years. I think 1954 was the one before that. Now I think this is a matter of serious concern. If a police commission alone has the determination of when an investigation will be launched into the treatment of a citizen of this province, and if in the only case where there has been an independent inquiry in Metropolitan Toronto in all those years, it has been proven that there was mistreatment, I think then it becomes a matter of serious concern to all of us.

I wonder if any procedure can be established or if the hon. Attorney-General will take under consideration the establishment of a special tribunal which might prevent this situation happening in the future. It seems somewhat unusual that—as the editorial points out—in all of the cases where charges of mistreatment have been investigated up until this instance, the people concerned were vindicated, and yet in the only independent inquiry the decision was otherwise.

I think it points to a weakness in our system. I suggest that if it had been some ordinary individual who had made the charges it probably would have been brushed off. But because of the character and integrity of the individual who did make them in this case, it was deemed advisable to have an inde-

pendent inquiry. And I suggest this is worthy of mention. It is something which I think should concern all of us. I think we have a responsibility to determine that people are given justice and not just the appearance of justice, because I think it is too often the case when the commission itself or the people responsible try their own personnel.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, my only comment with respect to that is I would suspect the reports relied upon by the hon. member do not disclose the facts completely. I will endeavour to furnish him with a copy of the report of the chairman of the Metropolitan Police commission which indicates that there have been several instances of summary disposal of charges against members of that force, charges similar to this one.

I would also commend to the hon. member a full reading of the report of the Royal commissioner, which would indicate the duties of ordinary citizens, as well as the duties of the police, which are not always recognized and carried out by citizens.

I would also say that perhaps at some later time during these estimates under vote 224, he might wish to pursue the matter further because I suspect at that time I may wish to speak about the same matter under that vote.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Attorney-General was reading the report of his advisory committee on indecent literature, did he say when they had a list of books submitted to them for investigation and they reported their findings, does this go back to the commission concerned? Was the report going back to all the commissions throughout Ontario? Or was it just the one concerned?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, the situation is this: there is a large committee, the names of the members I read to you, and then there is a small advisory panel whose names I also read to the House, who do most of the work. What happens is, if police have some publications they want to have an opinion on, they refer them to the committee. If I receive them or the deputy Minister in my department receives them, we refer them to the committee. And the committee gives its opinion to those persons or that department which refers it to them, but that person or that department or that police commission is not necessarily required either to take action or not take action on the basis of the committee's report. It is only an advisory committee and their job is to advise to the best of their ability and their ability is very great, I would

say, as to whether they consider these matters are obscene or not. Therefore, from then on it is a police action, whether charges are laid and what happens.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, on vote 201, item No. 12, compassionate allowances to the widow of the late Constable N. F. Maker. How much does the widow of the constable get in pension?

Hon. Mr. Cass: \$600 a year.

Mr. Thomas: Where does the rest go? There is an item of \$9,000. Where does the rest go? If she is receiving only \$600, who receives the rest?

Hon. Mr. Cass: The estimate indicates that \$9,000 is the amount which we have in the estimates for this year. The annual amount being paid in the current year is \$7,825.80. I certainly will be pleased to furnish the hon. member or to table in the House if desired, a list of the names, but I do not think it is fair to those who are named in it, to have them read at this time. If the hon. member would agree, I will either furnish it to him or table it as he wishes.

Mr. Thomas: Well, in the public accounts for the year ending March, 1962, the amount spent there was \$8,500.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am advised that the grim reaper has attended to them. Many of these are widows of very old and valued civil servants, sir, or of people like the constable for whom there was no provision for pension. An allowance has been made, which with the old-age security probably provides a reasonable living. That is my understanding. But I will furnish the hon. member with that list.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, do I understand this is the widow of a provincial police constable?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am advised this is a widow of a police constable who many years ago was killed in the performance of his duty in arresting, I believe, one of our original citizens up north.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, it is or it is not a provincial police constable? The reason I ask the question, if the hon. Minister will permit me, is that we have had a situation in Hamilton where I think the inadequacy of our law enforcement was pointed out while dealing with this same subject where the constable in the course of his duties was slain. As a result the widow was under considerable

hardship and it was necessary for the citizens of that city to band together to provide her with a reasonable living allowance since the amount from the workmen's compensation was not suitable.

It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which should concern the hon. Attorney-General, since I think, in fact, it resolves itself, in the final analysis, to our ability to get the right type of policeman on our force. I think the situation where an officer carrying a gun is killed in the course of his duty is somewhat different from that of an ordinary workman where he is not subjected to those hazards. Yet, as I understand it, our law makes no provision for any special circumstances to that type of an individual. It seems to me that we might very well be concerned about this matter. It seems to me that the province might very well consider some legislation which would in fact force municipalities to provide satisfactory protection for the widow.

Fighting an enemy within is in my opinion no different from a person who carries a gun abroad defending our country. I think this is a situation which should receive serious consideration; I think it is one which has been let slip and I do not know the answer to it, but it would seem to me that the department responsible should have the resources to study this and perhaps bring forward some type of legislation which would encourage good people into our police services rather than discouraging them, as is the case at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I would just like to make a suggestion to the hon. member and that is that he would have every opportunity, I think, of presenting that viewpoint and perhaps finding out what really has been done along the lines by the Ontario municipal employees retirement system under The Department of Municipal Affairs. I believe from my slight knowledge of it, Mr. Chairman, that there are some provisions in there which are of great benefit to those members of municipal police forces who are members of the fund, and I would suggest that the matter might be pursued further at that time.

Vote 201 agreed to.

On vote 202:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a matter but what can be done about it at this stage I do not know. I think it is serious enough that it should be at least reviewed once again in this House. It concerns the comments of a certain county court judge

in a case which was considered in eastern Ontario during the past year. I recognize that the judgment in this instance has been appealed, if I can believe the newspapers—I sometimes find that the hon. Attorney-General looks askance at what one can believe in the newspapers and what not. I am referring to the judgment of Judge Costello with regard to the Bruneau case.

Now just let me put this in context for the House, from a source I am sure most of the people in this House would find completely unimpeachable and that is the *Financial Post*. Their comment was this, in an editorial on July 14:

In case you overlooked the item in your daily newspaper—and you should not miss it—we refer to it here because it formalizes an attitude which is apparently becoming widespread.

In brief the news story was this:

Raymond Bruneau, former Liberal M.P., was convicted of corruptly accepting a bribe when he was a member of the House of Commons and was given a two-year suspended sentence—i.e. judicial slap-on-the-wrist. The judge rejected a Crown request for a jail sentence saying that it would be a gratuitous insult to M.P.'s and Legislative members—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am advised by my deputy Minister that this matter is under appeal and part of the appeal of course, part of the grounds of the appeal of course, are matters which are now being discussed by the hon. member. I would strongly suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the proper time, although it is the proper place, to discuss that particular appeal. I regret it but I think that is very clear.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I acknowledged at the outset that the conviction was being appealed. What I wanted to address my remarks to was what the *Financial Post* refers to here as a very widespread tendency for acceptance of this kind of an attitude. I had hoped that, in discussing this attitude, I would not encroach upon what is now *sub judice* before the courts.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I would think, Mr. Chairman, that discussing the attitude without reference particularly to these words would satisfy my legal adviser. If the hon. member could do that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, just let me quote from the *Financial Post*, if I may, Mr.

Chairman, without going any further into the details of this specific case:

Was the judge in this case really implying that influence peddling for personal profit is a customary, generally accepted, and rampant part of the activities of Members of Parliament? Since the ex-M.P. was bribed \$10,000 to arrange the sale to the government, it is a fair assumption that the price the government paid for the land is inflated by at least that amount and presumably more.

In view of the judicial gospel announced in this case, are citizens to assume that all or most, or many pieces of real estate and all other things sold to the government, also undergo very sudden inflation in prices prior to their purchase by government and much to the personal profit of some M.P.?

Perhaps the judge in this case is merely recognizing and giving voice to a now widely accepted principle of public morality. Certainly all parts of our country have been splattered in recent months and years with incidents of political conduct shocking to most ordinary citizens. But is conduct which would jail the private business man to be accepted as the political norm? If it is naive to expect honest dealings in our government affairs, then the *Financial Post* is and will continue to be naive.

I raise this, Mr. Chairman, because it is under this estimate, but it has reference to other matters that we have discussed in this House, in other estimates, such as Municipal Affairs, where our approach is to say that if a law has been violated by an elected representative of the people, it can be violated with impunity unless some individual citizen wants to assume the cost and the initiative for legal action. Otherwise he just suffers defeat when he goes to the people, assuming the voters learn enough to defeat him.

This is an attitude, Mr. Chairman, which I think is most shocking when it comes from the bench. But the significant and most shocking aspect of it is that I think the judge was only here giving credence, or giving recognition, to what is a very widespread attitude today. The thing that makes this even more disturbing is that we have heard comments made many times in the past about inadequate salaries paid to judges, paid to people who sit on the bench.

I have been puzzled, for example, as to the range of salaries and the limitation of salaries of those who are magistrates, and

I often wonder how those in authority can conclude that you can get top-flight people to become magistrates when, if they stay in the practice of law, the likelihood is that they are going to make two, three, four or even five times as much in the practice of law. Here you have a man on the bench in effect saying that the reason why this was done was because the M.P. was only getting \$10,000, and \$10,000 was not adequate! Now by implication, one would conclude that people sitting on the bench who are only getting \$10,000 or \$12,000 can be forgiven, and punishment would be unfair, because it would then bring into disrepute all others who happen to be in the Legislature or the House of Commons.

Now I do not know what can be done about this. The hon. Attorney-General's department at least has taken the minimum action and that is to appeal this because it received critical comment in about as widespread a fashion as I have ever seen a judgment from the bench criticized. But it seems to me that that is not enough. When a man sitting on the bench can make comments like this, which in effect suggest that the level of political morality, or at least the breach of the law, can be condoned if the recipient happens to be a person who has a limited income, and this could be condoned in the instance of a person who is a public representative, or by implication a person sitting on the bench not getting adequate salary, I think our task in rebuilding the standards of public morality is indeed going to be a very difficult one.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make some reference to this matter of the chief judge and the system that we passed last year. I believe it was last year that these went on the statute books. It has been operating a very short time. I hoped that the hon. Attorney-General would make some reference to it and would tell us what the experience has been in the new use of the so-called roving judges that have been established in the province. I observe that the hon. Prime Minister has returned to the House. He has missed a very friendly debate that we have had this afternoon, the spirit of amity that has prevailed. Perhaps he is able to tell us whether it has been decided yet whether their cousin from Ottawa is going to address the convention or not.

Mr. MacDonald: What estimate does that come under?

Mr. Sopha: Well, I was not talking to the hon. member.

If he will be there, I will go down and hear him—the great man—he is still a member of your party?

Mr. Singer: Nobody will say.

Mr. Sopha: This business that we initiated last year, Mr. Chairman, about the establishment of the office of chief judge and the inauguration or the founding of, I believe it is 14 appointments, judicial appointments we now have in the province that have been filled with so-called roving judges. It is of course a grave departure from what was intended by those people who wrote The British North America Act.

I mean by that simply that under The British North America Act, as I understand it, judges were to be appointed by the federal government and were to be paid by the federal government, so that the spirit of the cultivation of the independence of the judiciary, a cardinal foundation on which our legal system is built, would not be diluted to the extent that judges would be beholden to any more than one government. Those who wrote those words were wise men and they knew the danger of judges becoming beholden to the state or to government. So they decreed in The British North America Act that the same government that appoints them shall be the government that pays them.

Then in order to show what they had in mind they also decreed within the four corners of the same statute that the administration of justice within the province would be a provincial affair.

Now, you see the genius of it. They leave to the provinces the responsibility for the administration of justice, the daily job of carrying on police work and initiating prosecutions, and the details of it. But the government that does that has nothing to do with the appointment or the payment of the judges, and that goes a long way to preserve their independence of government. That is just what we want judges to be— independent of any type of coercion or influence or pressure of the state. Judges are such because they look upon government as being worthy of no greater respect than any citizen within the state.

In Ontario that principle has become gravely diluted, it has been gravely vitiated. For some reason that I could never understand or I could never get through to find out, the former Attorney-General had a penchant, had some sort of a sense of mission about the activities of county court judges. We went through a series of enactments last

year in which he sought to alter the judge's place within the framework of the administration of justice. I will not go into the details, but it ended up that now the province of Ontario, vis-à-vis our independent judges, pays a substantial part of their salaries. A substantial part of their salary is paid by the province, \$3,500 a year. I forget what they are paid, I have heard it is somewhere between \$10,000 and \$12,000—perhaps a little more, I do not know. They are paid by the federal government and now they are paid something up to \$3,500 by the province—something in the neighbourhood of 30 per cent.

So now we have that principle that the founders of Confederation wrote within the terms of the written part of the constitution, we have that principle of the independence of judges almost completely eliminated. Not one but two governments now pay them. So the judges, if they have in mind an increase in their remuneration or emolument, like everyone else in the country—and it would be a very salutary thing to have in mind in a day of rising prices with the cost-of-living index going up, to have in mind an increase in the emoluments, the rewards for occupying the office. Now presumably judges are going to look to two governments. You see what it leads to. They look to the federal government for an increase and not getting it there they can look to the provincial government in Toronto for an increase.

Judges are human, the same as everyone else, and that is why we have these things in the constitution. Because we recognize the human quality of occupants of important offices, we recognize they are prone to the same human failings and temptations as anyone else. The danger of course is that the government they look to, and they get a response by an increase in their salary, that they become friendly to that government. Even in their subconscious—the danger of it acting on the subconscious should be avoided.

Mr. Nickle: Will the hon. member allow me to ask him a question? Does he suggest that the learned judges are prepared to breach their oath of office for the sake of a dollar?

Mr. Sopha: I did not suggest any such thing.

Mr. MacDonald: If you read Judge Costello's judgment I do not know how you could come to any other conclusion.

Mr. Nickle: Well, I am not prepared to go that far. I know a lot of judges.

Mr. Sopha: I am not going that far. I know a lot of judges, too, and my hon. friend from Kingston has known a lot more than I have known, but I am setting out the violation of the principle. It was intended originally when this Confederation was founded that one government pay judges and one government appoint them—the one and the same government. Or to put it another way, they were appointed and paid by one government and they worked for the other. The government that did not appoint them or did not pay them was responsible for the administration of justice within the province, and that is this government here. But now you have the judges in the impossible position where they are working for two governments.

Mr. Nickle: No, no, no, they are working for the administration of justice.

Mr. Sopha: They are working for two governments in that they are being paid by two. They are being paid by two governments and that I say is a departure from a good and valid principle. These principles always are directed toward the cultivation of the very utmost in judicial independence.

And let me add this note: we in this country never had a row between government and judges, but our good neighbours to the south—because we on this side like them—you will recall in the thirties how the Head of the State in that country got into a row with judges and what happened and what dislocation was caused in the constitution of the very highest court of judicature. It is to that end that I get up and speak.

I know I take up the time of the House, but I make no apologies for it. If you feel a thing strongly, if you see some sense and validity in the historic principles upon which this nation is founded, then it is your duty to get up on the floor of the House and expound them. That is why I do it.

But I hope there will be a halt caused by vote 202 in the creation of that office, an office of quite considerable power, an office whereby the occupant of it is entitled to push other judges around. I do not use that as a term of opprobrium; I use it as a term of fact. He is entitled to direct the activities of other judges—"You go here, you hear cases there," with their consent of course.

Now I am directing my remarks almost exclusively to the hon. member for Kingston because he is demonstrating such interest—this is a departure from the principle that the county court system is founded with the knowledge that the local man knows the

problems of the area, you see. One of the virtues of our system, the county judge knows that area for which he sits as county judge. Vote 202 is a departure from that principle inasmuch as the occupant of this office sitting at Toronto can tell a judge in Kenora: "You go and hold court in Stormont."

Mr. Nickle: Well, does the hon. member not believe in the procedure of rotation of judges?

Mr. Sopha: I do not.

Mr. Nickle: I do.

Mr. Sopha: I do not, at the county level.

Mr. Nickle: I certainly do believe in rotation of judges so they do not get the local atmosphere too much.

Mr. Sopha: Just a moment. Just a moment. There is much to be said in the province for the adoption of the Quebec system of Superior Court judges even at the high court level. There is much to be said. Many respectable people at the bar feel that the assignment for a certain area of judges of the high court and the Supreme Court of judicature is worthy of a second look.

Just to illustrate: the predecessor of this honourable gentleman who sits as Attorney-General, in response to a question I asked him about the establishment of weekly court in chambers at Sudbury told me it was under active consideration. He went further and said:

"I think I can assure you that within a very short time we will establish weekly court in chambers at Sudbury to look after that area."

Now that was over a year and a half ago that he said that. As my hon. friend knows, we have one at London, that is London in the bush, not London on the Thames, and one in Ottawa. You see? We never got it. So there is much to be said for the establishment of the high court judges in a fixed area, because for us and the people we serve in northern Ontario it means that, without weekly court in chambers, we have to employ the Toronto profession down here, the same as you do. We have to employ them and engage them as our agents to do that weekly court in chambers work. There's more than one expense to living north of the French River.

Mr. Nickle: If the hon. member would have patience, he would have a weekly court—an assize court—in Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Why not have a weekly court come to Sudbury?

Mr. Nickle: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Sopha: Why not have the weekly court sit in Sudbury as they do in London in the bush and Ottawa?

Mr. Nickle: Well, the hon. member said he could not have it in Sudbury, but I am telling him he can if he—

Mr. Sopha: Well, the hon. member talks about charging \$2 for advice, it is small wonder we have to charge \$2.25 in Sudbury for the same advice.

Mr. Nickle: How much? It is only \$1 down my way.

An hon. member: What is that, \$1 a minute?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, just in order that the hon. member should not be too exercised, I would like to say this. I am advised and it goes well before my time, so I know only by advice, that the payment of surrogate allowances and fees to county court and surrogate judges who are appointed and paid otherwise by the federal government, is a matter of long standing. Two score years or more. I believe that over that period of time there are very few of us who could point a finger at the judiciary on that bench. Nor have they given the profession or the public any cause to believe that they have been suborned or otherwise afflicted or affected by these payments, for which they give real good value.

Mr. Sopha: I do not suggest for a moment they have. I just call attention to the danger, that is all. I just wanted to call attention to the danger and to state a principle that I think has been violated. I do not recant one whit of what I say.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that when this House adjourns its present sitting it shall stand adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Can the hon. Prime Minister say—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I am waiting an opportunity. There will be some budget debate tomorrow and we will go

back into the estimates of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass). There will be no night session tomorrow night, no night session Wednesday night, but there will be a night session on Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 of the clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 19, 1963

Fourth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Cowling	823
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	823
Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. Nickle, Mr. Whicher	823
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Reilly, agreed to	847
Estimates, Department of the Attorney-General, Mr. Cass, continued	847
Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation Act, 1949, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	860
Children's Mental Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	861
Psychologists Registration Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	861
Pesticides Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	861
Hospital Services Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	861
Private Hospitals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	861
Dental Technicians Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	861
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Macaulay, agreed to	862

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1963

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery students from Forest Hill Junior High School, Toronto; in the west gallery students from Jefferson Public School, Richmond Hill; and in both galleries students from Belleville Collegiate Institute, Belleville.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) for Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West) from the standing committee on private bills presented the committee's fourth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr24, An Act to incorporate Trent University.

Bill No. Pr41, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Bill No. Pr43, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Bill No. Pr45, An Act respecting the united counties of Northumberland and Durham.

Bill No. Pr46, An Act respecting the county of Carleton.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. Pr24, An Act to incorporate Trent University.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following:

1. The report of the Minister of Agriculture, Ontario, for the year ending March 31, 1962.

2. The report of the Ontario Stockyards for the year ending June 30, 1962.

3. Report of the Ontario Food Terminal Board, Department of Agriculture, Ontario, for the year ending March 31, 1962.

4. Report of the Co-operative Loans Board of Ontario for the year ending December 31, 1962.

5. The 8th annual report of the Ontario Development Corporation of the province of Ontario for the year ending December 31, 1962.

6. The annual report of the Ontario Telephone Service Commission for the province of Ontario for the year ending December 31, 1961.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. W. M. Nickle (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, first of all today I would like to put myself on record and indicate as clearly as I possibly can the very deep debt of gratitude and appreciation I have for the former Prime Minister of Ontario (Hon. Mr. Frost) and the present hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), who, as a result of their kindness to me since 1951, generally speaking, have permitted me to occupy seat No. 2 in this House, which seat my father occupied when he was Attorney-General and Mr. Ferguson was the Prime Minister of this province.

This might well be the last speech I will make in this Legislature—and I so indicate my feelings, Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to the hon. leader of the government (Mr. Robarts) this afternoon—as is my very fond hope, there will be no adjournment of this Parliament until such time as the Roach report has been tabled.

I am speaking for myself as the member for Kingston and the islands of Wolfe, Amherst and Howe. I feel that that report

could be, maybe, far-reaching in its effect and I think those of us, like myself, who do not intend to run in the next general provincial election, should have an opportunity in this House of indicating our views as to how the probe was conducted and any other comment we may wish to make.

I may tell you I direct my remarks just at the moment to the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha). He and I had a cross-fire conversation yesterday afternoon and I would not be a bit surprised, come the report on crime, if we each have something to say one to the other based on a very friendly point of view.

I would like to try to help, if I may, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer), because down my way, Kingston way, Frontenac-Addington way, he has no member in this House. I read in the *Kingston Whig-Standard* that he has a split in his party down there in Frontenac-Addington. So I thought this afternoon I would try to give him some legal aid.

Down where I come from, the Grits and the Tories are in no way interested in headquarters trying to dictate who their candidate is going to be. I think the hon. leader has a very excellent candidate down there representing the Liberal party, Mrs. Teresa Chippendale. She was chosen at an open Liberal convention. But now it seems to be that the hon. leader of the Opposition wants to run the principal of the Frontenac high school, Mr. Keys, or perhaps a lawyer friend of mine who is the chairman of the hon. leader's policy committee, Mr. W. J. Henderson. I say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that Mr. Campbell of his headquarters would be well advised by him to keep him out of Frontenac-Addington. Keep him out of this constituency. They can handle their own affairs.

On Saturday morning I was at the market. We have a very excellent market down there and you would be surprised how indignant the hon. leader's people are because he is trying to dictate as to who his standard bearer should be. I notice he has been sending telegrams, and has been trying all sorts of funny things. No matter who he runs I do not think he will get elected; but that is beside the point.

What I am trying to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition is this: he will have a lot happier riding down there if by chance he will just allow these good people, many of them very great friends of mine, to run their own show. The hon. leader of the Opposition should mind his own business.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Is the hon. member trying to tell me how to run it?

Mr. Nickle: I am just telling the hon. leader how to run it if he wants to have some peace and quiet down there.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Why does the hon. member not concern himself about the Tories?

Mr. Nickle: Well, I may see him later in the day.

Another point I would like to discuss this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is one which gives me some concern. That is the question of the freedom of the press.

I have read an article in the *Kingston Whig-Standard* recently about the freedom of the press. It interested me greatly. The day has passed, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, when a judge should have the power to put a man or woman in jail for not disclosing where he got the information for a news story.

The *Whig-Standard* is the only daily paper in Kingston, it has done a good job in keeping the people informed fairly in relation to all matters, be they international, federal, provincial or local.

Some people have a warped view about the freedom of the press. They think, many of them shady characters, small political mosquitoes if you will, that it is the duty of the press to report their slanderous character references about those charged with seeing to it that our laws are enforced rather than breached by people who would have you believe they are good and decent citizens, which in many cases is not the fact. When their vitriolic statements are not published, they complain and say there is no freedom of the press.

It is my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, to you and the law officers of this government, that The Libel and Slander Act should be amended. A reporter should not have to tell the source of his story for a newspaper. This applies equally to government and business. He who refuses to inform a court or commission where he got his information should not be held in contempt and liable to be jailed indefinitely until he has purged his contempt.

Mr. Singer: Has that ever been done here, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Nickle: I will give the hon. member the reference in just a second.

Newspapers and magazines render a public service in keeping the public informed, particularly in reference to controversial political and business matters. If these agencies of the press libel an individual they can be sued for damages. Whatever a wronged person or corporation might recover in court, the paper and its owners are well able to pay.

To muzzle the press is not fair to the public. Why should a spy be allowed to carry on unmolested breaching security measures of our country because a reporter has the story and is afraid to publish it because he may be in contempt of court in refusing, if asked, to give the source of his material to a properly constituted tribunal? A newspaper reporter should be allowed to honour the confidence he gives to the one who gave him his information. If a government department is wrong, if a corporation is wrong in what they are doing, in the name of justice let us have the facts, and right the wrong no matter what it may be.

Those are my views in relation to the freedom of the press. The law is that if a reporter is asked to give the source of his information and he refuses he is then in contempt. There is law on that, if you want to look it up.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It opens up alarming possibilities.

Mr. Nickle: It may open up alarming possibilities, in answer to the hon. member for Sudbury, but I put it this way: I would rather see a wrong disclosed than the muzzling of those who are prepared to render a public service; the newspapers of this province.

Mr. Singer: Has the hon. member ever heard of a case like this in Ontario? There was one in New York state.

Mr. Nickle: And there have been a couple in England. Yes, there has been one in Alberta—Blair Fraser.

These are the things in this day and generation that we must look after. We must see that there is a freedom of the press and that those who write sincerely and honestly—and I believe that newspaper reporters do write in that fashion—should be protected by not having to face the prospect of being incarcerated if they refuse to tell the name of a man or woman who gave them information in relation to any particular matter or thing. Those are my views.

I am going to leave them with the suggestion that the hon. Prime Minister and the

hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) should at this session see that there is an amendment to The Libel and Slander Act which gives the privilege to the reporter; that in such cases as I have indicated he does not have to disclose the source of his information.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter that has given me some thought, and that is about Armistice Day. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) that come Armistice Day our boys and girls in the secondary schools—and there are many of them here in the galleries today—should not think of it as a holiday. It is a sacred day and I suggest to the hon. Minister of Education if, come Armistice Day, the schools are going to be closed, then the teachers, the lecturers, the professors of the secondary schools, call them what you will, should be obliged to take their classes to the Armistice service.

The classes should be instructed as to what Armistice means, the sacrifice which has been made by our people in two world wars, and that our way of life and democracy, as we understand it, is the privilege that they enjoy as a result of sacrifice made by others a quarter or a half a century ago.

Mr. Speaker, you would think, having regard to the philosophy of the Opposition and those who have gone before them in the last 40 or 50 years, that they would have thought well to honour one of Kingston's greatest citizens, a man who was Prime Minister of Ontario longer than any other person, Sir Oliver Mowat. Yet it fell to my lot last session to suggest in relation to this great statesman, this great Liberal leader, that a plaque should be unveiled in Kingston to his memory.

It seems fitting that Mowat and I had some things in common at least. He was a Presbyterian and so was I. He went to St. Andrew's Church in Kingston and so did I. He was a lawyer and so was I, and there we part company.

Sir Oliver Mowat was articulated as a law student in the firm headed by that great statesman, Sir John A. Macdonald. Sometimes, you know, a young rooster thinks he can take on the old cock. That does not always work out. Mowat thought he would run against Macdonald. He tried his hand at that, and was soundly defeated.

That was a very wonderful thing for Ontario and it was a great thing for Canada, Mr. Speaker, because if Macdonald had been defeated we would have lost his vision and judgment nationwide during the time he was Prime Minister of this country. We would

have lost the services, I suggest, of Mowat, who became the Prime Minister of this province, as I say, longer than any other person. That defeat was really a blessing in disguise.

There are those sitting across the House this afternoon who seem to have twinkles in their eyes, as much as to say, "What can I ask him to put him off stride?"—but I will not have that trouble. I suppose you people will say, "Well, the member for Kingston was trying to make some political advantage out of this Mowat plaque". Well, you see, and I am speaking to the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald), I put it this way: I was not trying to do anything of the sort so I decided I would get somebody with me who could help pull the golden cord that opened the curtain and showed the plaque. So I got Mrs. H. W. Davis. She is the president of the Eastern Ontario Liberal Association.

Mr. Sopha: Who is that again?

Mr. Nickle: Mrs. H. W. Davis. She is the president of the Eastern Ontario Liberal Association. She is also a member of St. Andrew's Church. The beauty of that ceremony, and I say this in a broad metaphorical way. We grasped hands and pulled the curtain together to unveil that plaque.

Mr. Sopha: Behind the curtain?

Mr. Nickle: No, in front of the courthouse. You may ask about Mrs. H. W. Davis. Her great-grandfather was the Reverend Mr. Robert McDowell. He christened, in Kingston, Sir Oliver Mowat and all the members of the Mowat family.

On this occasion the Kingston Historical Society was represented by Lt.-Col. L. J. Flynn; the judiciary by his honour the local judge, Judge M. W. Strange; the historic sites branch by Dr. G. F. G. Stanley; and the dedication was performed by the Rev. Mr. Skoutajan of the United Church in Kingston. A cross-section of our people were there that day.

One of the best parts of the ceremony, as I recall it, was that we had one of the elder statesmen of Kingston, one of our senior citizens, Mr. Colin Macpherson. His background again is more Liberal than Conservative. He, as a boy, remembers Macdonald extremely well. He was there. So I say to the hon. members of the Opposition, come next election, if you go past the courthouse you will see this plaque; but with gratitude may I ask you to indicate that it was only there through the wisdom and the foresight

and the decency of the Conservative member for Kingston?

Mr. Singer: The hon. member is so modest.

Mr. Nickle: I know, but I have to be modest; that is my trouble.

For the purpose of the record, Sir Oliver Mowat was born in Kingston in 1820. In 1857 he was elected, a Liberal, to the legislative assembly of Canada. He served as Provincial Secretary in the Brown administration. He was a delegate from Upper Canada to the Quebec Conference in 1864.

In 1896 he was appointed to the Senate where he became the government leader. He also held the portfolio of Minister of Justice in the Laurier government. The following year, his duties being too onerous, he retired to accept the appointment as the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario which position he held to the time of his death in 1903.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to this budget, I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) brought down what I would say was a very sensible budget. On page 1 of his opening remarks that day, he says:

The government has long considered the promotion of economic growth and development to be one of its major responsibilities. Throughout the years we have continually fought to formulate policies and marshal our resources for the purpose of fostering growth and achieving higher living standards for our people. The continuance of the economic expansion that we have been enjoying is one of our greatest challenges, and the government is taking vigorous action to meet this challenge. The outlook for the future is one of confidence and optimism. We are experiencing a resurgence of economic activity. Our financial position is strong, our plans to revive the facilities and services required for the progressive development of the province are broadly based and soundly conceived. We are ready to proceed with vigour, foresight and imagination to make the most of our great opportunities for future progress.

Then, Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from Kingston, there is another remark made by the hon. Provincial Treasurer to which I would like to direct to your attention. That is this:

Education continues to present us with our greatest challenge.

In relation to the capital and maintenance grants that are made by The Department of Education for the city of Kingston, I would

like to indicate to you, we have there Queen's University, we have high schools, vocational schools and a very excellent system of public schools. No matter what the taxes may be in Kingston, like other places, the population is getting greater all the time, but the grants that come from the government to assist us both on the school level and the university level mean a very great deal to what I would call the educational, the academic standing of Kingston.

Having regard, Mr. Speaker, to the contribution Queen's makes, not only to Ontario but to Canada at large, through their graduates in art, science, medicine and divinity—

Mr. Sopha: How does a fellow get some of these grants?

Mr. Nickle: I will tell you; all you have to do is to come down there and make your representation on behalf of Queen's University. Perhaps if you and I had a quiet chat! You are going to have a university your way, and may I just give you one good wish, sir, may it be just as good as Queen's. And if it is, sir, when you speak about your university you will know the pride that is within my breast today, when I speak about Queen's.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): They are going to restrict the number of lawyers they put through.

Mr. Nickle: I would say that having followed the progress of my successor in the department that I once held in the Frost administration, he has done a very excellent job. But I today cannot possibly name, I cannot hope to name, everyone in that department who has rendered such yeoman service. The first person I would like to name is the head of our industrial branch, Mr. F. J. Lyle, who recently resigned but his great services in relation to industry were not lost in that he went to the Ontario Research Foundation.

I want to give you something about the contribution that Mr. Lyle has made in relation to our economic development; what has taken place in the immediate past, what I hope will take place in the future and that is this: Lyle trained the man we have in New York, Probyn; Lyle trained the man we have today in Chicago, a man by the name of Grant Claus. He also trained the man that we have in Rome, Mr. Samthmaura. Likewise he trained Mr. Stapleford, who was here for

a time. During the time that he was in Toronto he established, without reservations, in my opinion, very excellent public relations with the Canadian consul-generals both in Chicago and in New York. Stapleford has trained Webster Thompson who is presently the industrial commissioner at Ontario House.

Mr. Singer: Is that the man who could not get along with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay)?

Mr. Nickle: I never knew anyone he could not get along with.

Now, we also have—and it would not be fair unless I paid some sort of compliment to the agent-general, James Armstrong; he is not a highly trained industrialist but his public relations are very excellent. You have to have a good public relations man over there—he is tall, good-looking, well groomed. I would say he is the Adonis of the cocktail hour, but on the other hand—

Mr. Sopha: That is a very sore point with the hon. Minister right now.

Mr. Nickle: I never heard such a thing in my life until you just mentioned it.

Mr. Sopha: McPherson will publish another cartoon.

Mr. Nickle: When I look over there, are you crying, or do you have nose trouble? May I say, I hope, honestly, it is a cold.

Now, you must have in charge of public relations, somebody who can go along; I do not think there are many people in this House who are so good at what I would call the cocktail hour, but it is a refreshing place where there is frothy, vivacious conversation and in the main does not amount to too much when the thing is over. I think the agent-general, on that basis, has done a very good job. He has been gifted and has the support of what I would say are very able men. You see in the crime probe, I do not want to stay off that, I would like one chance to talk on that—but, you see, some of my friends over there, two or three of them, are going at me all at the same time and I do not know who made the remark, but somebody said something about one of the men I named not being in the best books of my successor. Well, I never heard that. All I can tell you is this: The men whom I name today—get this straight, no matter what my successor might think of any of them—the men I named today I found to be firm, sincere and trustworthy. If that department is going to go ahead in the future, as I think we did in the past, then these are going to be

wheel horses that will advise him soundly and he will find them to be loyal and competent advisors. That is my compliment to them.

Mr. Sopha: You sound as if you would like to say something and you do not quite know how to say it. Be frank with it!

Mr. Nickle: Mr. Speaker, I thought, as a matter of fact, I did pretty well with the last one. But, however, if you would like me to strengthen that statement I would do my best and see what I can do to help you. If there are any questions I will answer them to the best of my ability.

Mr. Sopha: Do you find that the department is different nowadays than when you were the Minister in charge of it?

Mr. Nickle: All I know is what I read in the press and apparently they are going forward with characteristic success.

Mr. Sopha: Did you ever have a dinner at which you have—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I would advise all the members, if they have a question to ask, to rise in a dignified way and ask permission to ask the question rather than just shout them out without notice.

Mr. Nickle: Mr. Speaker, again down in eastern Ontario, the part of the country from which I come, I note, sir, that I need not make this comment, but from conversation that I have had with you, sir, I certainly think I judge you correctly when I say, sir, that you are a man that reads your Bible thoroughly, frequently and well, and that you know your biblical references; and when I tell you that all the wise men come from the east, you would not quarrel with that statement. So I just let that go because, you see, my critics do not come from the east.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): What about the north?

Mr. Nickle: The hon. Minister says: "What about the north?" I have been up there with him—he invited my wife and me very graciously—and I think it is a very wonderful country.

We are very proud in eastern Ontario about what I would call some of the family businesses. Mr. Speaker, with the approval of my colleague and friend, the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Auld), we have down in Brockville a jewellery firm known as Stacey's. They have been going for over a hundred

years. It was founded by Mr. Thomas Boyd Stacey. Then his son Frederick B. Stacey took over and the present owner is Mr. Ardeil Stacey, who took over the business after he returned from World War I where he had a very excellent record with the Canadian artillery.

Mr. Speaker, I have a very high personal regard for the chairman of the liquor licence board, His Honour Judge W. T. Robb. I have never had anything to do with him in connection with an official application or whatever—these things they issue in connection with the sale of alcoholic beverages or beer, be that as it may—but when I was the Provincial Secretary—and I so suggest this to the present hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko)—when there were any statements going to be made of a far-reaching character and of great importance by the chairman of the liquor licence board, when I was Provincial Secretary and had the assistance of a very excellent deputy, Mr. R. J. Cudney, we asked the liquor licence board to tell us what they were going to say and we cleared it with them.

I think that last Christmas, when the hours came out in the newspapers that beverage rooms were going to be allowed to be open Christmas eve, it was later changed by a very firm statement made at the time by my hon. leader, the Prime Minister. It got great headlines and, frankly, I think the headlines embarrassed Judge Robb.

What I say to my hon. colleague today is this: if these statements are going to be made, then they should be cleared through him. If he knew about that statement then, as a friend of Judge Robb, I would say he should have corrected it, and not brought him into the ridicule and contempt which necessarily followed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nickle: You see, the beauty of a speech that I make is that one minute you fellows are with me and the next minute you are against me.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): The hon. member is half right.

Mr. Nickle: Well, better half right than all wrong.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nickle: I say, Mr. Speaker, through you to the hon. members opposite, that none of us is infallible, not even them.

An hon. member: Not even the Tory party.

Mr. Nickle: That is right. We will make mistakes, and you are making them now. It is all part of life's philosophy.

Mr. Sopha: Would the hon. member consider Diefenbaker a mistake?

Mr. Nickle: The only mistake I say anybody ever makes is when a man and woman, after they are married, bring into the world somebody who is no good. And I do not think he is in that category.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nickle: Mr. Speaker, there can be little question that economic matters will command a great deal of the attention of this House in the months that lie ahead. I need not reiterate the steps which this government has already taken to encourage and foster the orderly development of commerce and industry throughout the province. Nor do I need to draw attention to the vigorous programmes now under way, or to those outlined in the speech from the Throne designed to ensure that jobs will be available for the many thousands of young people who will soon be entering our work and labour force.

The matter which I would now raise, Mr. Speaker, has been brought to my attention by many of my constituents, some of them personal friends of a lifetime, who have spoken openly to me of a matter which has come to be of great concern to them. Many of them are union members, for many of Kingston's plants are organized and none of them, so far as I am aware, is opposed to trade unions, or challenges the legitimate role of the trade union movement in this country.

What concerns them, however, is the fact that trade unions can presently be certified in this province as a bargaining agent of a group of employees without the requirement of a representation vote of all the employees who would be affected by that certification. Under The Labour Relations Act, as it now stands, a vote of the employees is not required in all certification cases. I am informed that in fact a vote is held in a relatively small percentage of all certification cases.

My point is a simple one, Mr. Speaker. Documentary evidence of the kind now relied on by the board is not as clear and free from doubt as one would wish, and it should not be relied on as absolutely as it is now. It would be my recommendation to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) that he give consideration to an amendment to The Labour Relations Act requiring a vote to be held in all certification cases.

A vote of all the eligible voters was a good enough way for all the hon. members of this House to win their seats, and in spite of it may I say the results of those of us who are here is as a result of the people exercising their franchise by the ballot. If it is good enough for those in federal, provincial and municipal politics, then I say likewise it is good enough to find out exactly what the employees want, in relation to the bargaining agent, by a secret ballot.

The decision of the voter, alone in the polling place and secure in the knowledge of the secrecy of the ballot, is the surest indication of his wishes that I know of; and the union which is certified after winning such a vote is a strong indication of what the people wanted. How much better would such a system be than the present one, which does nothing to reassure the many parties involved in certification issues that the result is a true and proper one.

Before the hon. members opposite rush to remind me that there is provision in the Act for objecting employees to make their views known to the board, let me say that many of the objections I have received stem from these very provisions. The requirement now is that employees opposed to the union must not only file documentary evidence as the unions do, but must back it up by a hearing in Toronto with oral evidence, which the unions do not have to do.

As I come from a small county town, as I am a small county town solicitor, sometimes I think—as other hon. members of this House, they probably have the same view as I have—that when we have business we all have to come down to Osgoode Hall to deal with it. I think the time is coming, more and more, when weekly court and other routine courts are going to go to the people rather than having the expense of coming down here to Osgoode Hall. I think this thing has to be spread out a bit and save the people expense of employing at all times Toronto counsel.

I do not object to paying Toronto counsel, mark you; but I do say to the litigants—there is a book "What Price Justice?"—and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that what we ought to do is broaden our judicial system and have more weekly courts scattered around the province in-between assizes courts or non-jury courts of the Supreme Court of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: I do not think the hon. Attorney-General is listening.

Mr. Nickle: I am quite sure he is listening; he is quite close there.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): If the hon. member would listen to it and pay attention—

Mr. Sopha: This is for his benefit.

Mr. Nickle: It is not for anybody's benefit at all. I am just talking as I see the situation and exercising my right of free speech.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member's speech was not so free when he was in the Cabinet.

Mr. Nickle: Oh, it has always been free; and look at all the trouble I have been in. Sometimes I thought I was too free, to tell you the truth. However, I managed to stay until I decided I would go out under my own steam for personal reasons. That is something. I was not booted out.

The requirement now is that employees opposed to the union must not only file documents, as I have mentioned. It seems to me that, in the interest of good labour-management relations, if we had a vote, a secret ballot, that would cause more industrial harmony than anything else that I can possibly suggest to this honourable court for its consideration.

There is another man who was in my department, he is now retired because of his age. He was the head of the conservation branch, Mr. A. H. Richardson. They did not make them any better than Herb Richardson. When he was given his honorary degree in Montreal, *honoris causa*, he was introduced to the Chancellor of McGill University by the Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture, and this is what they had to say about this great public servant. I would like to read it into the record.

Mr. Chancellor, I have the honour to present Arthur Herbert Richardson, the distinguished Canadian conservationist, in order that you may confer on him the degree of Doctor of Law. Mr. Richardson has been responsible more than any other single man for the development of conservation and flood control programme and policies in Canada. Beginning with his role in the pioneer work of the Ganaraska Watershed near Port Hope, and culminating in the establishment of the twenty-eight Conservation Authorities in Canada, which are models for co-ordinating the interests of regional and local governments in dealing with these problems.

Mr. Richardson's vision and leadership in this field over more than forty years have given Canadian efforts in the field of conservation an international reputation which is the greatest tribute to his success.

As a biologist with imagination, a forester with insight, an engineer with a sense of real values, and a man with a burning concern for the well-being of his fellow-men, young and old, he does us the honour by becoming one of our distinguished graduates today.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I would like to refer to. To you, sir, I am indebted, for the opportunity of representing this government, all parties of this government, sir, when the parliamentary association came to Kingston last year, when they were the guests of the government of the province of Ontario.

In that delegation, sir, there were men of the different parliaments of the Commonwealth. There were white and black gentlemen. It illustrates to me that we all had, sir, a common allegiance to the Crown, H.M. Queen Elizabeth II.

You were there. On that day we had with us a very outstanding Queen's University student, a man by the name of Mr. Locksley Edmundson who on August 6 organized at Queen's University a reception on behalf of the Jamaican government of the new Prime Minister, Sir William Alexander Bustamanti, at which time those of us in public life, of all political philosophies, were invited.

That day on behalf of this government, sir, it was my very great pleasure to extend to this outstanding economist at Queen's, representing as he did that day his government, on behalf of the people of Ontario our felicitations and best wishes to the newest member of the great Commonwealth. It was a very great day and a very wonderful opportunity, sir, that you accorded to me and my wife. For that, I shall be eternally grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I have often heard it said by men and women of all political philosophies that the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario possessed the unique power of drawing the hearts of his associates towards him. I realize the truth of this assertion and can say that since I have been brought into intimate communion with him he has become endeared to me in every respect.

His patriotism is beyond question, his service with the Royal Canadian Navy in the Second World War establishes this fact. Mr. Speaker, his devotion to the Progressive-Conservative Party has prompted the spirit of envy to level every shaft at his reputation and his government to destroy his great name, his great mind, his sound judgment and government policies which are formulated in the best interests of all the people of the province of Ontario.

As I will not be a candidate in the next general provincial election, I can only say I want to put myself on record, without reservation, that come the next election my hon. leader can count on my wife and me for our loyal and enthusiastic support, that we may make our small contribution in seeing to it that the present hon. Prime Minister will form the next government of the province of Ontario.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this budget debate the first thing that I would like to do is to pay my most sincere respects to the hon. Provincial Treasurer of this province (Mr. Allan). Over the past number of years I have gotten to know the hon. Minister very well, Mr. Speaker. I regard him as a personal friend, as I am sure most hon. members of this House do. Besides looking after his administrative job as Provincial Treasurer very well, he has one big advantage. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether I should say it to the House or not, but I believe we are the only two dairy distributors in this House, and that throws us a little closer together.

I would also like to pay my respects at this time to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) who presented the budget criticism for the Liberal Party. Unlike the people in the New Democratic Party who disagreed with what he said, I want to say that I, and I am sure all hon. members of this House, were most impressed with the honest way he faces situations, the sincerity with which he presents a budget criticism; and this sincerity, of course, adds dignity.

That is something, of course, that our hon. leader has. It is recognized, not only by ourselves in the Liberal benches, but it is recognized as a general situation throughout the province of Ontario. With that dignity he is greatly different than that energetic, I must say, hon. gentleman who is the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald). Energetic though he may be, some of his wild, fantastic charges of the last four and five years in the Legislature do not add to the dignity that the hon. leader of the party should have.

One of the first things I was impressed with by the hon. leader of our party—who as a barrister perhaps one would think that he would not know too much about the agricultural situation in this province—but one of the things that I was most impressed with was the very capable way in which he presented an agricultural criticism as far as the budget of this province is concerned. I thought it was outstanding and I thought

that he brought to the attention of the people of this province that those engaged in the agricultural industry in this province are not facing a rosy future or have not had the rosy past or the rosy present that the hon. Provincial Treasurer of the province or the government of the province like to paint to everyone, to the taxpayers of the province.

I was very interested to read just the other day an article from Mr. Jack McArthur, the financial editor of the *Toronto Daily Star*. This is not a place where one would be prone to find too much about the agricultural industry, and particularly a financial editor pointing out and sticking up for the many good points the farmers of this province have. Also, many of the adversities they have to face. He made three points and I would like to quote him.

One: The average farmer is not particularly heavily subsidized by the government. This country subsidizes its farmers much less heavily than most others. I suspect that the auto and textile industries, among others, are more subsidized than the farmers. Their subsidies come directly from the consumer in the form of higher prices resulting from protective tariffs and quotas.

Just to say a few words about that point, Mr. Speaker, I have been talking not only to people in the government benches, but even some of my own hon. colleagues who come from the city, and there seems to be a general feeling across this province that the farmers of this province are being subsidized every day of the year.

This is certainly not true! There are many farmers engaged in certain parts of the agricultural industry who derive not one single cent of farm subsidies as far as they themselves are concerned.

Secondly, by any measure efficiency has risen more rapidly since the end of the war in agriculture than in any other main industry.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that many of us at times feel that in the great industrial concerns of our country efficiency has improved many times over. We forget that the farmers, as I will prove to you in just a few minutes, as Mr. McArthur says, provided more efficiency in their line of work than any other.

Number three: Farmers have proved as mobile, as willing to change, as any other class in the Canadian economy.

Look at these figures. The average size of farms has risen from 200 acres in 1921, to 280 in 1951, to more than 350 in 1961.

The number of people on the land has dropped from 1,400,000 in 1939 to 675,000 now.

Mr. Speaker, in his criticism of the budget our hon. leader pointed out the fact that in 1901, for example, one farmer provided food for ten people. Now they provide food for 30 people. Farms have decreased in number from 160,000 to 127,000 in that time.

Now our government for years gone by, and certainly at the present time, Mr. Speaker, has pointed out wrongly—certainly wrongly—that the farm economy has been rising and that farmers are making more and more money all the time, in other words that they are prosperous.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an absolute fallacy. The farmers in this province are the lowest paid members of the whole economy. I do not care where you go. It has been said on many occasions that the people of the cloth, the clergy of this province or any other, are the lowest paid in their province or wherever it may be.

However, let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of this province, not only this year but for many years past have been in this position, and you can go back right to the time that this government took over, except for the war years—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister without Portfolio): And before that too.

Mr. Whicher: What I want to say to the hon. Minister without Portfolio, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not too interested in what happened then. We are interested in what is happening right now, and this government is doing a very poor job. I am not interested in what happened 50 years ago or even 20 years ago, but I am interested in the untruthful statements that have been made by members of this government about what has happened in the past to the agricultural industry and the fact that today the 127,000 farms that we have are not getting a fair deal as far as the economy of this country is concerned.

It is emphasized in our hon. leader's speech when he says that in 1951 the gross amount of money that was taken in by the farmers of this province was \$1.26 billion, and in 1962, 11 years afterwards, it was \$1.30 billion. In other words in those 11 years there was a gross increase of \$40 million. During that time, Mr. Speaker, farm prices—that is, the prices the farmer gets for his goods in this province—fell by 20 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you: Is this something of which the government of the province of Ontario should be proud? Instead of going out on the hustings and saying what a good job they have done, they should be honest for once and say, "As far as the agriculture industry is concerned we should be ashamed of ourselves."

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister was up in Durham not long ago too and had 20 people there. I talked to four or five of those—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. member was down in Frontenac-Addington too.

Mr. Whicher: I am talking about where the hon. Minister was. I talked to four or five of the 20 who were there and they told me that they wished they had stayed at home.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is just this: It does not matter how much the hon. Minister interrupts. The fact is that in the last ten years the prices the farmers of the province of Ontario have been getting for all lines of goods, beef or pork or milk or whatever it may be, have fallen by 20 per cent. At the same time in that period the cost of machinery and services has risen by 19 per cent. To me that is a disgusting situation.

The government says at the same time that these are good times for farmers in this province. Not only have we had poor times, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time we have had a complete mismanagement of the farmers' affairs by the government sitting opposite. One of the places that I mentioned before Christmas was in the milk industry in the province of Ontario. I can say this to you most truthfully, Mr. Speaker: When you consider the fact that one farmer is selling milk for \$5 a hundredweight and his next-door neighbour is selling exactly the same product for half the amount of money, you know that in histories of the past there have been revolutions fought over situations that were not nearly as serious as this.

I cannot for the life of me understand how a government can stand up and make excuses when for exactly the same product—exactly the same product—one farmer gets twice as much as the other. I strongly suggest that it shows there is a great lack of leadership by the government of this province in not undertaking to help the farmers to create a plan whereby each farmer would share equitably.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. Whicher: When we take over we will not just suggest, we will do something about it.

I gather, Mr. Speaker, by what the hon. Minister has said that as far as his party is concerned this is a helpless situation and that they cannot do anything about it. If that is what he says I say: Move out of the way and we will show you what to do.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: We are interested in the hon. member's thoughts because he is in that business.

Mr. Whicher: I am in the business, in the other end of the business. I am in the business with the fluid milk producers of this province, and fluid milk producers are getting a square deal. These are about ten per cent of the farmers—the other 90 per cent are in the milk business—whom this government is crucifying financially.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What is the hon. member going to do about that?

Mr. Whicher: Now then, it is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who come from rural ridings, inasmuch as we feel that the agriculture economy is certainly not what it should be, that when government members stand up and suggest that they are going to put in a private bill, which incidentally has never been put in, to my knowledge, allowing the colouring of margarine, it is for this reason that those of us from rural areas are a bit touchy on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great attention to the speech of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) when he advocated allowing the colouring of margarine in the province of Ontario. I would be the first to admit quite frankly that there are many people in my riding who use margarine and who colour it; there are indeed many farmers who colour margarine in my riding, but the situation is this: The milk industry in this province, the dairy industry, is a big industry. It is a big one, and as was mentioned by Mr. McArthur, the financial editor of the *Toronto Daily Star*, there are other industries that are subsidized heavily.

He himself mentioned the automobile industry, whereby, through tariffs, it costs us probably an extra \$500 for a Chevrolet or a Ford car in the province of Ontario, compared to what you can buy it for in the state

of Michigan. I remind you that the gold mining industry is subsidized, the railway industry is subsidized, practically every segment of the economy is under some form of subsidization today. Therefore, we feel that, inasmuch as the dairy industry is such a huge one in this province and so many thousands of farmers are involved, if we allowed the colouring of margarine, certainly made yellow the same as butter, that it would be the first step inside the door.

The farmer's wife, over a period of many, many years, has used what is known as the cream money to put goods and food on the table. That bit she gets at the present time would be even lessened. For this reason we say that we feel that margarine should not be allowed to be coloured.

On the other hand, we say this much: If this government wishes to colour it some other colour than yellow like butter, then by all means go ahead. It has been said, I am not sure whether the hon. member for Eglinton said it or not, but it has been said by other people that butter has no right to the colour of yellow, because at certain periods of the year that yellow colouring is added to it.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I just point this out most emphatically: Butter has been yellow for hundreds of years and it deserves that colour by right. We do not want any other substitute such as margarine trying to take its place. On the other hand, too, we say that if you wish to do away with all subsidies, if you wish to do away with the high tariffs that protect the automobile industry, do away with the tariffs. Do away with the extra money that the railways get from the federal government; do away with the monies that are paid to the gold mines and the many, many other industries. Why then, by all means stop subsidizing the farmers, too, the little bit that they get at the present time. I assure you that immediately, and for all time to come, the agriculture industry will be the one that gets ahead in the long run.

I had put in my hands not too long ago something in connection with this margarine situation which was of great interest to me, because it showed the data re the operations of the TB sanatoria in Ontario for the year ending December 31, 1961. This paper comes from table 4, page 40, of the statistical report of the sanatoria of Ontario, part I. And these institutions, three of four of which I am going to name, are, of course, privately owned and operated for profit, but are maintained solely from public funds donated or from the public Treasury.

I was amazed, for example, when I saw that in Weston Sanatorium, in the year 1961, there were 11,386 pounds of margarine used and only 237 pounds of butter. This shows how that particular institution is sticking up for the agriculture industry in this province, I can assure you. There are others named; for example in London, 4,640 pounds of margarine and 2,196 pounds of butter only. In Fort William, 5,928 pounds of margarine and 174 pounds of butter.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, who has now left his seat as he quite often does, asked me what we would do if we were faced with the problem of the agricultural people in this province. As far as I can see, the reason that the farmers in this province do not get a decent living is because there is just a small surplus. Too much food is being grown, even though the number of farms is lessening every year; but still too much food is being grown. There is a small surplus in practically every line of goods that they grow. Now then—

Mr. W. B. Lewis (York-Humber): May I ask the hon. member a question before he moves on? Is he stating the policy of the Liberal party in his opposition of colouring margarine? Before he moves on to the next—

Mr. Whicher: No, I am certainly not stating my party's policy. I would say, Mr. Speaker—and I think it is a very fair one—I am speaking my own policy and I am wondering whose the hon. member for York-Humber was stating when he got up and said that it should be coloured.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would answer the question; the hon. member was kind enough to answer mine. It was my candid opinion that margarine should be coloured and it was my own opinion. And it is the hon. member's that it should not be?

Mr. Whicher: Right.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Would you call him the hon. member of Bruce hereafter?

Mr. Lewis: My apologies, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bruce.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, this is what I feel will have to be done in a great food-growing country such as Canada. It is not fair that year after year the agricultural people of Canada, not just of Ontario but the whole of Canada, should, because they happen to be on the farm, be the least economically successful of any segment of our population. And it is because of the fact,

as I stated, that there are certain surpluses, more limited I think than most of us believe, which come on to the market; consequently the price that the farmer gets for his goods deteriorates. I suggest that in a country such as ours, where we have millions and millions of acres of productive farmland, it is up to you and me, who have been blessed with this farmland, to give some of this food away to some of the starving nations of the world.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that this has been advocated by many people for many years. And you may feel it is just an easy way of getting out of certainly a tough situation. But nevertheless I do not think we are just our brother's keeper in the province of Ontario, or our brother's keeper in Canada. I think when we read about people in India, in many of the Asian countries, that we have an obligation to help look after them, to fill their bellies, as the saying goes. I have seen pictures of them and I have seen myself what it is for people to practically starve, when I was overseas, and it is certainly not a pleasant situation.

I feel that hunger will do more to break up this old world, and the democracies of which we are one, than any other particular subject, and when we have so much and are storing so much at such fantastic cost.

For example, I am told that it probably costs about a dollar a pound to produce our butter and to store it. I suggest that it would be much better to give some of this away, to give some of our other foodstuffs away to people who really need it. By doing that, we will be protecting ourselves, not just the agricultural people of the province of Ontario or of Canada, but we will be protecting business in Canada; and also making friends of the same people at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that our friends who sit opposite, who are so friendly with the government in Ottawa in these difficult times, would do their very best to see that the Colombo plan would be enlarged, particularly insofar as food is concerned. People who are hungry, Mr. Speaker, are far more interested in food than they are in machinery or guns or whatever it may be.

Last night I noted that the hon. Prime Minister of the province (Mr. Robarts), who unfortunately is not with us today, in speaking to the Ladies' Conservative association in the Royal York Hotel—that has been mentioned a couple of times in the last week or so—said that these were critical times for the Conservative party in the province of Ontario. With such a statement I think all of us most heartily agree.

But they are critical times not only for the Conservative party; they are critical times for the people I just mentioned, the farmers of this province. Many of them simply cannot carry on much longer. In fact many of them have been driven off the farm, as I have shown you by the number who have left already.

They are critical times in the province of Ontario for our students, for our high school students who have no university to go to after they have passed Grade 13, of which there were 4,000 last year. They are critical times too for the mothers and fathers who have spent thousands of dollars in educating those same students with the fond hope that they would be able to go to university and become a doctor or lawyer, school teacher or nurse, or one of the other dozens of professions, and then, when the time comes, find there is no room for them.

They are mighty critical times for the unemployed of this province too. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), and I have seen quoted in the paper dozens of times, talk about where the economy of this whole Canada of ours has gone up 8 percentage points, or whatever it is. But I say to you it has not gone far enough up, because at the present time there are still half a million people unemployed across Canada. I do not know what percentage that is in the province of Ontario, but, whatever it is, it is far too much when we compare our situation with the other democracies of the western world.

I give you a quotation from the *Financial Times* of London, January 29, in which they state as follows—I would just wish the hon. members would pay attention to this:

"In West Germany today there are nearly five vacancies to every unemployed worker."

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely that is an astounding fact. Here in Canada today, according to the statistics issued by Ottawa, there are a half a million unemployed. In West Germany there are nearly five vacancies to every unemployed worker, despite the fact that German industry employs more than 750,000 foreign workers, 600,000 of these Italians.

In other words, they have to import three-quarters of a million workers and despite that fact, there are still five vacancies for every unemployed worker there.

The labour market is almost as tight in the Netherlands and in large areas of France. Even in Italy, the traditional labour reservoir

of the Continent, there is now a shortage of technicians and highly skilled workers; while in the highly industrialized Milan-Genoa-Turin triangle most types of labour are scarce. Some Italian firms are now advertising among emigrants in Germany, Sweden, Belgium and Switzerland to come back to Italy at the same time, rates and commissions they now are getting. In this way Italian wages and commissions are being pulled up to the European average.

There is another critical time Mr. Speaker, for other people in this province, the province of Ontario. Other than the Progressive-Conservative Party, as the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario said last night, there is a critical time in this province and in Canada for the taxpayers of this province; even though the hon. Provincial Treasurer minimized the fact when he said there was a shortfall of revenue of something over \$100 million. This fact, in my opinion, should not be minimized.

As a matter of fact, it makes it all the worse when I read in the reports from the Canadian tax foundation the other day that it is estimated that the deficit in Ottawa for this year will be between \$600 million and \$800 million.

Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly like to group this government with the one down in Ottawa, but nevertheless you are all Tories who were all eating down in the Royal York Hotel yesterday and today and again tonight and listening to many things you do not believe. The point is that in the last number of years, in the last 15 years as far as this government is concerned sitting opposite to me, there has been a deficit or a shortfall of revenue every single year. Even people in what we call the back concessions of this province know that we cannot continue this thing for ever. Sooner or later these budgets are going to have to be balanced. I am awfully glad to hear that you stand up for it, because you are one of the very few in this country who think that is a good way to do business.

Mr. Speaker, this is emphasized most emphatically when one looks at the estimates of The Treasury Department for this year. I remember just before the war when the budget of the province of Ontario was approximately \$100 million, give or take a few million. This year, when one looks at the estimates of The Treasury Department, you find that over \$90 million is designated as interest on the debt. Now then, I think this is something that should be known by all of the people of this province and not minimized by our jovial friend, the hon.

Provincial Treasurer. Ninety million dollars being put aside, almost as much as the whole Ontario budget pre-war, almost as much as was used to look after all the highways and the education and the health of our people.

I did not say it was all net—there is a lot of it net, a great deal of it net, because you do not have to be too great a mathematician to appreciate the fact that the net debt of the province of Ontario this year will be \$1.3 billion. Multiply that by five per cent, it comes to \$65 million net being paid for the interest of the money that you borrowed from the people of this province and your New York financiers over the past number of years.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. Provincial Treasurer of this province cannot go on for ever hiding behind the fact that he is going to give away an extra \$100 million here this year and \$100 million another year as has been his custom for the last three or four years. Without facing the fact that as the hon. Provincial Treasurer of the province he is supposed to be one of the keen financial brains of this province. All other keen financial brains balance their budgets, he is the sole exception—

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): What about our friend in Quebec?

Mr. Whicher: Never mind our friend in Quebec. This has been going on for years and years. This has been going on for the last 15 years in Ontario. You are a master at red ink.

Mr. Speaker, I would agree with hon. members of the government, and certainly the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, that there is one way that perhaps this situation can be faced.

We have got to get our economy on the road. I give the hon. Minister of Economics and Development full marks for the fact that he has tried during the past year to accomplish that. I think when he started he was sincere, but I think that this thing has not been too successful, these speeches that he makes and these meetings that he has all over Ontario and all over the world that have been going on for a full year are not bringing in the necessary results. We are getting sick and tired of speeches and we want a little bit of action.

We want to be able, for example, to pick up our papers and to read that for every vacant job, as in West Germany, there are nearly five vacancies for every one unemployed worker, and not the—

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): That is the silliest statement you ever made. It is bad for the economy to have any such situation as that. If you would like a better authority, Mr. Walter Gordon said that in his last book.

Mr. Whicher: I would much prefer to take Mr. Gordon's figures on it than I would those of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. On the other hand, I tell you that—

Mr. Sopha: One is an authority, the other is not.

Mr. Whicher: I would like—I do not think the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has made a mistake, I think we are in the amateur league economically compared with West Germany and have been for many years.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That is nonsense.

Mr. Whicher: It is all right to say nonsense, we have half a million unemployed at the present time. Last year we had three-quarters of a million unemployed.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. member might be interested in honestly stating that in Ontario we have an adjusted average at the moment of 3.5 per cent. It is lower than Canada's, lower than anything in the United States.

Mr. Whicher: That is quite all right, and higher than in Germany, in France, in the Netherlands.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That is quite correct.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that when you compare ourselves with the United States, the United States can afford it and we cannot. It is just as plain as that.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: But we did not have our whole economy bombed flat the way Germany did, they started from nothing, they had so much farther to go and they still have.

Mr. Whicher: We should have been that much further ahead, we have had every advantage. We have got a young country—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: We are not going to get it on the kind of budgeting that our hon. friend proposes.

An hon. member: We are not getting it this way either.

Mr. Whicher: In any event, I was trying to be complimentary to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. I said I thought

that he had tried to do a good job. The fact that he tried and has been unsuccessful is not my fault.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: How can the hon. member say an unemployment rate like that is an indication of lack of success? You know that since the Ontario trade crusade began our unemployment has gone down in every single month including in the winter.

Mr. Whicher: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this was the result of the Hon. George Hees or the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, or are they speaking together now? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, and if the hon. Minister is fair, there has been far too much duplication of effort between the federal and provincial governments—the provincial government in Ontario and the federal government in Ottawa. Far too much duplication. And before the estimates of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development are through we want to find out what the results exactly are. We are not prepared to accept just his word for it; we want facts and figures put here right on the table. And furthermore—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: I am not going to throw my books halfway to heaven the way the hon. Minister did when he gave a speech over there one day a few years ago.

We want to know what all of this costs too, Mr. Speaker, and I think this is a fair proposition. For example, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development looks scornfully when I suggest that there has been a duplication of effort between his department and in Ottawa. I may say that many people in this province agree with me.

I could give you as an example the agriculture committee of the economic council that the hon. Minister has set up. To me I do not think that this is necessary at all. If it is necessary I suggest that the committee as set up should report to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), who is a full-time Minister, sir, and not to some other man who does not know which end of the cow the milk comes from. That is the way it should be done.

I suggest furthermore that there is a duplication of effort in our tourist industry. We have a full-time Minister in this province of Ontario who gave his estimates not long ago, a total of \$2.4 million. He is paid equally as much taxpayers' money in doing his job as the hon. Minister of Economics and

Development, and if there is going to be a tourist committee set up in this province then that committee should report to the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cathcart) and not to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. member will be interested in knowing that it does.

Mr. Whicher: Well, why should they have to report to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development at all?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: They do not report to me.

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister is the man who set it up.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That is right, and they report to the hon. gentleman immediately behind me.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister signs letters. They send a letter out and he signs it with them.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: This may be an area where we jointly sponsor something.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from an article—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: On this side we work together.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote from an article of just last month from the Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association of the province, and it is headed, "Too much duplication of effort". Mr. Speaker, may I remind you that the people who are in the fruit and vegetable business of the province of Ontario are not Bay Street lawyers! They are not doctors. They are not dentists. They are farmers, and they know what they are talking about and this is what they say—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: What date, incidentally, is that?

Mr. Whicher: It is just last month's.

One of the obvious weak points in the effort to expand export markets for Canadian agriculture products is the inability of the various government agencies, federal and provincial, to work together. The result is a multiplicity of committees including the latest, the agriculture committee of the Ontario Economic Council set up by the hon. Robert Macaulay, Minister of Economics and Development.

Set up not by the hon. Minister of Agriculture but by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development; the Minister, as he has been described, not by myself, the Minister of everything.

As far as the fruit and vegetable industry is concerned this particular committee will have little to offer, mainly because it enters the field at a late date and is composed in the main of people who have little or no knowledge of the export field. Ontario in the last two years has made progress in developing export markets for fresh and processed fruit and vegetables, largely as the result of the activities of The Ontario Department of Agriculture, the Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, the Ontario Food Processors Association and the Fruit and Vegetable Marketing Boards. These agencies have been guided and aided by trade missions sent abroad by The Ontario Department of Agriculture and the federal Department of Trade and Commerce. To date there is no indication that the agriculture committee of the Ontario Economic Council has attempted to benefit by the activities of the organizations named above.

There is more. The finish is even better.

It can also be said that only two members of the committee have had experience in the export field with the result that they have had to start from scratch, which means the members of the committee have a lot of homework to do before they are in any position to advise or recommend. The result is that the Ontario fruit and vegetable industry must be prepared to write off Mr. Macaulay's committee and place its hopes in the determination of The Department of Agriculture—

Where it should be, incidentally:

—to develop export on the firm base already established.

The need for development is now, it is being developed now, it cannot wait for action by a committee that as yet is completely in the dark as to the availability of markets and what must be done to exploit these markets. The agriculture committee of the Ontario Economic Council has agreed that development of export markets depends upon continuity of supply and maintenance of quality. This sage conclusion offers nothing new for it is the yardstick of successful trade in any man's country and always has been.

Mr. Macaulay's committee will have to come up with more than this, just as it

will have to learn that monthly meetings give no warranty of speed in aiding The Department of Economics and Development in making any positive moves. Perhaps what Mr. Macaulay's committee on agriculture should do is ascertain what has been done, what is doing and what is planned. Having done this the committee may find it is late on the scene and out of touch. It can be said that the committee is not expected to wave the flag but it is expected to realize that its purpose is expansion of Canadian trade.

Finally, one questions the ability of some members of the committee to make much of a contribution. A chain store executive, for instance, doesn't necessarily qualify as an expert in the export field.

Mr. P. Manley (Stormont): What is the membership of that committee?

Mr. Whicher: We have not got it. We will get that from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development at the proper time, no doubt.

An hon. member: The proper time was a long time ago.

Mr. Sopha: Well, he does not say anything about that one. It must be true.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: I have said at the start of my remarks about this particular department that I felt the hon. Minister of Economics and Development had tried hard. One of the things that he tried to do, of course, was in connection with these famous words "trade crusade", which is in every paper, to my knowledge, in the province of Ontario. It faces us on billboards and has had a great building up by the advertising—

Mr. Sopha: Do you notice the MO on the billboards?

Mr. Whicher: I certainly do and it has been pointed out to me not only by hon. Liberal members, but by several hon. Conservatives, what that MO stands for, in their opinion.

Mr. Sopha: Well, tell us, what does it stand for?

Mr. Whicher: Well, it is just a rumour but it is: Macaulay's Ontario. I said it was a rumour.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: What did the hon. member pay for that little advice?

Mr. Whicher: I do not have to pay him anything, but it will certainly cost the hon. Minister plenty.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, there has been much favourable publicity given to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development about his trade crusade. Once more I give him due marks for it. I feel, as he does, that we must export. That this is a huge country is self-evident and we cannot eat up all the food that we supply; we cannot use all the goods that we manufacture. The point is that much of it must be exported and it is his duty as hon. Minister of Economics and Development to export all that he can and also see that the prices it takes to manufacture these goods are comparable with the world markets. But it seems to me that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has not been absolutely 100 per cent successful in his efforts.

For example, in his advertising, and I am sure he will correct me if I am wrong, he has just said: "to buy, if possible in Canada and not buy imports." What he should have said is this: There are some countries in the world who have an unfavourable trade balance with us and there are some who are exactly the reverse. The fact is that countries such as Japan and West Germany and England buy far more from us up to the moment than they sell to us and there are only two main countries in the world, to my knowledge, and I am going to use a quote here to back it up, from whom we buy more in substantial quantities than to whom we sell.

This quotation is from the *Independent Businessman* of January, 1963, and it is a quotation from Mr. H. M. Force, president of the Canadian Small and Independent Business Federation, at a recent meeting of the federation's executive in Toronto. These are some of the remarks of Mr. Force, and with them I most certainly agree:

We cannot boost our exports to some countries on one hand while we cut imports from them on the other, he said, for many of those countries could not then or would not then buy our products. Already the balance of trade is in our favour with many countries as it is with Britain, Germany and Japan.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development was in Japan not long ago, I am not exactly sure who he had along with him, whether it was a large staff, whether it was a businessmen's council, whether he hired one airplane or whether he took over six, but I read in the press he was in Japan attempting to sell Ontario products. At the

same time he is back in Ontario and telling us, in an indirect way: Do not buy goods made in Japan, buy goods made in the province of Ontario—and, Mr. Speaker, you cannot get away with it. It is just as simple as that!

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Whicher: When the Dominion of Canada sells wheat to Japan, as they do in substantial quantities, how does he expect the Japanese people are going to pay for those goods? Would the hon. Minister of Economics and Development suggest that we accept yen or whatever money they have over in Japan? Because our citizens here, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer would not accept that money. What we must accept for that wheat is strictly a trade situation. We must accept goods and if we are going to export wheat or whatever it may be to the great country of Japan, then we must be prepared to accept imported goods in return and nothing that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development says will change that situation.

The same applies in England. We cannot use their British pounds over here—their pounds, shillings and pence. We have to use goods manufactured in the British Isles, and if we wish to trade with them and export goods to them in large quantities then we must be prepared to accept imports back again.

In spite of the fact that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has written letters to British organizations attempting to be fair to them, the fact is that we export far more to England than we import from them. And one could say that the English, quite frankly, are not getting too square a deal.

The hon. Minister of Economics and Development is attempting to make it even less so. To carry on with Mr. Force's remarks, he said:

Canada has grossly unfavourable balances of trade with two countries, Venezuela and the United States. There is only one way in our opinion to alter the balance of trade with the United States and that is through a drastic tightening of belts, for most of our imports are in the luxury class. We should begin discussing our problem with the American government immediately.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a fact and once more I give the hon. Minister of Economics and Development due marks for going to

Chicago and New York and giving speeches to American businessmen down there. I think that this is a commendable effort and I was very pleased—and I am sure most people in the province are pleased—with the favourable press reports that he received in standing up to these American businessmen. But the point is this, you have got to do more than talk to the American businessmen.

If we are going to have a tightening of our belts—which the hon. Minister of Economics and Development will admit to his conscience even if he will not admit it to the public as a whole—then he must discuss this situation with the American government and not just the American business people.

The fact is we cannot grow bananas in the province of Ontario, even if it says so in the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity's latest pamphlet—we cannot grow bananas and if we want to eat bananas we must import them from the United States. We cannot grow lemons, oranges or many things and therefore they must be imported—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, We Have No Bananas!

Hon. J. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Grow them in Essex.

Mr. Whicher: Therefore I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while the hon. Minister of Economics and Development has tried with his trade crusade—and I would not want it to change for one minute, keep right on going I say and do the best you can, because that is all we can do until this country as a whole is prepared to tighten our belts and do without many of the luxuries that we import from the United States. On the other hand, in the Venezuelan situation, we would have to spend millions of dollars on a pipeline from western Canada, and instead of bringing the oil that we now import from Venezuela, use our own oil through western Canada.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): Add them both together and we'll have a banana belt.

Mr. Whicher: I had one more point that I wished to bring out with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. We have a tendency, I think, in Ontario and in Canada, sometimes not to appreciate the industry we already have here, and I am going to give you an example.

Periodically industries run into problems, we run into financial problems where money has to be borrowed, we run into labour problems and many others and I am going to

give you one example now where a certain firm—which I am prepared to name to the hon. Minister privately, Mr. Speaker—where a certain firm ran into some income tax problems. Now remember that nobody had been put in jail; this firm had never been drawn into court but all of a sudden one afternoon last August the Royal Canadian Mounted Police came along and marched into the office of this particular firm—which incidentally, employs over 100 people—and acted exactly the same as a Gestapo and seized all books, safes, pay-book records, unemployment insurance records, and personal effects. They went not only in the office of this firm but in the private houses of the executives concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know perfectly well that when one is dealing with the income tax situation the laws of Canada allow drastic action to be taken but this to my mind is going a little bit too far. This is something like we read happened during the war in Germany, when our police force can march into a place and seize certain matters—and I have the correspondence all here—including the pay records and it ends up with that very loose word "and things".

In other words they could take anything in the whole factory if they wanted to. What worries me, Mr. Speaker, besides the fact that this was done is the fact that none of those goods and personal effects and things have been returned to this day, or at least they were not returned last week. I consider this to be a breach of the legal rights of people living in this province. And the manager of that firm—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Has there been a prosecution?

Mr. Whicher: There have been no prosecutions. And the manager of that firm told me—he has a considerable amount of money, and I know that he said this not in a boastful way at all—he said it just makes one think he should pack up and forget the whole thing. Now, this is not good for industry in the province of Ontario, and I bring this instance to the attention of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. I will certainly give him any private information that he may wish.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: May I ask the hon. member: He draws it to my attention with a view to what?

Mr. Whicher: With a view—I am not criticizing the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: No, but I mean—I will try to do anything I can, but what does the hon. member want me to do?

Mr. Whicher: I would suggest it be drawn to the attention of the public so that it would not happen in the future, because businessmen have got enough to put up with today in making out income-tax forms, plus the dozens of government departments there are to report to, without having people coming in—

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. member doubt that there was not at least some *prima facie* case for investigation—

Mr. Whicher: I say this, that if there were, why should it not have been acted upon long ago? These things were seized last August and they have not been returned to this date, with no explanation whatsoever. And the lawyers have attempted to find out what was wrong and they have been unsuccessful.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, they probably have some of those Bay Street lawyers, they are not much good.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I just want to finish my remarks in connection with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, his particular department, by saying this: I believe that I have been fair, I said, in my opinion, he has attempted to do the best that he can. Through his efforts, or an act of God, the economy of this province is much better than it was a year ago. I suggest that the Ontario product has increased, as has the gross national product across Canada. One of the reasons that it has done so is because wages have increased, the costs of goods and services have increased all the way along the line. This is a great help to inflate the gross national product. Some of this growth that we are talking about is strictly because labour costs have increased and the cost of other goods.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that we, on this side of the House—and I hope you know that we are all united in this particular instance—one of the things that we are worried about is some of the entertainment costs which are being created by this hon. Minister of Economics and Development of ours.

Mr. Speaker, all of us will agree that when a fellow takes an airplane over to Japan you have to be able to have a hotel room when you get there, you need to do a certain amount of entertaining. We know that when you bring businessmen into Lon-

don or Toronto or wherever it may be, from this province of ours, that they deserve some entertainment. There is no question about that and I am one of those who heartily agree with it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the ugly head of politics has reared itself in this entertainment. I know it has reared itself down in the Royal York Hotel just last week when press reports stated that about 2,000 ladies were entertained by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

Mr. MacDonald: With imported Scotch!

Mr. Whicher: Paid for by the taxpayers of the province of Ontario. I say this, Mr. Speaker: Certainly after reading some of the press reports of this women's trade crusade, that it was far too much money. As far as I am concerned, the little people in the township of Elderslie or in the town of Chesley or Port Elgin or Walkerton or Kincardine, think that eight dollars a head is too much money to entertain these people in the province of Ontario.

May I just point this out and this—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Would the hon. member permit me to say this: The eight dollars a head that he is quoting is his own figure. I have already denied that in the House and I ask the hon. member to accept my word for it.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. Minister of Economics and Development to accept my word, because I have inquired into the cost of this party. I want the hon. Minister to table the bill, because I know that the figure quoted as \$17,000 in round figures is substantially correct.

An hon. member: Nonsense!

Mr. Whicher: It is correct. The hon. Minister has admitted that he has not got the bill. We want to have a look at the bill when it comes along and I know that the hon. Minister in his fair way will be most pleased not only to show it to us, the members of this Legislature, but have it publicized all over Ontario to see how he is entertaining.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: May I ask the hon. member a question? Does he object to the fact that I had that dinner for those women for that purpose?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I do.

Mr. Whicher: I object and I am going to go a little bit farther. I would not mind if

it was the women's trade crusade that happened in the Royal York Hotel, but to the large percentage of the ladies present, this was a women's Progressive-Conservative organization meeting that was held at the Royal York Hotel, paid for not by Progressive-Conservatives, but by the taxpayers of this province and we Liberals kick about it.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: As a matter of fact, I might just tell the hon. member that I received a very nice letter from the president of the ladies Liberal association today congratulating us on the dinner and the value and the importance of the women in the trade crusades.

Mr. Whicher: There is no question, if I myself had nice roast duck and many other things that I am not going to mention here, given to me free of charge, it would be only courtesy to thank the hon. Minister. If he had invited me he would have received another letter.

Now, just to get on, Mr. Speaker, I am now going to quote a letter, not from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, but from the Kitchener *Record*. I have not the date here, but it was just a couple of days ago.

Toronto: The first conference of the women of Ontario to launch a consumer trade crusade got off to a confused start here yesterday and managed to step on the toes of the Consumers Association of Canada.

Those are not my words, those are by the society editor of the Kitchener *Record*.

Mr. MacDonald: Who got them on the rails?

Mr. Whicher: On the rails?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, in one of the stories I read it was Christine Thomas who got them back on the rails.

Mr. Whicher: I do not know whether they are on the rails or whether they are not, but in any event I am going to quote another paragraph or two here:

A cross-section of the group interviewed by this writer was highly enthusiastic about the basic idea of the trade crusade. But the top executives of the provincial branch of the Consumers Association of Canada, for whom this dinner was given, made few bones about the plan overlapping a programme it has been carrying on for 15 years. The provincial CAC President, Mrs. A. G. Volpe, of Toronto said her organiza-

tion was anxious to support the trade crusade's overall objectives, but that it would just wait and see what develops out of yesterday's meeting before determining the role it would play. She also raised an objection to the official name "Consumers' Trade Crusade".

The conference came to a halt abruptly when the group had to be hustled from the concert hall of the Royal York Hotel to make way for another meeting. There was no official vote of endorsement taken.

I would just say this, Mr. Speaker, that this meeting was ill-conceived. It was certainly not properly planned as many of the other meetings of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development have been. I think if he does not do it now I think he will in the almost immediate future wish that no such meeting had taken place.

I am told this: that is was the largest dinner ever put on by the largest hotel in the British Empire, with almost 2,000 people sitting there.

Mr. Sopha: In this department we do things big before elections.

Mr. Whicher: I understand it was so large that they had three rooms overflowing with closed circuit television so that everybody could see the hon. Minister as he gave his speech. I wonder how much money that cost the hon. Provincial Treasurer—he is not present. They had a special press room down there with 12 typewriters and telephones for everybody. I wonder how much this cost the taxpayers of the province of Ontario?

In any event, with the liquid refreshments—and I have noticed a couple of rather good cartoons whereby it was pointed out that all the liquid that was consumed was not of Canadian manufacture—we know that it cost approximately eight dollars per head to entertain many fine ladies of this province, but many of whom were invited solely for political purposes. If it were not for the fact of embarrassing a few of them, I would be quite prepared to name a few, and I will do it privately if the hon. Minister would like that, but why should I, he already knows their names.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects that the hon. leader of the Opposition touched on—I thought he made an excellent job in his budget criticism—was the education system in this province.

For the next few minutes I wish to dwell on this subject because for many years now I have been worried about the fact that in my opinion for the amount of money we were spending in this province we were not really getting a good deal. Surely that has been emphasized by what has happened during the past year.

The Liberal Party of the province of Ontario, not just the group of members who sit here, but the Liberal executives and leaders across this province also realize a good job has not been done and they are prepared to do something about it. Consequently, in that famous hotel a month or so ago we also had a conference.

Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that we are worried about the education situation in this province, the Liberal Party has come forth with a new plan to look after the education of our youngsters in this province. I think that you would agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time a new plan was forthcoming.

Last year it was pointed out in this House by hon. members from both sides that the tax on land and real estate in Ontario is fast approaching the point where people who own land and buildings are simply not going to be able to afford the cost. We accepted on a firm basis, I believe, the fact that it cost approximately 29 mills on real estate, on an average, to look after the education tax for our public and secondary schools in this province, and it was pointed out by the hon. Prime Minister, who was then the Minister of Education, that ten years from now that cost would increase from 29 mills to 47 mills, or an increase of 62 per cent, on the real estate owners of this province.

Mr. Speaker, you and I can take this in our stride and say the easy thing is to do nothing about it, but the fact is the owners of real estate, certainly in my area, cannot afford the increase of 62 per cent for education purposes during the next eight or nine or ten years. It is a fact that is indefensible.

I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer of this province, in his budget statement, did not come along with the solution. Because there must be a solution.

At the present time in Bruce county, for example, a farm that might be worth \$20,000 could very well have real estate taxes of about \$500. And half of it goes for education. Do not forget that if, God forbid, we suffered in the agony of having this government carry on, in the next nine years that \$250 would increase by 62 per cent.

Supposing he sold the farm right now and he got all cash for it and put it into province of Ontario bonds; then, Mr. Speaker, he would not pay one single five-cent piece for the education costs of the public and secondary schools in this province. Mr. Speaker, any way you want to look at it that is not a fair deal for the real estate owners of this province.

We on this side have realized the fact that real estate is carrying far too large a burden for the education of our youngsters in this province; and for that reason we decided to do something about it. Our hon. leader has come forth with a plan which was certainly endorsed by the leading Liberals of this province in the last month or so. The name of it does not mean a thing but it is called the Foundation Programme. It means that the real estate taxes, as far as education is concerned, in this province have gone far enough. When we take over, which will not be long, the real estate taxes will be frozen as far as education purposes are concerned.

I am worried that my hon. friends opposite laugh at this situation; but I tell you, whether you believe it or not, they have to be frozen because, the way you are governing, people will not be able to afford real estate in this province in the next five or six or seven years. We will tell you where we are going to find the money and it will not take too long. For this reason, real estate taxes must be frozen as far as education is concerned. They cannot continually keep going higher and higher.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from one of the Yorks back there suggests where are we going to get the money. Perhaps we might get some of the money from the fellow who owns the bonds instead of the real estate.

Mr. Lewis: Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. Whicher: I said perhaps from the man who owns the bonds instead of the real estate. Just because you own real estate is no reason why you should be stuck evermore, every year, for education purposes in this province. That is what you people are doing in this province. Furthermore we agree, on this side of the House, that there has been a great difference between the educational opportunities of those people going to rural and urban schools, for example in my own county and in this great city of Toronto, and those going to separate and public schools. We have agreed it is not right, just

because you go to a rural school or a separate school, that you should be regarded as a second-class citizen. Let me say this: A child in Bruce county, for example, has just as much right to a good education as a child in the city of Toronto. Mr. Speaker, at the present time they are not getting it.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): The results show that?

Mr. Whicher: That is true, and your department will admit it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All our great leaders came from the rural areas.

Mr. Whicher: I could think of one great leader that did not come from Spadina anyway. In any event the point is that, at the present time, the average student in the city of Toronto has a great deal more money spent on him than on the one in Bruce county, or Grey county, or Huron county, or any of our rural areas. This is not right.

A child to us in rural Ontario is just as important as a child in the city of Toronto, and they deserve equal opportunities for education. The only way we are going to get that—

Mr. Lewis: Will you permit a question? You are getting out too far. I would like to know where the money is coming from.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. members will agree, as does the hon. Minister of Education, in nodding his head, that the student in rural Ontario, or the separate schools student, is as important as the other students in Ontario. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that this government has been sitting there for many years, and has done nothing about it. It is true, you will be the first to admit it if you can add two and two, that the students in Toronto, or Hamilton, or Ottawa, have more money spent on them per student than the students in rural Ontario. And it is equally true, if they wish to admit the truth, that the students in public schools in Toronto are getting more spent on them per student than those in separate schools. We say that this is not right and we are prepared to do something about it. You have had every opportunity—

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: You have had every opportunity. In spite of the fact that there has not been freedom of opportunity for the various

students in this province, we have come to the unhappy situation today where, in spite of the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent for education purposes in this province, people have no schools or colleges to go to!

One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker: It is not our fault over here because we have been warning you, certainly for the last eight years since I have been here, and the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) tells me he has been warning you for about 30 years, and you have done nothing about it; it is not our fault that there have not been colleges ready for these students to go into.

I wish to just take a moment and quote from an article in the Toronto *Star Weekly* of September 15 and 21 of last year. It goes as follows:

This is the week that a Canadian teenager we'll call Willard Robinson had planned to begin a six-year grind towards a Ph.D. in mathematics and physics. A high school science major at Hamilton, Ontario, and the son of a Scottish immigrant parent, he got an average of 70 when he wrote Ontario's Grade 13 exams a few months ago. No earth-shaking performance, it would have been good enough only a few short years ago to get Willard Robinson through the doors of any university in Canada for just about any course. This fall, however, 70 per cent was the entrance minimum for the maths and physics course at the University of Toronto to which young Robinson had applied for admission last March. The minimum had risen gradually because the course was swamped with applicants each year and only the best were being allowed in. Some of the Grade 13 70's squeaked in this month.

When they got to Willard Robinson's application there was no more room. It is true that he may have had an outside chance of getting into some other university but he did not try, so today he is a \$61.10 a week shipping clerk in a Hamilton warehouse.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this: Who is to blame for this situation, who is to blame? Is it my hon. friends of the New Democratic Party? Is it the Liberals who are sitting around here?

Several hon. members: No!

Mr. Whicher: There is only one party to blame and that is the party in power, and you have been there long enough so that

you simply cannot give excuses. The funny part about it is this, that the building of colleges, the physical building of colleges, does not cost that much money in the overall picture. The brutal facts of the situation are these: That only six per cent of the total cost of education goes towards capital assets in this province and approximately 70 per cent, as an example to give a comparison, goes into teachers' salaries.

Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, in the overall picture that it would not have cost too much money to give these colleges what they require so that our sons and our daughters may have the opportunity to get an education in this province. So that they do not have to immigrate to the United States or some other country not only for their education but so that they may, after they get that education, be a lawyer, doctor or teacher or whatever it may be in that particular state.

This is a tragedy and this tragedy can be placed at the feet of the Tory government in this province and nobody else. And if you happen to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of this province one more time by not accepting this responsibility, why, then I say that there has been a very thick blanket pulled over their heads indeed. This is a tragedy and it is your fault.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned many other things in his speech besides the things that I have covered. He mentioned the fact that he was disappointed, as I am sure most of the people of this province were disappointed, that there was no sign of a medicare plan in the budget speech as given by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. We are not going to be able to hide behind anybody's apron strings or aprons, Mr. Speaker, the fact is there is going to be medicare in this province in the very near future in spite of the Tory party.

As a matter of fact just the other day we read what they did in Alberta, which has the most farthest to the right party in the whole Dominion of Canada. The Social Credit Party of Alberta, are going to initiate a medicare plan in the very near future in that great province.

What the people of Alberta are going to get and what the people of England and some of the Scandinavian countries now have, the people of Ontario also deserve. There is no use in the government of the day trying to deny this fact and not bringing forth some plan so that those people who are hit by more money than they can afford for medical expenses, will be looked after.

Our plan, Mr. Speaker, I regard as one of

the sanest plans that I have even seen developed by any country—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that this week's plan?

Mr. Whicher: Never mind this week's or last week—our plan.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: And as I said it is one of the sanest plans of which I have ever read in my studies of the many medicare plans in the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, we have been financially realistic, and I say this in a friendly way, we have been financially realistic just as our friends from the New Democratic Party in my opinion have not been. This is going to cost a fantastic sum of money. My hon. friend from York South said approximately \$165 million or \$170 million, I believe.

Mr. MacDonald: Very little more than what we are now spending.

Mr. Whicher: The facts are that I do not believe that any political party in this province can say right out of the blue that we are going to add an extra \$165 million or \$170 million to the already hard-pressed taxpayers of this province.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not in addition, it is—

Mr. Whicher: Our party on the other hand has said that as soon as we get into power we will give medicare free of charge out of the general Treasury—

Mr. MacDonald: Where are you going to get the money for that?

Mr. Whicher: I will tell you where we are going to get the money. If you will sit back and not talk so much once in a while you might learn something!

An hon. member: Sit back. You have to be patient.

Mr. Whicher: We are going to take over the cost of so-called medicare for all those over 65 years including drugs, immediately without a means test.

Mr. MacDonald: Without a means test.

Mr. Whicher: Without a means test and this will cost in the neighbourhood of \$35 million. After that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: We will tell you where we are getting the \$35 million in a minute. We feel that everyone in the province of Ontario—whether they be 65 years old or more—that they deserve the opportunity to be able to buy medicare insurance. At the present time that is not possible in the province of Ontario, and I give you an example. In the county of Bruce, in the rural areas for example, there is nowhere where a person may buy medicare insurance that will look after some of the catastrophic expenses that could happen to someone who gets very sick.

On the other hand, in the city of Toronto, most of you, I believe, have the opportunity of buying a medicare plan, such as PSI. In many parts of rural Ontario this is not possible.

We feel that everyone should have the right to be able to buy such a plan as this, and for that reason it has been laid down by our policy convention that in a limited period of time, perhaps a year or 18 months, we would guarantee that there would be a plan so that everyone would have the opportunity of buying medicare insurance.

At the end of another definite period, perhaps six months or so, we would investigate why certain people have not been able to buy this plan and it might be for those who are making \$40 a week, or \$50 a week, that the reason they have not got it is because they simply cannot afford it. And at that time we would investigate the possibilities of some of the lower income groups of the province being subsidized. But one thing is certain that, over a definite period of time, everyone would have the opportunity of having what is commonly known as medicare in the province of Ontario; certainly within four years.

Mr. MacDonald: Over forty years, you mean.

Mr. Whicher: Not forty years. Many of us were not born then, and you don't act as if you were. Now, Mr. Speaker, quite rightly, many hon. members in the opposite seats, in the New Democratic Party have said, "Where are you going to get the money?"

I think it was spelled out quite adequately, and will be emphasized by myself in just a minute, by the hon. leader of the Opposition where we are going to get the money.

The brutal fact is this, that our tax structure, not only in the province of Ontario but in the whole Dominion of Canada, and in our

municipalities, is sadly outdated. We have been told, not by Liberal spokesmen, but by no less a person than the hon. Prime Minister of the province of Ontario himself, the man who sits in that seat at the moment, and also his predecessor, that our tax laws are completely outdated. For that reason it has been suggested and certainly suggested from this side of the House, that we have a conference of the financial people of the federal government, of the provincial government, and of the municipalities and settle—

Mr. Lewis: Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. Whicher: Just a minute, you keep quiet. You have enough to do running the Ontario hospital scheme, because the way you are making those costs go up is something that worries me too. We must have such a conference. Our municipalities at the present time are being starved, our provinces—the way you are running the show—are being starved, and our federal government, which has suggested a \$600-\$800 million deficit this year, also has not got enough money. Somewhere along the line we are going to have to find out just what branches of revenue go to each particular level of government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this cannot be done in five minutes. You have been sitting over there for 17 years, or 20 years, and you have not done anything about it at all. So now my hon. friend has asked, "Where are you going to get the money?"

The answer is this: we must find where the federal government is going to get X number of dollars, where the provinces are going to get X number of dollars and where the municipalities are going to get X number of dollars. We have no idea what taxes might be increased or what taxes might be reduced.

One thing that we do know, Mr. Speaker: the financing of this whole country at the present time is in a most deplorable state. For this reason, when the hon. leader of the Opposition suggested some of the programme that he has advanced in this Legislature cannot be put off, I am sure that the hon. members opposite agree that we must have more university space immediately, not five years from now, not ten years from now.

We need a crash programme. We must have the money, even if we have to borrow for it, because we are going to make money in the long run, by educating these students so they can be doctors and pay income tax in this province, and not somewhere else.

We must have medicare, we must have some degree of medicare, and over a three- or four-year period a total coverage of medicare, because the citizens of the province of Ontario are just as important as the citizens of England. If they enjoy it, we should have the right to enjoy it too. We are not going to be held up by any Tory government.

However, Mr. Speaker, we recognize the fact that this cannot be done in five minutes or a day or a month—it will take three or four years anyway to settle this jungle, this financial jungle, you have thrown us into.

The hon. leader of the Opposition has suggested this: the only thing we can do is to initiate a crash programme for those things that we consider to be absolutely necessary. The only thing to do is borrow the money. He suggested that it be borrowed in the form of certificates, as many trust companies do at the present time, for a four- or five-year period.

At the end of the five-year period—and we are not going to take 20 years as you have done, just to do nothing about the financial tax structure of this country—we will have the answer.

Mr. Lewis: How are we going to pay it?

Mr. Whicher: How are you going to pay the \$100 million you went in debt?

The point is that we must borrow to look after your children and my children. It has to be done. We must borrow to look after the mistakes that you have made in the last 20 years.

My hon. friend may very well smile, but the fact is that you did get us into this mess—it is your government—this mess whereby a student that I was talking about a moment ago, who got 70 per cent and passed his Grade 13 education, has got nowhere to go in this province. That is a fact.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree, as most people in this province when it is explained to them will agree, that the hon. leader of the Opposition, when he brings forth this plan and says that we must investigate it, the financial jungle in which we are now—we must spend many serious hours and probably months with the other level of government and decide what we are going to do about the financial obligations of the province of Ontario.

In the meantime we cannot stop building hospitals, schools and universities, and we cannot stop the obvious fact that the people of this province of Ontario not only deserve the medicare plan but they need one.

Mr. L. Reilly (Eglinton) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

House in committee of supply; Mr. D. H. Morrow in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 202:

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): On vote 202, Mr. Chairman, the appointment of the chief county court judge was a new measure produced a year ago. It was based substantially on some of the recommendations contained in what is known as the Silk report. I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) could give us a report on the success, or lack of it, that this appointment has had, tell us how this office has functioned, if it has added anything to the administration of justice in the province or not.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to give the hon. member for York Centre, and other hon. members of this House my opinion at least. I think that opinion is substantiated by several discussions with the chief judge and with association members of the county judges' association and officials of my department.

As the hon. member has said, this was a new departure and it did follow the recommendation of the Silk report in part. It arose out of the concern which the government and all the people connected with the administration of justice had over among other things the unequal work load in various parts of the province so far as the county bench was concerned. As the House knows, provision was made not only for a chief judge but for the appointment of certain judges to the county bench of Ontario at large.

As a matter of fact, my former colleague, the former member for Hamilton Centre, is now one of these roving judges, so called.

The chief judge of the county court was an experienced counsel and has become a very experienced judge. He has followed the example, which I think is a sound example, of the chief justice of the high court here in Ontario by spending a considerable amount of his time on the bench performing his judicial duties. Like the chief justice of the high court he has also spent the rest of his time in the administrative and other duties

of his particular office. The combination is working very well on the county bench as it has on the Supreme Court bench, high court division, in our province.

His Honour Judge Wilmott, the chief judge, has visited most of the areas of Ontario. He has had meetings in each of the districts with the county bench and he proposes, so he advises me, Mr. Chairman, next month to have a meeting of all the county bench here in Toronto to discuss matters of mutual interest and better arrangements, if such are necessary and desirable for the administration of justice at the county bench level. In other words, the chief judge over the past year and a half has been making a very thorough study of the problems, of the procedure and of the matters which are brought before him as well as before the Attorney-General by the county judges. I may say that I think the new system of county judge is working very well. I can say and do say that the choice of chief judge which was made was an excellent one, that His Honour is filling his position most capably in both the judicial and the administrative sides.

I have no hesitation in saying that the system is working, that we have been able, with the combination of the roving judge and the chief judge, to place in certain areas of Ontario, where there was a considerable backlog of work in the county court, other judges to assist and catch up on the backlog. In addition to that, as an indication of how the system works, at the beginning of the year the chief judge came to me and said that in Toronto there was quite a backlog of division court cases which, even with the assistance of Judge Ferguson, a division court judge, we were not handling as quickly as we could.

He recommended that His Honour Judge Shea, who was retiring, be retained as a division court judge for three months to help clear up the backlog. This was done and not very long ago the chief judge advised me that the division court backlog was being nicely dealt with and that this particular transfer and reappointment of His Honour Judge Shea was doing what we expected.

Mr. Singer: Is Judge Shea still a division court judge?

Hon. Mr. Cass: No, he is a county court judge sitting only on division court matters.

Mr. Singer: I know he retired but I am wondering if he was being carried on.

Hon. Mr. Cass: No, he was just reappointed as division court judge.

Mr. Singer: For a limited period?

Hon. Mr. Cass: For a period of three months, January, February and March, and my report, Mr. Chairman, is that he has been very successful in helping the normal complement of judges catch up on the backlog. Without the chief judge, Mr. Chairman, that would not have been possible because there would have been no one in a position to arrange matters like that even though the senior judge of York county has been doing an exceedingly good job of arranging his schedules here to keep up with the heavy load of work.

I think I can say, and I do say, Mr. Chairman, without reservation, the choice of chief judge was an excellent one and that he is doing an exceedingly good job and the new system is proving itself; but it will take some time still to make all the necessary arrangements for transferring, from time to time as the occasion arises, judges within their districts and roving judges to meet the pressure of business as it arises in various areas.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 202 agreed to.

On vote 203:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. Attorney-General will have heard the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) this afternoon making reference to, or making his plea—and a very eloquent one it was indeed—for the establishment of a weekly court and chamber sittings in Kingston.

Now, I would like to renew and re-echo that plea and ask that the hon. Attorney-General make some representations for the establishment of weekly court and chamber sitting at Sudbury. As I said yesterday, it was all but promised by the hon. predecessor of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts) at one time to me when I raised the question.

I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General has contemplated the rule; the rule recently that every lawyer in the province must have an agent at Toronto. We are obliged to have an agent at Toronto and I wonder whether the hon. Attorney-General has contemplated the ramifications of that rule. That goes hand-in-glove with the weekly court and chambers sittings because my friends in the House who are not members of the bar will know that if one wants to prosecute a chambers or a weekly court matter, one has to do it at Toronto and one has to hire an agent here and to that extent by doing that the client in Sudbury, Moosonee, Foleyet, Kingston,

Chesterville, Duntroon or anywhere else is required to pay not one lawyer but he is required to pay two. He pays the bill to one and that lawyer pays the agent at Toronto to carry the matter to weekly court and chambers.

Under this vote I wonder whether the hon. Attorney-General has ever approached the learned chief justice of the high court to ask him whether the court might be moved to establish sittings at other places in the province other than London and Ottawa which is the only place in the hinterland, so to speak, that they now hold such sittings.

You know, if you go to a judge of the high court when he comes on assize or he comes to the non-jury sittings—if you go to him in his chambers, and this is no criticism of them at all, and you say I have a motion regarding payment into court on behalf of an infant or a motion in relation to—in relation to an interpleader or some other one of the technical matters of the conduct of actions or proceedings in the high court—if you go to him and say would you hear this while you are holding the assizes or holding the non-jury sittings, he will say: No, I will not. We come here to hear cases and I will not be bothered dealing with details like that. And he is quite justified.

He is absolutely justified in making that reply but if on the other hand, say two, three or four times a year a judge was sent into the hinterland—if we got away from the conception that Toronto is the metropolis and everything has to be done in Toronto, and Toronto is the seat of justice and the fountain of mercy and everything else—if we got away from that conception and sent judges to handle these matters into the vast hinterland that makes up this province—after all, four-fifths of it lies north of the French River, four-fifths of this province in land area.

Well, that is one thing and I hope the hon. Attorney-General will listen to this plea and make some representations to the honourable the chief justice of the high court in order that a little flexibility and in my opinion some improvement is made in the administration of justice in that regard.

Now, another thing. Here we are voting a substantial sum of money—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. member whether we have passed vote 203, which in my book is division court, and are talking about Supreme Court? I would just like to know.

Mr. Sopha: I am sorry. Yes, yes, I am sorry, I am on 204.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 203 agreed to.

On vote 204:

Mr. Sopha: May we take everything I said heretofore as read? Fine.

Now, in this vote we vote \$74,500 for salaries. Now, there is a conception abroad that justice is free. I want to tell the hon. Attorney-General in one little significant detail how justice is not free and falls right foursquare within this vote.

Presumably that \$74,500 includes payment of judges' secretaries. They all have a secretary or they have a stenographic pool and they are paid from the public monies to the extent of \$74,500; they and others. Now, if a judge in his wisdom decides to reserve his decision in a cause for a period of time to allow him to reflect upon the matter, perhaps consult the authorities or contemplate on it for a length of time before handing down his decision—when he does hand down his decision in written form eventually—then you would think after the plaintiff or the party went and looked at the record and saw what the endorsement was on the record, that he might want to see how the judge arrived in his reasoning to the fulmination on the record.

In other words, he might want to look at the written reasons. And if justice was free then that party could go somewhere or go to an appropriate place and he could look at those reasons free. He cannot. He will go and he will pay, depending upon how prolix the judge was, he will pay \$5, \$6, \$7, \$10 or \$12 in order to obtain, from an official, the written reasons—and all this at about 80 cents a page.

Eighty cents a page he has to pay somebody—I do not know who, I do not know who gets the 80 cents for it—but I think it is certainly the creation of an injustice that the judge having delivered the results of his deliberations and inscribed it on paper and it having been typed up that in this country where we think justice is free that the party then has to go and pay a sum of money in order to obtain those reasons.

Now it came to mind where I acted for a widow, and the widow in the final result in the case did very badly. She lost her husband in a motor vehicle accident, I will not go into the details, and she sued the culpable driver. As a result of the trial of the action the judge eventually found that her husband

was at fault to much the highest degree and accordingly the widow was cut down in her recovery.

Now in order to ascertain—and the widow was vitally interested—to determine what the judge had felt about her husband's conduct in the happening of the accident—in order for her to determine it we had to go down to Osgoode Hall and pay something like \$7 or \$8 to someone to get these reasons. Now I presume that when the judge wanted to dictate his reasons for arriving at his conclusion, that he called one of these secretaries in that are provided for in the vote, \$74,500, and he dictated his reasons. It would seem to be a normal, an absolutely normal function, for a secretary paid by the province.

Now what happens after this, after having dictated his reasons, where do these reasons go that somebody latches on to them and appends a sum of money to them? At 60 or 70 or 80 cents a page. And how does it end up?

When the litigant goes or her solicitor goes down to the office where the reasons can be obtained and mark you, the reasons are not put in the record, they are not put in the file. If justice were truly free, you see, then they would take the written reasons and they would put them in the file at Osgoode Hall, and you could go down and ask for the file by the name of a case, get the file out, take the reasons out and read them. But you cannot get them that way. All you will find in the file is a copy of the record and on the record will be inscribed action dismissed with costs or judgment for the plaintiff for \$5,000 with costs, and that is all that is there. You have to make inquiry to get the reasons that led the judge to make his endorsement.

Then somebody down there or somewhere in the organization, somebody gets \$7 or \$8 for those reasons. And I think it does not need a great deal of argument, Mr. Chairman, to have this very minor but, in my opinion, very significant matter rectified. All the hon. Attorney-General has to do is give some instructions somewhere along the line to someone and say hereafter the reasons will be filed with the papers in the action, a copy of the reasons will be filed. That would solve it. Then the plaintiff herself or himself or his solicitor, if he wanted to—he would not be getting anybody else's labour for nothing—all he would have to do is go down and make a copy in longhand of them, if he wanted, or bring a secretary up from his office and make a copy.

I have spoken as to Toronto. I want to go on to say this: If the action was started at

Sudbury, and the judge leaves town and takes the decision in his head with him and subsequently delivers reasons in the decision, then he takes the record along with him, and the record will come back with the endorsement of the judge on it only. Then if you want the reasons you have to employ your agent or you write to Mr. Beddis down at Osgoode Hall—you write to him and ask him to supply you with a copy of the reasons.

You will get them, but you will also get a bill for \$7 or \$8. It is a very simple thing, but I think in the interests of the free administration of justice that the freedom should go as far as the judge's reasons. He took it away in his head, when he delivers the judgment then the results of his cogitations should also be free.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all let me assure the hon. member that those citizens of Chesterville who need weekly court services could get it very adequately at Ottawa. I am well aware, of course, of the matter of a Toronto agent, and that is something I will be glad to look at as the hon. member suggested I might.

I am advised, Mr. Chairman, in answer to this last rather lengthy question from the hon. member for Sudbury, that it is very essential to the profession and thereby to their clients that the reports of cases heard in our courts, particularly our superior courts, be published so that they may be available to all. And under The Law Society of Upper Canada Act, I understand, there is authority; and I am advised that an arrangement was made many long years ago whereby reports of the cases, including judgments and written reasons at length, are published under the authority of the Law Society. There is a fee paid for that, and in return for that and certain other payments of Law Society funds themselves, the whole profession, and thereby all of their people, and anyone else who is interested, can obtain not only the written reasons with respect to any specific case, but written reasons with respect to all cases of interest, or with new law in them, which are heard in our superior courts.

I must say that certain officials in my department perhaps in the past have told me and assure me again that this particular matter, which the hon. member has raised, is one that does bear looking into so far as having a copy of the reasons placed with the record. I will be glad, Mr. Chairman, to have a look at it and see if there is anything, without interfering with the very great service which is being given to bench and bar by

publication of these reports and financing them in this and other ways. I will be very pleased, Mr. Chairman, to take a look at it and see if I can find some way to attain the same end that the hon. member wishes.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, in the United States periodically there are attached to the justices of the supreme court leading law graduates, scholarship men and so on, who serve as secretaries there. These are usually handpicked by the judges and these persons, during the course of such employment as advisors, or law researchers or secretaries, acquire very substantial knowledge and add a great deal to the administration of justice in that jurisdiction. Many of the states of the United States follow this practice; I think New York state does and I am sure several others do.

I understand that in Ontario—I am not certain of this—but I think in Ontario, in fairly recent years, attached either to the chief justice of Ontario or to the chief justice of the high court, to my knowledge there has been at least one such appointment, too. This is a practice that I think, Mr. Chairman, should be encouraged. I think that the province of Ontario could gain a great deal by allowing such facilities to be available to leading graduates from our law schools, and that the administration of justice of the province could gain a great deal if this was encouraged. I would hope that a portion of this figure in the estimates is included specifically for this purpose and that the hon. Attorney-General would, in his conversations with the judges of the Supreme Court, encourage this practice.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 204 agreed to.

Vote 205 agreed to.

Vote 206 agreed to.

On vote 207:

Mr. Sopha: Vote 207 is of course another place that grieves one that justice is not so free in this country. I have called attention in the past to the pernicious system that exists in this province of having to pay very high charges for the transcripts of evidence prepared by these reporters. I think these have gone up to something like 85 cents a page now, or 80 cents a page. And believe me, Mr. Chairman, when a person feels that he has been unjustly dealt with in a court in the first instance one of the inhibiting features which prevents him from going to a tribunal is the high cost of the transcript he will be

forced to pay before he can get through the door of the tribunal. You have to tell that person after he has been convicted in one of the other courts, or after he has been dealt with in the way of civil litigation, he may have lost his case, you may have to tell that person, that depending on the length of the trial he will have to fork out of his pocket \$200, \$300 or \$400 in order to pay for the transcript.

I took occasion to look at the public accounts to see how much these reporters are paid. It is not a grand sum, it is not a great deal of money, something around \$7,000 or \$8,000 depending upon the amount of seniority they have in the profession. But, they have a great supplement to their income, a great supplement in the preparation of these transcripts. Of course, it is interesting to note that the best-heeled clients in the province, the very best-heeled ones, that is the Crown, the Attorney-General or his servants or agents, do not have to pay for the transcript at all. It will go this far that you have the right of election in a great many criminal cases, most of the serious ones, give rise to a right of election and you go before the magistrate and he says how would you like to be tried: by a magistrate, by a judge alone, or by a court composed of a judge and jury. He selects, the accused selects, the latter two, then a preliminary inquiry is held right on the spot right then and there. Counsel for the accused will want the transcript of the preliminary inquiry. He will want it, for a number of reasons I do not have to go into, for use when the matter comes up before the courts of second instance, the higher courts of competent criminal jurisdiction, but do you know that the Crown gets theirs free, and when the reporter has prepared the transcript they will send two copies, they will file a copy with the papers, and send one or two to counsel for the accused, and they will send one to the Crown counsel free, he does not pay anything for it. The accused forks the money out of his pocket, pays the shot to the reporter.

If you appeal from a conviction before a magistrate and have a trial *de novo*, as we say, have another trial before the county or district judge, you want the transcript for use, of course you do, you want it for the comparison of the evidence in the second instance. So once again the accused forks money out of his pocket to pay for it, 60, 70 or 80 cents a page. But the Crown gets theirs free. They get it free. One is delivered. The accused or his counsel is not even asked. They do not even ask him, "Should we give

one to the Crown?" They trot one down to the Crown's office and say, "Here is yours". Out go two or three to the accused and his counsel with the bill—\$70, \$80, \$90, \$100, depending on the length.

A lawyer who is serving his client best in the magistrates courts practises an economy of words. He would never be as prolix as some of the people in this institution, because that transcript is building up, the more obtuse and prolix the counsel is, the transcript is building up at 60 or 70 or 80 cents a page. I do not speak much when I am in the magistrates court because I know the expense to my client.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): He naturally gets weary, does he?

Mr. Sopha: Oh, I suppose he gets weary, but you see he is paid to listen. That is how he differs from you. Once again you see the injustice of it, the injustice of it where these reporters should be paid a fixed and stipulated salary and do all the services for nothing. It is always the accused that gets the short end, that he has to go into his pocket and pay for it. I venture to say a good many appeals, valid appeals, in this province that might have been prosecuted to the highest tribunal are not prosecuted because the accused lacks the money to pay for the transcript.

Let me give you an illustration. Pick up your paper. Pick up the *Toronto Globe and Mail* every morning and look at the Osgoode Hall reports as we call them, and you will see one week a month, one week a month you will see where the courts of criminal appeal, the criminal courts, usually under the chairmanship of the Chief Justice Mr. Justice Porter, and you will see one after another, appeals by the accused in writing, appeals by the accused in writing. What has happened there is the person was tried and convicted, sentenced, now in jail. He feels he is unjustly dealt with. He probably was not represented by counsel at the trial. As he sits in the lonely and solitary cell in confinement his feeling of injustice and his harsh treatment descends upon him and he writes to the Registrar of the Court of Appeal at Toronto and he asks for the court to review his sentence—his conviction and sentence.

Let me tell you that if he has not got the money, and he normally has not if he did not have a lawyer, it follows automatically that he does not have the money to pay for the transcript of the evidence, that his chances of having it reviewed and any injustice rectified are much less. All because of the exist-

ence of this pernicious system of requiring accused persons or litigants to pay for these transcripts, when these reporters are paid from the public purse. They are probably not paid enough. I never hesitate, Mr. Chairman, to make a plea for a higher salary for anybody who works for this government, because as long as they—

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Except the hon. Ministers.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, except the hon. Ministers, my hon. friend from Wentworth. I would not make a plea for a higher salary for them, they are paid enough for the results we get. The same government that gives \$60,000 to the thoroughbred horse society can afford a little raise. Why do we not get away? In our administration of justice we all but wiped out the stipendary system of paying sheriffs and magistrates and Crown attorneys, it is all but gone from the province. Why don't we make one final break and wipe out this principle that in the administration of justice in this province, somebody has to be paid in order to prosecute the cause further and further into the courts. Justice to be truly valid must be free. It must be free. There must be recourse to the courts without any distinction between ability to pay or inability to pay, and until that is done, until the courts are open to everyone regardless of his means, then there are people, a body of opinion, that will feel there is a law for the rich and a law for the poor.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 207 carried?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the House I wonder if I can revert for a very brief point to vote 205. Very quickly, I just want to say this, under the estimates of the Master of the Supreme Court of Ontario, looking at the public account there is the salary of the Senior Master, Mr. Marriot, several gentlemen who are identified as Masters—I suppose there are assistant masters, there is the taxing officer and so on.

I have noticed that in recent weeks or recent months Mr. Kimber, one of the Masters of the Supreme Court has been acting as Securities Commissioner and this matter will of course come up under another vote, but I was wondering how the Master's office is functioning with Mr. Kimber having been removed from that office and being transferred in an acting capacity to another office?

Hon. Mr. Cass: It is my understanding, and it is confirmed, Mr. Chairman, by the deputy and by Mr. Kimber to whom I spoke

before I came in here, that he is performing duties in both places until some change has been made in the Ontario Securities Commission.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, still in regard to the remarks the hon. member for Sudbury had about obtaining evidence. This is becoming a very real problem, the cost of evidence.

There was a case, Mr. Chairman, in our Ontario courts this January where a lawyer, on behalf of a client who did not have the funds to pay for the evidence, attempted to have the court give an order where evidence would be supplied. The accused was found guilty in Supreme Court of procuring an abortion and then an appeal was attempted. The accused who was found guilty in our Supreme Court did not have the funds for the evidence which came to some \$600. The lawyer who was acting without fee for this person first wrote to the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, using an ancient common law application asking for "mercy of the Crown." He sent a registered letter but no reply was received from Ottawa.

He then made a motion in front of the Court of Appeal, here in Ontario, but the Court of Appeal ruled that they had no power to order the evidence be supplied by the Crown. So here was this individual having somehow to raise \$600. Fortunately the reporter who could have charged \$600, saw to it that the evidence was obtained for \$250, and the accused was then able to borrow the money—the \$250 required—and the case was eventually heard in the Court of Appeal. The accused was found not guilty on the original count. There are still two other counts to be heard—but on this account where they were once found guilty they have now been found not guilty.

Here is a case where, if the court reporter had not donated his time, this individual would not have had the case heard. Certainly we have heard from our own Court of Appeal that the government cannot be forced to supply the evidence to an accused. I think it is time that we had legislation passed in this House where, if an accused can show that he does not have the funds, the evidence will be supplied. You can see from the case I have quoted—I have the facts here but I do not wish to use the accused's name—that this becomes extremely expensive, in this case \$600. Certainly we should be grateful for the co-operation of the court reporter. But it is about time that the government took some action to see

to it that the accused people had the right of a proper hearing.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear from the hon. member for Parkdale that in the instance he quotes, of which I have been made aware, that justice was done and that the necessary evidence was provided at a cost which probably was fair to both the accused and to the man who had to do the work to provide it. I am further advised, Mr. Chairman, and I think we should all know, that in many instances the evidence has been provided free of charge by the Crown, and in all capital cases for all hearings up to and including the Supreme Court of Canada, in the case of indigent persons accused of crimes of that kind, the transcript is provided to them by the Crown.

Mr. Trotter: How many cases go unnoticed? There are one or two cases where people are fortunate that some lawyer has found out about their case and taken an interest, but there must be many, many cases where justice is not done and it is essentially the fault of government. They give a few words and sit down, make a few observations which mean nothing and yet they literally do nothing and this injustice goes on and on. I think it is time the government got off its backside and did some work.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to enter into this because I know very little of this field except that I had an experience in the past year which leads me to believe that the plea which has been advanced by two hon. members on the Liberal benches is a sound plea. I would be curious to know how much the cost would be in the overall dispensing of justice in this province if you were to make transcripts free. I would also be curious to know for example what this really means. Is it that the government is paying an inadequate salary to court reporters and that this is in effect a means of subsidizing it? Is this a sort of professional tipping arrangement made necessary because of the inadequacy of salary?

The thing that prompts me to say just a word or so about this is that there happened to be a particular hearing in the past year for which I sought the transcript of the evidence. Upon first request I found that it was going to cost \$300; as far as I was concerned that was the end of it. But I was

interested to discover that in this instance they had made a number of copies of this transcript and presumably there were two or three extra copies left, for a week or so later word was communicated to me indirectly to the effect that it would now be available for \$150.

Presumably they had these two or three extra copies left and they were going to be \$150 in pocket by just getting rid of them.

Well, with my Scottish background, I rebelled even at the \$150 and I did not get it even then. But it struck me as being a very strange procedure in cases such as the hon. members have outlined, that this extra cost should be the barrier to securing justice, when securing a transcript is really a routine item in the whole processing of justice. It seemed to me that the pleas are pretty sound ones in terms of some kind of procedure whereby a few more people might be added to the staff preparing these transcripts so that they become available to everybody who needs them, instead of this little extra on the side in which a few people try to make enough beyond their inadequate salary, or perhaps are supplementing an adequate salary.

Mr. Sopha: It has some interesting ramifications and now that the interest has been activated the whole story should be put before the House and the public might be interested. If there is a big prosecution, under The Combines Act, let us say some company is charged with contravention of The Combines Act; I will just tell you what goes on. Because the client is well-heeled, you see, they will hire, they will get a team of court reporters, there will be three or five of them and they will run what they call in the parlance of the trade "daily copy"—one reporter will go into the court for the first half hour, he will take down the evidence; then he will leave, he will put that on the dictaphone and a typist will begin to type it; then another reporter having gone in, he will stay for an hour, he will come out and he is replaced by another one. The dictaphones are going, the typewriters are going and the solicitors who are acting for that client are handed the day's evidence by about nine or ten o'clock at night.

For this they pay quite a considerable sum of money. I think the amount they pay is 80 cents a page, the normal rate, then they pay an extra \$1 a page so that comes to \$1.80 a page they are paying for this evidence. But you see the great advantage to the well-heeled client, his lawyers—and in a

combines case I use that term advisedly, there is not one lawyer there is a whole battery of lawyers—have the evidence before them to study. They do not have to rely upon their notes, you see; they have an exact certified record of what occurred in the court that day.

The next day as the trial goes on, and these trials sometimes last two or three months, they have a running record of the proceedings. Every day they can refer to the evidence given the day before and presumably, I have never been in such a case, never seen such a case, but presumably the law of previous sworn testimony would apply in all its ramifications, so that if witness "A" testifying today was also in the box yesterday the lawyer has before him a transcript of what "A" said yesterday and he can refer him to it and say, "Did you say this yesterday, last week or some other time?" A great advantage in the conduct of a case.

One would think that a person on trial for murder, where his life was at stake—not that we hang very many in this country nowadays and I am glad to hear that, I endorse that, we do not hang many, but we still hang some of them—one would think a person, where the prospect of the result of his case is the noose, that he would be interested in obtaining daily copy of the evidence. Sometimes a murder case goes a week, ten days, two weeks, three weeks, but normally the people charged with murder are not well enough heeled. They are penurious people; all the people charged with murder that I have defended have been penurious people, let me assure you. They cannot afford this service. So it rather underlines my earlier assertion that there is a law for the rich and a law for the poor.

If you are well equipped, if you are well larded with money, you sort of get a better trial, you get a better trial in this country, and it all boils down to this. In 1954 or 1955 we had an Attorney-General in this province who came in with a crusading zeal, you remember him, reducing deaths on the highways, that was the whole thing, he was going to eliminate the deaths on the highways, that Attorney-General. He is gone now. But every other part of the department where some progress might be made in ironing out the kinks, taking away some of these inequities, all those parts of The Attorney-General's Department were shaded into limbo. Nothing was done about them.

This is not the first time I have made my plea for free transcripts here, but as long as I was here I could make that plea peren-

nially. I could get up and make the plea and nothing would ever be done about it because it falls on fallow ground over there, fallow ground. The hon. Attorney-General will get up and he will say, the new hon. Attorney-General will get up and he will say: "I will look into it. It bears looking into."

But I would bet my bottom dollar that if I come back next year at this time and said, "Have you looked into that?" why, I would be told that he would be, that he was still considering it.

Mr. Trotter: They look, but they do not see.

Mr. Sopha: Yeah. Yeah. Well, next year; forgive me, forgive me, next year—

Mr. MacDonald: We will be over there then.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to the question and remarks of the hon. member for York South with respect to salaries.

The salaries for the Supreme Court reporters are classified salaries of civil servants and they are dealt with by the Civil Service Commission and I believe are reviewed regularly.

Mr. MacDonald: Do they get the extra from the transcripts?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Yes, if you will just let me—they are reviewed regularly and I believe are kept on a fair basis with respect to other civil servants doing a similar type of work, but that salary, I am advised, is probably not of a level equal to the salary they could earn out working for Stonehouse & Company or some other court reporting firm, and it is quite to be expected that they would charge the going rate, which is their own return because it is done on their own time, for these transcripts.

I do not know if that answers the question of the hon. member or not, Mr. Chairman. That is the situation.

Mr. MacDonald: It does not meet the problem.

Hon. Mr. Cass: No, but it sets out what the situation is at the moment.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? In the case of murder cases, do I understand that appeal transcripts are made available in all cases free of charge or only in legal aid cases?

Hon. Mr. Cass: As I said when mentioning it, Mr. Chairman; in indigent cases when the accused is not able to pay.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I think that this is something that might very well be taken into consideration. A case came to my attention a few years ago. It was not an indigent case; I have personal knowledge of a situation where an individual had been tried for murder, had been convicted, and subsequently was hanged, and my information is that at that time the appeal was not proceeded with as quickly as it might have been because the funds were not yet available for the transcript. Surely here is one case where the province might show some compassion.

I would think this is a very serious matter and I would think this is one case where the hon. Attorney-General might take another look at the situation. Surely there must be some places in this situation where money should not enter into it. I think that where a man's life is at stake this possibly could be one of those situations.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to take the situation as put out by the hon. member unless I have the opportunity of looking in the case and finding out the facts; and if he will furnish me with that I will be glad to look into that particular case and if that is the case certainly it would be very unfortunate. At the same time, even though that may not have been the case at that time, I certainly will be glad, as was said by the hon. member for Sudbury, to look into the matter and, further than that, to let the hon. member for Wentworth know what the results of my looking into it have been.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I will make it available to the hon. Attorney-General, but I do not think it answers the problem. As I see it, sir, this is a situation which should not require special attention; it is one which, in my opinion, should be automatic, and I think it is wrong, Mr. Chairman, where there is a life at stake, for the appeal or the appearance of justice to in any way be related to a dollar bill and I go on record as so stating.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 207 agreed to.

Vote 208 agreed to.

On vote 209:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I comfort my hon. friends in the House by saying that when

we reach the estimates of The Departments of Agriculture and Education and a few others, that they will not have to listen to me. But within this department, I apologize, sir, that there are many things of which I have a personal knowledge and I want to draw to the attention of the House.

I ask, what is the justification for the hon. Attorney-General's department within this vote hiring outside law firms to write statutes that are passed by this Legislature? Mr. Chairman, I just consulted with my hon. friend from York Centre—and we are speaking from memory because the information is not too readily available—but when the returns were tabled to our question last year, and it is a joint question with him, we had a part of a day, the last day of the session, to examine them and we saw therein what I believe was The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act. I would not swear my oath on it, but I think it was that statute that was written by a law firm downtown and I think the sum paid, the sum paid for writing that statute was some \$20,000 or more. Some \$20,000 of our hard-earned money was paid to a law firm downtown to write a statute which this Legislature passed.

Now, presumably, if I understand the duties of legislative counsel, after the law firm downtown writes the statute, it still has to be passed on by Legislative counsel. I understand that it is within the ambit of their responsibility for the whole government that every statute that is passed by this House goes to them for approval. If that is so, let us assume that a statute is written in one of the eerie boardrooms of a downtown law office and it comes up to the Legislative counsel. If there is something grossly wrong with it the Legislative counsel will correct it; or put it another way: a person earning the money downtown to write the statute for the provincial government to be passed by this Legislature will know that if he goes very far astray, if he makes any glaring errors, that the Legislative counsel are going to correct it. They are going to make suggestions to him, and I would think that the Legislative counsel's duty would go to the extent of revising the product that is tendered before it is presented to the House. But \$20,000 is not a sum of money that is easy to come by, and I would really like to hear the justification that the Treasury benches have over here. You see the hon. Attorney-General is not directly responsible here. Which department is it that is responsible for the Water Resources Commission? The Department of Municipal Affairs, under the aegis of the predecessor of the present hon. Minister—

Mr. Singer: Which one?

Mr. Sopha: That gives rise to an interesting speculation too. Presumably the predecessor or the man, he has now gone to the bench, he has become an authority on the law now.

Mr. Singer: The predecessor before the predecessor.

Mr. Sopha: Or the predecessor before him. Presumably—and I do not use these terms in any disparaging sense—he took a look at the Legislative counsel. Maybe from where he sat in the House he took a look at them at the end of the row there—I am trying to be facetious—and he said: "Now this Water Resources Act is a very important statute; can I really trust the writing of this statute to the Legislative counsel?"

"I can't, I can't" was his determination. So he decided to send it by brief down to a firm downtown. Now happily I forget the name of the firm that wrote it, but I remember making some mental note about their political complexion at the time, that just flashes across my mind.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): They were Liberal.

Mr. Sopha: No, they were not a Liberal firm, they were either Conservative or New Democratic Party. I forget which.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: There is a noted firm of Bay Street lawyers that are socialists. There are two of them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And the hon. member right next to the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Well, he is on Richmond Street.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Bay and Richmond.

An hon. member: The address is Richmond Street.

Mr. Sopha: But I made that note, and I ask; look here, Mr. Chairman, if I cannot convince anyone else I know from my private conversations with you I can convince you because you are fairly flexible. They will pay something like \$8,000 a year to a graduate lawyer in this department and other departments of the government, and yet, they will pay \$20,000 to write a statute, one statute, that is to be passed by this House.

Now the hon. members—I was not here

when that statute was passed, but my hon. colleagues who were here did not know when they passed that statute that they were handling such a valuable document. And I do not think it is very long—I have not looked at it recently, but I do not think that statute is very long. It might be 40 sections or something like that. If I got the right one. I am fairly certain it is The Ontario Water Resources Act.

And how long did it take the firm downtown to write the statute? That would be an interesting area for inquiry, because if it took them a couple of months or three months then it is economy to, say, hire a solicitor who can write statutes and pay him \$12,000 a year. He spends only two or three months writing The Water Resources Commission Act and you got nine months of his time free, you see. That is sheer economy, and if we practised some economies like that then I say that we would not have to catapult this province into debt to the extent that we do.

My hon. friend from York Centre, Mr. Chairman, just to make the record correct, we want to inform the public accurately here—says that some of the lawyers hired by this government are paid a little over \$6,000, a little over \$6,000. The fees that are paid downtown in Toronto here would go a long way to hiring a few full-time ones with vastly increased and more appropriate salaries than they are now paid.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I am awfully glad that the hon. member decided that he was not sure what Act it was he was referring to. I am advised by Legislative counsel that The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act was prepared by the Legislative counsel and that we are getting, as we always have had, full value and good value from the members of the bar and the other people in this particular branch of my department.

I would also like to say, Mr. Chairman, to keep this record straight, that when there is outside counsel retained for helping to draft bills and regulations, they are paid for out of the estimates of the department which is responsible for that particular Act. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read, for the information of the hon. member and for that of all hon. members of this House, a memorandum which has been given to me by the Legislative counsel which will indicate to the House the practice which is followed in connection with drafting bills which are presented to this House.

Mr. Sopha: Did the hon. Attorney-General say that no statute passed in this Legislature was written by a firm of outside lawyers?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I said nothing of the sort, and if the hon. member will look at *Hansard* tomorrow he will find out. All I suggested is that the hon. members on the other side, when they start talking wildly about charges and things, should be sure of their ground.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Attorney-General is avoiding the point—

Hon. Mr. Cass: May I have order, please, Mr. Chairman? This is a memorandum dated February 19, addressed to me, and it says:

Re: Estimates—Office of the Legislative Counsel and Registrar of Regulations.

And I am now reading the memorandum which is signed by a legislative counsel, Mr. MacTavish:

Down through the years it has been the practice on occasion to obtain outside assistance in the preparation of bills and regulations. This is done because,

1. of the special knowledge of the person retained of the particular subject;
2. the time factor is too tight for normal development of the bill or regulation.

In any event, all these legislative measures are processed through the office of the Legislative counsel and registrar of regulations in the usual way. For example, The Hospital Services Commission Act, 1957 and the Ontario Plan of Hospital Care Insurance provided for in that Act were developed by a committee of which John G. McDonald, Q.C., was counsel. A similar pattern was followed recently in connection with the bill respecting portable pensions.

I understand—

And this is Mr. MacTavish:

I understand that recently Donald Guthrie, Q.C., was retained by The Department of Insurance to prepare a revision of The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

The present Crown Timber Act was revised in 1952 by Donald Guthrie, Q.C., who had been counsel to the Royal commission on that subject, of which General Kennedy was chairman.

W. W. Laird, Q.C., in the middle forties—

That is the time, not his age:

—drafted a great many regulations for The Department of Education. Robert Wherry,

Q.C., was retained to draft regulations for The Department of Public Welfare after he left the public service in 1953.

Norah Legge, formerly a solicitor in The Department of Health, was retained, after leaving the department, to draft certain regulations, and at the present time, I understand that D. M. Treadgold, Q.C., is being retained to draw some safety regulations for The Department of Labour.

It is to be noted—

And this, sir, I draw to the particular attention of the hon. members:

It is to be noted that most professional and university Acts and amendments, e.g., The Medical Act, The Dentistry Act, The Law Society Act, The Veterinarians Act, The University of Toronto Act and the like, and the regulations made thereunder, are prepared by the governing body's own solicitors and processed through the office of the Legislative counsel and registrar of regulations in the usual way.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, this will answer the hon. member and also enlighten the other hon. members of this House.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 209 agreed to.

On vote 210:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on vote 210, with the change in Minister, I wonder if we have any different views on the question of breathalyzer tests than those expressed by the previous Attorney-General?

I would imagine that the views of the staff of the crime laboratory have not changed too materially in this regard, and I was wondering if we could have some views from this hon. Attorney-General as to his opinion about breathalyzer tests, compulsory and otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to make any announcement as to any change or any views that I may have with respect to that matter.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 210 agreed to.

On vote 211:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I will not take the time of the House to spell out all the merits of probation work and the expanding role that it should play in the field, but there were two aspects of the estimates for this year which captured my fancy.

I notice that there is \$3,000 for grants and

university bursaries. I wonder if the hon. Minister could give us more details with regard to exactly what those bursaries are. And if I may just give him completely the line of reasoning or thought that is going through my mind at the moment, perhaps he can deal with the whole thing. An annual question that I have asked in these estimates has been the question of whether or not the expansion of the probation staff has been held at its present pace because of the limited funds or because of the availability of personnel?

I had been assured by his predecessor that it was the availability of personnel that was the main brake, so to speak, on an expansion, because if I may just digress for a moment I think we are penny-wise pound-foolish if we do not expand our probation system to the fullest extent possible. If there is personnel available, I think in the end the public is going to be better off for it. It costs much less to have people on probation than it does to have them in a penal institution, and certainly the number of our people who are being tried and sent to penal institutions rather than being put on probation in my view is still unduly high. So we need more people, and my annual question has been the question of whether or not the expansion of our staff is being held up because of the availability of good people or because of the unwillingness of the Treasury benches to make money available.

If it is the lack of availability of good people, then we come back to this business of university grants and bursaries. Because it may well be, because of the rapid expansion of the staff in the last new year that we are getting near the bottom of the barrel, so to speak, that it is not so easy to get competent people now. In other words we are going to be faced with the necessity of providing university training for people who take that training with the conscious knowledge and intention that they are planning to go into probationary work. If there is a shortage of trained personnel it could easily be that this \$3,000 figure for university bursaries is once again penny-wise pound-foolish. We should be willing to invest more in it, to train the people we require for continued expansion of this staff.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the first question and that is item 5 of vote 211, I would explain that it is a grant of \$1,500 to each of two members presently on the staff who also receive a year's leave of absence so they may go and take advanced work and training. I would draw to the atten-

tion of the hon. member for York South item 6, which says: Training—\$7,000; and that is in-service training and both these matters arise out of a situation which has been so ably described by the hon. member for York South, and that is the availability of personnel for this position of probation officer. This is something that concerns my department and the service very greatly. We sit down a moment and think ten years back and take a look at the staff there was at that time when probation services were just getting under way, and look at the staff we have now of over 200 with a hundred and some probation officers.

I think we must admit there have been very large strides and to ease the mind of the hon. member I may say that this particular matter was one over which this year, as the new Minister, I had no difficulty with the Treasury Board. All the money that was desired was made available for the purposes of new staff. It was impossible, according to the information given to me by my officials, that we could get more than 12 officers this year, and there is money provided for them. We cannot get all 12 at the first of April, but through the year we anticipate getting 12 more officers—we have the funds for them.

I am advised, and I believe correctly, that we will be very lucky to get these 12 additional officers. Knowing that, therefore, we are doing our best to take people with minimum qualifications, and using two things. First of all, in-service training—and I had the pleasure, Mr. Chairman, of listening in on part of a class that is going on now. This in-service training is to try to raise up the qualifications, and then when trainees get to the point where they can stand some advanced university training we send them at the rate of two a year.

The more we send away there, Mr. Chairman, the fewer probation officers we have working, so, two a year is what appeared to be the correct number that we could release under the present time.

Now, I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, of the tremendous good being done by probation work, not only in the financial way as has been mentioned, but in the way of keeping families and homes intact, and of course keeping the jails empty and people off the bread-line and off the payroll of the government.

I assure the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, that the government has given every support possible. The Treasury Board has made all the money that we think we can handle available, and we propose to continue the expan-

sion of the branch this year, as I say, by 12 officers which is the very best that we think we can locate.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, can I make one further comment on this? I would like to make a further plea with the hon. Minister. If he faces difficulty in getting the 12 officers which he needs, let's face it—the \$3,000 is only to provide bursaries for a year for a couple of people who are now on staff, and the \$7,000 is for in-training—beyond that is what I was trying to focus attention on. If you need more than 12, I wonder if the government has given any consideration, or the hon. Attorney-General has made any consideration, to making bursaries or scholarships available to entice people to go to schools of social work, or any other related field, that provides the basic grounding and experience with the intention that having got that training they will then be available for probation work.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I missed that point in the hon. member's remarks. I think his remarks in that respect parallel the thinking of the director of probation services and the senior people in my department. There is nothing in the estimate of this particular kind, but I can assure him that it has been discussed with me, and we will continue to discuss it because there are a great many problems associated with any such programme. Not just the money problem; it is not just a question of what university are you going to allow them to go where there are proper courses. There are a great many other things involved. I can assure the House, and the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that that matter is certainly causing us concern, and is being considered, and I myself have discussed it with the director of probation services.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): There are five or six bills that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) is anxious to get to the health committee, and I just wondered is it possible that we may be able to carry this one vote so that we can get into this?

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): With regard to probation services; on Friday night, when I went over to Union Station to catch the train, I bought a newspaper and went to the waiting room to sit down, and an elderly gentleman was sitting beside me. Pretty soon I noticed he was downcast, and I asked him if he would like to read half my paper. He said no, but that he would like to talk to me.

He said: "I just came out of Burwash this morning. I am on my way home to Welland; I have got \$9 in my pocket, and I have no place to go when I get to Welland."

I asked him why he was put there, and he said that he was drunk in a public place; he had no lawyer to protect him at the court and thought he took an unfair sentence of six months.

However, he is on his way back to Welland, and said he did not know who to contact. So I told him the welfare services would all be closed, and asked him if he knew any officials in Welland. He said he did not, so finally he said to me he was going to the magistrate that gave him the unfair sentence and ask him to take care of him. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if this is possible under the probation services you have in this department, or not.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I presume that the hon. member meant it was the sentence that the man considered was unfair. May I say that I was late, Mr. Chairman, coming to this House today because I was having lunch with the Ontario director of the John Howard Society downtown. We discussed matters such as has been raised by the hon. member now, and not only does the probation service of our government look after many parolees for the federal government, and many from our own institutions, but we also have two societies, the Elizabeth Fry, and John Howard. One of the things which they have been doing—and I suspect the magistrate in question would probably refer this man to a representative of the John Howard Society—one of their specialties is the rehabilitation of these people. They do it not from an institutional or government viewpoint, but through people in ordinary life, people in business, people who can sit down and deal with the problem, perhaps in a different and more effective way than even the probation service.

There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that there are many unfortunates in the same condition as the man to whom the hon. member for—

An hon. member: Kent East.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Kent East, thanks—has referred; he will be well taken care of if he applies to the magistrate or to any official of the court, either through probation services or through the John Howard Society. I do not know whether that is the question he is asking or not.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister why was this man not informed of this when he left Burwash? Why was there not someone there to give to him some information where to go, so as not to leave him with \$9 in his pocket when he got to Toronto? I think they get about \$20 when they come out, but he got here to Toronto with \$9. I felt very sorry for this man. Someone in that institution should have informed him where to go when he got to Welland, if he had no home.

An hon. member: How much did you give him?

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 211 carried?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if this vote is passed yet? Vote 211?

Mr. Chairman: No.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 12th Order, second readings.

THE ALCOHOLISM AND DRUG ADDICTION RESEARCH FOUNDATION ACT, 1949

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation Act, 1949.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the intent of this amendment is very simple, it is to permit of the addition to what is now known as the Medical Advisory Committee those of other disciplines whose skill and training are required in this work.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CHILDREN'S MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Children's Mental Hospitals Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this too is a simple amendment, to remove what is now listed in the bill as the maximum age for children, namely, 16, and to allow the superintendent of the institution freedom to admit those over that age if he deems it wise.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PSYCHOLOGISTS REGISTRATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill No. 52, An Act to amend The Psychologists Registration Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, this also is a simple amendment to permit of the registration of the psychologists trained in other jurisdictions with the educational standards equivalent to those of Canadian graduates.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PESTICIDES ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Pesticides Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendments here are in general to provide greater safeguards for the protection of the public because of the developments in this field of pesticides. This bill will go to the committee on health.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make the directors of the corporations personally liable for the payment of hospitalization insurance premiums that have been deducted from the wages of

the corporations' employees but not remitted to the commission. This bill will not only go to the committee on health but will go to the legal bills committee at the request of some of the lawyers.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PRIVATE HOSPITALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill No. 55, An Act to amend The Private Hospitals Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I discussed the principles of this bill quite fully on first reading, and I want to repeat that this bill will also go to the committee on health.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DENTAL TECHNICIANS ACT

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves second reading of Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Dental Technicians Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, what I said about this when I introduced the bill still holds and it also will go to the committee on health.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay moves that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof it stand adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House it is the intention of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) that the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests would be called tomorrow and any of the items on the government bills and order, unless there is some comment which the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) may have to make. I think it likely that we would be all day on the estimates, but if not, we will be able to go on with any of the other items. There is not a night session tomorrow night, but I understand that there will be Thursday night.

I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): In other words you will not pick up on the estimates of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) where we left off today?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: No, the Attorney-General has to be, as I understand it, in Ottawa or some place tomorrow. We will go on with them just as soon as we can again.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): When will they be resumed again?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, it is hard to say but we will certainly try to avoid going on with a third department until we have

cleared these two out of the way. Whether it would be better to break up—I think actually we will have to break into the Lands and Forests estimates because the hon. Minister will be travelling north Thursday afternoon. So I think if we do not finish Lands and Forests tomorrow we will go on on Thursday with Lands and Forests and on Thursday night with the Attorney-General.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.50 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, February 20, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 20, 1963

First report, standing committee on health and welfare, Mr. Carruthers	865
Second report, standing committee on legal bills, Mr. Lawrence	865
Statement re additions to King's highway system, Mr. MacNaughton	865
Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	865
Representation Act, bill to amend, Mr. Robarts, second reading	866
Conservation Authorities Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading	866
Grand River Conservation Act, 1938, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading	866
Provincial Parks Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading	866
Town of Fort Erie, bill respecting, Mr. Bukator, second reading	866
Sudbury Youth Centre, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	866
Boys Home, bill respecting, Mr. Lawrence, second reading	866
Township of Bruce, bill respecting, Mr. Oliver, second reading	866
City of Waterloo, bill respecting, Mr. Wintermeyer, second reading	866
Beechwood cemetery of the city of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Morrow, second reading	866
Young Men's Christian Association and Young Women's Christian Association of Cobourg, bill respecting, Mr. Carruthers, second reading	866
Township of Scarborough, bill respecting, Mr. Sutton, second reading	866
Trent University, bill to incorporate, Mr. Cowling, second reading	866
City of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. Reaume, second reading	866
Sudbury high school board and the high school board of the town of Coniston, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, second reading	867
County of Dufferin, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	867
High school board of the township of Gloucester and the collegiate institute board of the city of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Morrow, second reading	867
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mr. R. C. Edwards, second reading	867
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, Mr. Bukator, second reading	867
United counties of Northumberland and Durham, bill respecting, Mr. Carruthers, second reading	867
County of Carleton, bill respecting, Mr. W. E. Johnston, second reading	867
Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Roberts	867
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	907

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1963

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the east gallery, St. Mary of the Angels Separate School, Toronto; and in the west gallery, St. Gabriel's Separate School, Willowdale and Stratford Vocational School, Stratford.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. Carruthers, from the standing committee on health and welfare, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Pesticides Act.

Bill No. 54, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Bill No. 56, An Act to amend The Dental Technicians Act.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence, from the standing committee on legal bills, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The General Sessions Act.

Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Public Officers Fees Act.

Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Voters' List Act.

Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Division Courts Act.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. 29, An Act to amend The County Judges Act.

Bill No. 45, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): **Mr. Speaker,** before the orders of the day, I wish to announce a new King's Highway to provide a direct north-south connection between Highway No. 3 at Leamington and Highway 401 near Comber.

The addition to the King's highway system will result from the assumption, effective April 1 by The Department of Highways of some 15 miles of Essex county road No. 12 between the north limits of Leamington and Highway 401. The new highway will be signed No. 77.

One obvious benefit arising from the assumption will, of course, be easier driving but of equal or greater importance will be the advantages accruing to the commercial and industrial economy of this section of southwestern Ontario and Essex county.

The tourist industry, of course, will also benefit materially in the Windsor and Leamington area.

Maintenance of the 15 miles of road assumed for addition to the King's highway system will become a responsibility of The Department of Highways on April 1, the take-over date. Reconstruction, where required, will be added to the department programme or schedule of projects planned for the future.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following:

The annual report of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission for the 12 months ending December 31, 1961.

Mr. Speaker: Orders or the day.

THE REPRESENTATION ACT

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves second reading of Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Representation Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONSERVATION AUTHORITIES ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves second reading of Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Conservation Authorities Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION ACT, 1938

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Grand River Conservation Act, 1938.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 49, An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF FORT ERIE

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr2, An Act respecting the town of Fort Erie.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

SUDBURY YOUTH CENTRE

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) in the absence of Mr. R. Belisle (Nickel Belt) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the Sudbury Youth Centre.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE BOYS HOME

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr12, An Act respecting The Boys Home.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF BRUCE

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South) in the absence of Mr. Whicher (Bruce) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the township of Bruce.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF WATERLOO

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Waterloo.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

BEECHWOOD CEMETERY

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr20, An Act respecting the Beechwood cemetery of the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

YMCA-YWCA OF COBOURG

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr21, An Act respecting the Young Men's Christian Association and Young Women's Christian Association of Cobourg, Ontario.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

Mr. R. E. Sutton (York-Scarborough) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr23, An Act respecting the township of Scarborough.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TRENT UNIVERSITY

Mr. Cowling, in the absence of Mr. K. Brown (Peterborough), moves second reading of Bill No. Pr24, An Act to incorporate Trent University.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr29, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HIGH SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre) in the absence of Mr. Belisle, moves second reading of Bill No. Pr30, An Act respecting the Sudbury High School Board and the High School Board of the town of Coniston.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF DUFFERIN

Mr. Cowling, in the absence of Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin), moves second reading of Bill No. Pr31, An Act respecting the county of Dufferin.

SCHOOL BOARDS OF OTTAWA

Mr. Morrow moves second reading of Bill No. Pr33, An Act respecting the High School Board of the township of Gloucester and the Collegiate Institute Board of the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr41, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. Bukator moves second reading of Bill No. Pr43, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

NORTHUMBERLAND AND DURHAM

Mr. Carruthers moves second reading of Bill No. Pr45, An Act respecting the united counties of Northumberland and Durham.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF CARLETON

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr46, An Act respecting the county of Carleton.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

House in committee of supply; Mr. D. H. Morrow in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1101:

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): In coming before this committee today for consideration of the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests, I am fortunate indeed to be able to say as I ask for authority for expenditures of money under the various votes which you, Mr. Chairman, will be calling today representing in the aggregate the largest budget which the department has ever presented, that the requests stem from very constructive advances and improvements for the future which I hope will receive the wholehearted support of the House and at a time also when the forecast revenues of the department are at an all-time high.

A little less than a year ago, on March 29, 1962 the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Spooner) as the Minister of Lands and Forests—and a very fine Minister he was as he undoubtedly will be in his new portfolio of Municipal Affairs—outlined to hon. members of the Legislature, a good deal about the department and its work, and it is not my intention today to repeat in detail what was so ably stated then by him.

In paying tribute to the former hon. Minister and his more than four years of office, I would say that this particular department can trace its origin back further than, I believe, any of the portfolios held by my hon. colleagues including that of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). We can go back to 1827, a period which even the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie) would have trouble getting back to, although I believe about ten years later his ancestor might have changed the course of history had he not been in Montgomery's tavern tarrying just a little too long.

There is, however, in the Legislature one of the new hon. members, and I here speak in a purely nonpartisan manner, who is one of the bright lights in the new group, in the person of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) whose father was at one time Minister of Game and Fisheries, now part of this department.

Now, perhaps departing from the non-partisan, I might say that after the next general election in Ontario when hon. members opposite are picking themselves up off the ground, they may look at this young man with a very hopeful look.

The Department of Lands and Forests with its duties and responsibilities reaching

out over all parts of the province has a far-flung, efficient and devoted staff of men and women, including a large number of technically trained personnel. At this moment, in the permanent staff complement of 2,661 there are 350 university degree personnel, being in a ratio of approximately 1 to 7 which is a remarkably high percentage in comparison with outside industry. Moreover, under the standards set by the department, a substantial number of the remaining personnel have ranger school training of a year or more, and in due course these people become specialists in their particular work.

I feel very fortunate, in presenting these estimates, to be able to inform the House that I have, in the short period of four weeks before this presentation, visited all the geographical districts, except one in northern Ontario. Moreover, before this week is out, I hope to visit the salt water rim of our province, Moosonee and Moose Factory, and a few points farther north.

Mr. Chairman, let no member of this House or any citizen of the province of Ontario ever have the least bit of doubt in his mind or diffidence in his speech as he talks about this province. It is a land of wonder. To all hardy Canadians I say, if and when you have the chance to do so—make sure you have the chance to do so—and to the young people in the galleries particularly, go north, not merely for summer relaxation, but go north for winter holidays, relaxation, and for witnessing some of the grandest scenery that exists anywhere on the face of the world.

I could give you—and some of you probably have not been 25 miles out of this area or out of your home area across the way, but just follow this—a panoramic view in a matter of minutes which should challenge the imagination and create the desire to see in our own province some of the finest parts of Canada and of the whole world.

Last week I visited North Bay, where the hon. member (Mr. Troy) has a fine constituency and was good enough to introduce me on one occasion there. There were gathered together trappers from all parts of the province and I saw an exhibit of some of the finest fur trapped here in our own province that you can find anywhere. I presented the shield offered by my department for the best prepared lot of furs for sale this year to Gilbert Graubarger, a very fine young man engaged in trapping in the winter and tourist operations and hunting in the other seasons. He lives at Restoule, near our very fine Ontario Provincial Park there in the Parry Sound district.

Incidentally, a year ago Mr. Spooner presented this same plaque, which is for annual competition, on the first occasion, and it went to a woman trapper from Savant Lake in Patricia district, east of Sioux Lookout.

Last Thursday at sundown at our district headquarters at White River, I checked the temperature. I can assure you it was well below zero.

Earlier the same day, I caught a glimpse of the great, new International Bridge at Sault Ste. Marie and of our headquarters at Pancake Lake and Agawa in two of our provincial parks.

Then came in all the grandeur and whiteness of a sunlit winter morning, the north shore of Lake Superior, Terrace Bay, Aquasabon Bay, Nipigon and Red Rock, a great semi-circle of beauty and majesty. In my opinion, this part of northwestern Ontario compares favourably, because of its variety of scenery, with either the Rockies or the Alps.

After witnessing winter sports, including tobogganing, at Kakabeka Falls provincial park, and visualizing what will be taking place at Silver Peak Mountain area in the Killarney Park reservation area, which I am sure this House is going to authorize in the very near future, I would say also that in sports potential, the north compares favourably with any other winter sports centre in the world.

May I say further that when this Silver Peak layout in the Killarney area is completed, I expect there will be a special run for St. Patrick.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens in those parts of our province blessed with these wonderful natural beauties are also entitled to tribute for their natural charm and capacity.

For instance, we stopped at Marathon for an evening meal on St. Valentine's Day and the Women of the Moose organization there was entertaining the elderly citizens of Marathon at a party. At the Lakehead the lumbermen from northwestern Ontario were having a get-together on the golf course to show their versatility. But I must say it was mostly indoors.

The Department of Lands and Forests is divided for administrative purposes into 22 districts, each with a district forester in charge and under him a skilled staff of foresters, conservation officers, rangers, biologists, forest protection specialists and other personnel, covering all aspects of the department's field of responsibility. This decentralization keeps the department close to the people in all 22 districts.

Much has been accomplished during the past year in many fields. A programme of establishing public hunting grounds in southern Ontario was begun.

Pheasants were hunted in Darlington, Sibbald Point and Presqu'île. Waterfowl were hunted at Long Point, Darlington and Presqu'île Parks. The success of the first year's operations indicates that this programme should be extended.

Regulations governing the hunting of big game were set up to be effective until 1964. The regulations have been simplified and are based on better assessment of game populations and the extent to which they can support continued hunting pressure.

Incidentally, last Saturday morning near Quetico Park I saw two big moose beside the highway and I missed a chance for a close-up photograph.

Now I want to say a word about our Indians.

Effective the beginning of the present fiscal year, an agreement between this department and the Indian Affairs Branch of The Department of Citizenship and Immigration and covering a ten-year period, calls for annual contributions of \$100,000 by the federal authority towards aiding the Indian economy in those resources in which the Indian is most adapted. The province, of course, does much more than match this expenditure. Some of the results of this work were evident at the Ontario Trappers Association convention and particularly in our trapline management programme.

For the coming year, as a further move in this field—and I think this will be of particular interest to the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Gibson)—I have requested Mr. A. S. Bray, our regional director for northwestern Ontario, to organize a course for young Indians of one month duration, which will enable two or more courses to be held this summer, at which Indians will be given training which will fit them for future work in Lands and Forests. I hope that these courses will attract a number of bright, young Indians who will be paid while taking it, on the same basis as our Junior Forest Rangers. In saying this I want to point out that our experience has shown that the Indian does not want special treatment on any racial grounds. Incidentally, the hon. members will see in the appropriate vote—1110—a request for double the amount for expansion of the Junior Forest Ranger programme.

I was at the Quetico Training Centre last Saturday when they were preparing to receive a number of guides, chiefly Indians

from northwestern Ontario, and I expect that that course is well on its way at this moment.

We have in the past used Indians for a number of purposes, particularly fire protection in this department and we are orienting more and more of our activities towards utilizing these people. It is my sincere hope that this policy will show good results.

The senior officials of my department are very conscious of the great ability and the woodsmanship of the Indians.

Now I would say a word about timber.

The economic status of Ontario's forest industries is good and this is particularly true of the pulp and paper industry. The lumber industry has improved over the past two or three years, aided by the development of a market for chips. Many sawmills now have chipping equipment, and are shipping these chips to the pulp mills, thus demonstrating a new and effective waste utilization measure.

There were 2.7 million "oven-dried" tons of pulp chips produced from sawmill residue in all of Canada in 1962. The value of this would probably exceed \$50 million. In some pulp mills, this type of product accounts for almost 50 per cent of the mill production. In the lumber industry this is becoming a "blue chip" industry.

Now a word on provincial parks. Possibly nothing we have done in recent years has met with such widespread public approval as our provincial parks programme. We have 81 parks now instead of the half dozen we had only a few years ago; 7,822,000 people used the parks in 1962 and more than a million used these camping facilities for all or part of their vacations.

Last night in a great fighting address the hon. Prime Minister of this province referred to our great—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Who is he fighting? **Mr. Diefenbaker:**

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. member will know when it is all over; he may have to walk a few miles.

He referred to the great shoreline of the Great Lakes system in the boundaries of the province of Ontario.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Those are the ones that are full of algae.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, that is the sort of thing I would expect to hear from the hon. member.

There are approximately 3,300 miles of Great Lakes shoreline in Ontario; half of this shoreline is located in the southern part of Ontario, south of the French River.

A little over one-third of this total frontage is in the ownership of the Crown.

The shoreline from the southeast corner of Georgian Bay—and I ask you to visualize in your mind's eye, the southeast corner of Georgian Bay—to the Quebec border on the St. Lawrence, that portion of the Great Lakes fronting the most densely populated parts of Ontario, is approximately 1,435 miles. Other than in parks, there are no useable public beach lands in this area.

Apart from the Niagara Parks and St. Lawrence Park and the Georgian Bay (National) Park, and small municipal or private parks, public access to Great Lakes waters in Southern Ontario is provided only through the provincial parks of Ontario.

On Lakes Huron, Erie and Ontario, the water frontage in the provincial parks is approximately 25 miles, representing 1.5 per cent of the shoreline in Ontario south of Georgian Bay.

Beaches in provincial parks now used by the public total 30 miles on the entire Great Lakes shoreline, slightly less than 1 per cent.

This I think shows in a very clear manner one of the main reasons for this land acquisition policy.

A word then on forest protection.

Remarkable progress has been made in recent years in fighting forest fires. The detection system has been greatly improved both with tower and aircraft observation and patrols, the expanded radio communication system and by the ever-growing co-operation of our citizens in reporting. In the attack on fire itself, some of the more spectacular methods of progress are: water dropping by aircraft, which is so organized as to bring a considerable concentration of water in a very short period of time over an appreciable area of fire, and the new weather co-operation between various protection services on an international basis which has now entered the earth satellite programme.

Another interesting invention is the Model "S" Bombardier swamp tractor which has attached to it a six-man shock force crew with a tanker which can go through swamps, muskeg, and other types of difficult terrain, drawing water wherever the water may be found.

We were lucky last year. As a result of good fire protection services and satisfactory

elements beyond our control, the smallest acreage in many years was consumed by fire.

Another thing we can be thankful for is that the number of lives lost in forest fires in Ontario has gone down tremendously in recent years. It is to be hoped that this will continue to be the case.

It is also standard practice now to drop by parachute equipment as part of the fire fighting service. A section only of our air service is in use in the winter time and it can sometimes have very emergent use even then. As a matter of fact, in the last few days we have joined the RCAF and their rescue group in the search in the north for Dr. Michaud and his 12-year-old son. I only wish I could report that they have been found. Let us hope that they will be found alive.

On the question of conservation authorities, the Conservation Authorities Branch is now working in conjunction with 31 conservation authorities embracing 461 participating municipalities. The total cost of projects completed, under way, or planned at the present time amounts to about \$136 million. This is an outstanding illustration of all levels of government and the public co-operating in a common project with tangible and visible results.

There is another type of conservation, of course, which appeals to a great many of the people in this province, namely, the preservation of our primitive areas. This is the constant study of our staffs not only at headquarters but at the district level.

At Maple and at our field research stations throughout the province, and we have a number of them, the research branch continues to probe for new knowledge and ideas in resources management.

On the question of future projects, the amazing increase in use of our provincial parks, including the fast-rising popularity of camping facilities, are ample reasons for our plans to expand and improve parklands and park services. We believe that encouraging both summer and winter recreation and vacationing will also stimulate business across the province among all concerned with supplying the needs of tourist travel.

With the five new provincial parks added—last year—we now have more than three and a half million acres of parks.

To encourage winter as well as summer use, winter sports facilities are being provided in some cases. Kakabeka, Darlington, and The Pinery are being kept open for winter use and a new year-round parks and

recreational area, as proposed in the Killarney area, may cover as much as 4,000 square miles eventually.

The beginning of this 20-year shoreline and parks acquisition programme has been announced by the hon. Prime Minister and in the budget address. It was pointed out that increasing population and industrialization make it imperative that this programme be pursued immediately if we are to meet future requirements for parks and recreational facilities.

This year we are undertaking a survey of our marine resources in conjunction with the federal government, including safe harbour, breakwater and dock facilities, channel markings, shore parks, launching ramp facilities, and so forth, which should attract more pleasure craft to Ontario.

We propose to continue and expand many of our activities, among them the management, protection and regeneration of our forest resources which we regard as most important. The reason for this is that most of our early exploration, settlement and development centred around the fur trade and the timber and colonization lands. They are essential to the future prosperity of forest-based industries and to the employment they provide. While approximately 44.2 million seedlings were supplied from our tree nurseries during 1962-63 for Crown land and private planting projects, we have set our near future target at 60 million.

Substantial progress has been made in the protection of our forests from fire, infestation and disease through modern equipment, training and public education.

New research programmes are planned to improve our various services.

There will, of course, be a number of matters which will arise under the various votes on which I may wish to make some detailed explanation or give further information.

With that in mind, I now conclude these preliminary remarks.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would want to commend the hon. Minister for his very enthusiastic explanation of the operation and conduct of his department. I cannot say that I agree with his gratuitous remarks about the conduct of affairs on this side of the House, but I suppose that is part of the game. However, I want to quite frankly say, sir, that I thought the hon. Minister did an exemplary job of explaining the operation of a department which is very

complex and for which he has been responsible for a short period of time.

There are a number of things I would like to touch on before we get into the basic estimates. The first is an observation that we on this side have made persistently, and that is the lack of attention in these estimates to the problem of the newsprint industry. The hon. Minister referred to a meeting, in Port Arthur I think it was. I have a clipping before me of that particular meeting at this particular clubhouse—the Gold Club to which the hon. Minister made reference—wherein the manager of the Northwestern Ontario Timber Operators' Association said that, and I quote, at least he told members attending the annual dinner, that there has been a substantial reduction in the operation of wood cutting, about eight per cent I think, and that it is due to the increase in productive capacity of pulp and paper mills in the United States and keener competition.

Sir, this is the point that we on this side of the House have argued for as long as I have been in the House that we simply have not, here in Ontario, been at all appreciative of the problems of this industry. In fact, we have lost the opportunity to expand this industry in a good part to competitors from the United States. I notice that one prominent man in the industry said in fact he would not construct another pulp mill in Ontario but would find some other province or some other jurisdiction. I think that was the ex-president of Abitibi.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): I would like to see that.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, you, on one other occasion, said you would like to see something and—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I will ask him.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Ask him! I have spoken to him many times and I do not think I do him any injustice when I say he is fed up with the co-operation he has had from this government. He said a man would be a fool to make another mill in—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Wintermeyer: The comment I want to make at this particular time is that in the operation of this department and in the presentation of the estimates, I regret that more time was not spent in explanation of the problems and solutions to this industry. However, sir, the point that I want to make this afternoon, is on an entirely different matter.

What I want to talk about this afternoon is The Crown Timber Act and its relationship to that recent and unfortunate strike at Kapuskasing. We on this side of the House deliberately, and I think very understandably, refrained from any comment about that strike during the actual negotiations that preceded its settlement. But now, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. Prime Minister that we certainly have a responsibility to criticize legitimately, and that we do. Sir, I point out to you that this government must bear a large part of the responsibility for ever permitting the situation at Kapuskasing to come to a head as it did.

In two respects I find this government at fault. First in respect to this particular department, I suggest that a festering sore continued to be permitted to exist for a period of well over two years. Something that was understandably irritable to those people involved in the particular operation in Kapuskasing and which unquestionably contributed to the ill-feeling that eventually caused violence.

Now I do not think this is the time to argue the position of management or labour on this particular matter and I do not propose to do so. The point I want to draw to your attention is a very elementary one and simply this: We have an Act called The Crown Timber Act which provides as follows:

A licence shall not be assigned, pledged or charged without the consent in writing of the Minister, and permission to cut timber on a licensed area shall not be granted by a licensee without the consent, in writing, of the Minister, and he shall not, under any circumstances, be bound to give such consent, and he may impose such terms and conditions as he may deem proper.

My understanding of this particular section is simply this: in the north, settlers—and there is a specific technical definition for the word “settlers” but I think for our purposes here this afternoon we can consider it to be that person who founds his livelihood on farms and who understandably is in need of a little bit of assistance because of the low income from produce in northern areas. This man is given additional assistance by a licence, or he is licensed, to cut on Crown land—not on his own land but on Crown land—up to 100 cords of wood per year; netting him, according to the best estimates I can gather, between \$900 and \$1,000.

It is understandable that these men, these settlers, are not wealthy people. This addi-

tional income is of great value to them. Nobody is complaining. This is good policy. I think it should be encouraged and it may well be that the technical definition of the word “settler” should be changed to extend to people other than those who physically live on a farm, own a farm and get the basic major portion of their livelihood from farming operations.

From a strictly technical point of view we have an Act in Ontario which says: “a licensee, such person who is granted a license, shall not sub-let it, or sign it or transfer it in any way to another person, without the permission of the Minister.” This, sir, is understandable, it is common sense. In effect what it means is that the benefit to be bestowed by the licence is intended to be a benefit to the settler himself and not to anyone else. It is recognized that his opportunities for the development of income from the farm itself are limited and to supplement them he is given a licence to cut on Crown land, away from and different from his home territory, to supplement his income to the extent of the sale of 100 cords of wood.

Now, sir, what has happened over the years is simply this: licences have been issued very freely—in fact, I think over 900 licences were issued in the Kapuskasing area, in the Kenora area 335 were issued, in North Bay 486, Port Arthur 367, Sault Ste. Marie, 124, Sioux Lookout 192, Cochrane, that very area, 517, and Fort Francis 423. I do not expect you, Mr. Chairman, to remember all these figures, but note that in Kapuskasing 930 were issued and in Cochrane 517. By far the greater number of licences were issued in this area.

The complaint has been made that these licences had in fact been transferred to others and that the Act has been violated. In the violation of the Act what has happened is persons had made it a specialty to accumulate not one licence but several licences and to make their actual occupation to employ people to cut lumber on licensed holdings, which were designed and intended to be a supplement to the individual settler.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we will have the opportunity later on, I presume, to argue the other aspects of this strike? Nothing causes more bitterness or ill-feeling than the supposed and ostensible connivance or violation of an existing law. I think this is the basic complaint that founded much of the bitterness in that Kapuskasing area: the contention that a group of workmen, a group of lumbermen, the union, in fact, felt that in conscience, for the public good, it is required and it is necessary to help out the settlers. These men

are agriculturalists, founding themselves, as I said, on a limited income, and benefiting, understandably, by public policy which grants them permission to cut, by themselves—not with one another but themselves—cut up to 100 cords of wood, of Crown timber, and supplement their income to that extent.

The union, the workmen in the bush, agreed that they would have to make some concession to the settler. It was understandable that his income should be supplemented in this fashion and nobody complains about that. In fact, we want to encourage that public policy. But when these licences became the subject of sale, or transfer, without official permission and without compliance with our statutory provision, then, sir, I say we had a cancerous condition that was bound to erupt in a serious dispute such as we experienced a short while ago.

Now that this matter has suddenly come to the fore I would say that it is like many other human problems, it must be dealt with, it cannot be solved overnight. But that was not the case in this instance. Two years ago representations were made to the then hon. Minister in the form of a brief or a submission to the hon. Minister and his advisory committee, outlining this very difficult problem, pointing out this difficulty, asking for relief, asking that something be done. And, sir, I understand that at least five requests have been filed with this department in the interval. If the government will open its books and files and produce those letters, I am sure my case will be founded, that in the intervening two years complaints have been made, requests have been made, petitions have been made, to overcome this problem, but all to no avail.

Mr. Chairman, I say to that this afternoon that what is required is a public inquiry into this matter at this time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: This is the unfortunate supercilious way in which—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: When the hon. leader of the Opposition says five applications—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask all the members, if they have a question they would like to ask the member speaking, that they address it to the chair.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, of course I did not say five applications, I said that on five distinct occasions and maybe more, specific requests were made to this government.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I understand that

the Minister who has just spoken, the hon. Minister of Mines is quite cognizant of the fact, that he received copies of the letters or at least was consort with the negotiations that were made or the requests that were made to the department. It hardly benefits him to act as though he does not know what I am talking about.

The point that I make is simply this: That this government had, or should have, knowledge of the condition and certainly they did, in fact, have knowledge. I will not grant them the benefit of ignorance in failing to know or in being ignorant of the situation. I am confident they were knowledgeable about this. And they did nothing.

Justice and law has its greatest support when it is administered impartially and fairly. That is the essential complaint here; that a law—clear, precise, understandable, purposeful and founded in good public policy—was not administered fairly and equitably and without discrimination. That is, I say, one of the fundamental irritants that founded the eruption and violence in Kapuskasing last week.

It was the fact, sir, that requests were made for conciliation, and where conciliation services were not given speedily and effectively, the animosity and the difficulties that existed here were aroused. We will have an opportunity to talk conciliation later.

This afternoon I am confining my remarks to the specific allegation that in the Kapuskasing area, innumerable licences were issued and innumerable licenses were trafficked and transferred without compliance with the Act, aggravating the situation and causing a good deal of ill-feeling in the area.

Sir, I have been told that a public inquiry was requested two years ago and I suggest that at this juncture—the strike having been settled—I do nobody a disservice. I refrained from making any comments until the strike was settled, but now, sir, I would violate, in my opinion, my responsibility if I did not formally demand a public inquiry into this matter so that the whole matter may come to the fore and that the feeling which exists at the present time may be tempered. That is the least that can be expected. It is not only that that we have a law, but that law must be administered fairly and impartially and that all appearances be given of impartiality. That is not the case here.

I have been told that in an investigation there are those who will come forward to demonstrate, unequivocally, that there has been trafficking, that there have been persons who have accumulated more than one

licence, and that they, in turn, have hired others than themselves to go out to cut wood, all in violation of the spirit and the purpose of this Act. And, sir, that has not been over a matter of a few months' or a few weeks' duration or complaint. That has been a complaint, a formal complaint, over a period of two years and more. And that is something that I think, at this juncture, at this time, and in this House, we must seriously consider, debate and solve.

For myself and my party, we ask formally this afternoon what was asked two years ago: A public inquiry into this matter so that what has gone on before will become public information and an intelligible common consensus can be formed so that a public policy can be formulated for the future that will at once respect the philosophy of the purpose of the settler and will at once assure that the law is complied with as it is intended to be complied with. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I anticipated this question would arise, but before I deal with that I would like to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that according to the figures which have been supplied to me on production in relation to the year 1961-1962, the 1962-1963 timber cut from Crown lands increased by four per cent.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Is that the overall?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is the overall cutting from Crown lands.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Excuse me. Am I right? Can the hon. Minister tell me what portion of the total cut in the Kapuskasing area is represented by settlers' cutting?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think in the statement I am now going to give to the House, I will answer that. If I do not, if the hon. leader of the Opposition will give me exactly what he wants and draws my attention to it at the end I will be glad to further amplify it.

In a limited number of sections of northern Ontario, where the land has been settled relatively recently, as an aid to the annual income to be gained by a settler, The Department of Lands and Forests instituted into government policy a system for the cutting of wood on Crown lands by settlers. I wish to say today and refer in particular to one of these areas which is known as the Kapuskasing management unit, comprising a number of townships vested in the Crown the cutting rights over which are subject directly to the authority and granting out by the Crown. I might say for the information of the House

that practically all northern Ontario where cutting operations are in progress is under timber management, either by company timber management unit or Crown management unit. The plans under which the company operates must be approved by the department. There are some 77 company management units and 79 Crown management units for a total of 156 management units.

For many years, going back to the early part of the century, cutting permits have been issued for small quantities of timber to pioneering settlers. Back about 1940 the present system was introduced, and I think that was during the period when Mr. Hepburn was Premier of this province. At that time there were some 11 small pulpwood operators holding licensed areas for varying periods of time, and their total cut was about 20,000 cords per year. These licences were gradually eliminated, with the exception of one small one which does not expire until 1966, as part of the policy of preserving the wood for settler cutting in the Kapuskasing management unit.

We are dealing for the most part in my remarks with the Kapuskasing management unit. In the year 1954 the department set up the present group cutting system by settlers and it has expanded each year. This group system came about through requests from the local inhabitants and the local clergy. I might say that in 1947 careful photographic analysis was made of the quantity of pulpwood available on an allowable cutting basis and it was estimated to be 65,251 cords of conifer per year. For a number of years the cut was less than that amount and it was stepped up a bit in order to get the best results in the management unit.

During the year 1961-1962 the total cut by commercial licences on the unit was 75,779 cords, and as of March 31, 1962, there was an undercut of some 55,927 cords, so that under the present policy for a further five years or so it would be feasible to cut at the 1961-62 rate without depleting the allowable cut over the long-term period. A wise policy would be gradually to bring it down to the 65,000 cords by the end of the next five-year period and maintain it at that on an annual basis.

To further the settler annual cash income supplement policy over these years, the policy of the government as implemented by The Department of Lands and Forests is to do all possible to assist the bona-fide settler to carry out good forest management and to be assured that the settler would get a market for the wood cut. To this end the group plan

to some extent on a township basis was inaugurated.

Now, let me illustrate, because I think that there is a lot of misunderstanding and a lot of ignorance in some of the statements that have been made. I might say that I had to do a fair amount of digging myself before I got right down to the rock bottom of the actual practice. Let me illustrate.

The department in its cutting licence rights to the pulp company would require that the latter buy from the settler certain quantities of the timber. It was not intended to make this an ironclad agreement but it was definitely intended that it would reflect the desire of the government and the intentions as indicated in the document. For example, I could refer first to The Settlers Pulpwood Protection Act on the statute indicating this policy and then for a further example I give you now the wording in the existing licence with the Spruce Falls Company under which it operates, the licence from the department—from the Crown, and I quote:

The licensees [that is the Spruce Falls Company] agree to co-operate with the Minister in the purchase of bona-fide settlers' pulpwood.

So you see that is set out right in the agreement between the company and the Crown.

In the existing agreement with the Abitibi Company the following wording appears—it is slightly different but pretty much to the same intent—and I quote:

The company will co-operate in the purchase of pulpwood purchased by bona-fide settlers and produced by and available from adjacent licensees.

It will be seen, therefore, at once, that the operation I have outlined is to see that these settlers have an opportunity of disposing of some pulpwood to the mills. Then someone familiar with the logging business—the hon. leader referred to this but I think he had a wrong slant on it and I would ask him to please pay attention to this because I believe this is the actual situation—someone familiar with the logging business, such as, for example, some small licensee operating in a township himself, or some settler or contractor knowing the capacity of other settlers in the township area concerned, would ascertain in any given year the number of settlers in his area who would qualify for cutting 100 cords of wood from the Crown lands in the Kapuskasing management unit. He would then discuss the matter with the pulp company concerned, in this particular case the Spruce Falls Pulp and Paper Com-

pany, and obtain from that company the required number of cards—they use the card system—which would represent the willingness of the company to buy 100 cords as per each card from one of the settlers through the head of the group on the understanding that The Department of Lands and Forests would indicate its approval on the cards.

This card would be presented to the department along with the attendance by the bona-fide licensees in person, the ones to be covered by the group of cards, and these licenses would then be made out to the individual bona-fide licensee. Cards would be stamped with the approval of the government and the cards would be handed to the company. The licenses would go to the bona-fide settlers. The group leader for his work and services would make an arrangement with the licensees for some charge.

The licensees, of course, would pay the \$5 deposit charge made by the department, and the ground rent and fire protection charges totalling \$13.80. The licensee would get his receipt, the government would have its guarantee of Crown charges which would be paid by the company and deducted by it in its settlement with the settler, and the government, though the department, through its inspectors, would keep tab on the cutting operations.

In normal cases it would be expected that the settler-licensee would do his own cutting and he might even do his own skidding. He might also do his own hauling, although it would not follow necessarily. In some cases he would not even do his skidding, and in some few cases for reasons that would have to be satisfactory in the long run to the government he might not cut all the allowable cut himself, or he might arrange, under exceptional circumstances, for someone else to do the cutting. In the latter case he would probably make the type of deal that would enable him to make a small profit in the transaction. This, of course, would be the exception to the practice.

The licence issued by the department would not be assignable. If a settler for some good reason could not complete his cut, for example if he had an accident, he could possibly get the department at the local level to issue a new licence to some bona-fide settler.

In the season 1962-63, that is from April 1, 1962, to date, licences—now, I have got three different types of licences so I am giving these figures in groups—licences under the group system I have just mentioned were issued for a total of 27 groups, 440 licences.

In addition to that, certain store co-operative groups received a total, in six groups, of 101 licences. I might say that these general store co-operative groups are made up of general stores along Highway 11 which help to finance the settlers concerned and they themselves sometimes do some of the work such as hauling. It is a co-operative effort.

Also, in addition to that type of co-operative, there are some six co-operatives that are affiliated with the Federation Deschambier co-operative, and they are divided into three cutting groups of which Valrica is in one, the total being for 121 licences.

Of all these 706 licences for pulp wood and saw logs which have been issued in the period, of a total of some 36 groups: 652 of the licences were pulp wood licences, 40 were saw log licences and 14 were poplar veneer. I might point out that where the store co-operative groups were concerned they would be the holders of the card and they would apply for the licences to be issued to the bona-fide licensees and this would be done when the department was satisfied as to the bona fides.

I am informed that no licences to cut pulp have been issued by The Department of Lands and Forests in the period of January 14 to February 13 of this year. During that period five saw log 100 cord permits were granted, one poplar veneer and eight were converted from pulp wood to saw logs. I should point out that the cutting licences are regulated by regulations issued by the department in both French and English. I would point out that an applicant for a licence must present to The Department of Lands and Forests, where applicable, proof of payment of school tax, statute labour tax, municipal tax, land tax, or land tax exemption, before a licence may be issued.

In the regulation relating to eligibility, it is pointed out that the widows are considered as a permanently incapable settler class and that particular class is entitled to come under this scheme to a certain extent. Actually, in practice sometimes a bona-fide settler who holds a licence himself arranges to handle the widow's permit as well. I think that the practice of issuing a licence to a widow is sound in that it enables her, though she will not herself be able to cut, to get some reasonable allowance to assist her in her position, though it will not be as much as would have been the case had her husband been alive and done the cutting himself.

I would stress also, in explaining this system, the fact that the department, through its inspectors, knows pretty well, from time

to time, who is doing the cutting. If they have reason to believe that there is in any particular case a series of transactions not in keeping with the regulations and the purpose of these cutting permits, to restrict, or cancel, or refuse to renew the permit.

The settlers generally know this and it is only occasionally that the department is faced with evidence of possible irregularity. By and large, it is the view of the department officials that the system works well. I have made a careful review of it and from what I can learn I believe that this is the case. I emphasize that the policy is to assist settlers in the area, that I have mentioned. Some several hundred bona-fide settlers, or people qualifying under the regulations as such, are currently being dealt with in this particular management unit operation.

This type of cutting, and I think this is what my hon. friend was looking for, this type of cutting in this particular area accounts for approximately 15 per cent of the total cutting going to the pulp wood company. In making this statement, I have confined myself to one mill. The same practice applies at the Smooth Rock mill, and the Iroquois Falls mill, both company operations. Then there are widely varying conditions from district to district resulting from differences that are found in forest types and in the treatment they have received.

For example, those located in northwestern Ontario differ from those in the clay belt, Cochrane and Kapuskasing area. In the Port Arthur district, where the Fort William unit is located—that is a government unit—the allowable annual cut is some 93,000 cords, of which 59,389 cords are poplar and white birch, which is not at all preferable for pulp and paper consumption.

I believe I am right in saying that, am I not, Mr. Chairman?

But also, 21,281 cords are spruce and balsam—that is the most preferable types—59,389 poplar and white birch, 21,281 cords spruce and balsam. The market demand for the poplar and white birch is low resulting in a cut of only 5,000 cords in the last year, whereas the entire allowable cut of spruce and balsam are used up.

As the province's objective is to cut as high a proportion of the allowable cut as possible, a liberal policy of granting cutting permits for poplar and white birch has been adopted in the Fort William management unit in order to use as much of the allowable cut as possible.

In the entire Port Arthur district, 356

cutting permits have been issued to date—I think you had a figure very similar to that for this fiscal year—on which Crown charges amounting to \$1,000 or less, in these cases, are levied. The basic differences between the situation in Kapuskasing and that in the Fort William management unit is the greater surplus of poplar and birch existing in the latter.

Let me just illustrate that. Allowable cuts net merchantable cords: white pine, 2,224 cords; red pine, 612 cords; spruce, 13,776 cords; balsam, 7,505 cords; jack pine, 9,341 cords: for a total accounted for of 33,458 cords. White birch, 22,118 cords; poplar, 37,271 cords; dover hardwood, 59,389: total all species 92,847.

This, Mr. Chairman—the figure for which the hon. leader of the Opposition is looking—is approximately two per cent of the total pulp and paper mill consumption in the area.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the issue that has been on the floor for the last half hour or better, but if you will permit me I will deal with it within the context of introductory remarks as I have planned them.

May I say at the outset that it is good to see the hon. Minister back in form. He has been very quiet for the past few months. The place was much duller for it, but he really came out of his corner fighting this afternoon and it is obvious we have another major target to hit at from this point forward.

What the hon. Minister said was interesting. The first point I want to discuss is what he left unsaid. A major aspect of the policy of this government, one of the deepest concern to the members of the Legislature who have to safeguard the public welfare and the future of the province, is to give every consideration possible to the perpetuation of our forest resources. This is something I have pounded away on, year in and year out, ever since I came into this Legislature—the necessity of having a policy that will ensure that we are going to have adequate forest regeneration.

Now, last year the government through the hon. Minister's predecessor announced a new policy which presumably was going to come to grips with this problem. It is something, I repeat, that we have been insisting on, have been pleading for, and finally it came. I accepted it with a degree of reservation. Instead of an overall blanket formula with regard to regeneration, the government decided that negotiations would be entered into with each company. Because

of the different local conditions, ranging from weather to topographical conditions, the agreements would be entered into by the government with each company rather than impose an overall one.

Now there was obvious logic in that. The thing that disturbed me at the time, Mr. Chairman was this: that for 40 years or more, since way back at the time of the farmer-labour government in the province, there had been efforts to bring in a good forest management programme. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, without any fear of contradiction, that most of these have foundered on the influence of powerful interests in the lumber industry, behind the scenes, who frustrated the implementation of these policies. My great fear is that when it is left to a negotiation as to what is going to be done in regeneration in each area with that particular company in that area, that it is quite possible that instead of a firm policy being implemented bringing the kind of regeneration programme we want, we are going to end up in political deals behind the scenes that will result in inadequate regeneration programmes.

Now I raise all this partly because it was interesting to have the hon. Minister rise a year after this rather historic pronouncement of how the government was going to come to grips with this very basic issue and find that the hon. Minister had absolutely nothing to say.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, this underlines that what the government said a year ago really means very little. We are still going to continue to drift.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind you of the kind of situation that we are facing. I do not want to go back as far as the Ministry under Finlayson, back in the mid-twenties and the efforts to establish a policy of that kind, let me go back no further than the conditions that were revealed in the Kennedy report in the late 40's, where Major-General Kennedy pointed out that there were some two and a half million acres, at least two and a half million acres, that had been cut over in this province of Ontario, down through the last century and the earlier part of this century which were not going to regenerate any marketable product. In other words, they had been cut over: there had been no natural regeneration. If it is to become an economic productive area again it can only be through an artificial regeneration programme undoubtedly involving a very healthy amount of actual reforestation. This was the warning of Major-General Kennedy.

Two and a half million acres became the responsibility of the Crown. Calculated at roughly 1,000 trees to an acre, an astronomical number of trees will be required to do the job.

Now we have been told down through the years that the government is coming to grips with this. I was very interested in this little booklet we were given this year on the eve of the estimates, as usual, and to discover that last year, for example, the total number of trees produced by the department's nurseries was 43,194,000.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman, this is approximately 6 million fewer than the year before, because in the year 1960-61, the total number of trees was 49,833,000. In other words, instead of moving forward to a figure of at least 100 million trees, which the hon. Minister's predecessor conceded was an absolute minimum to meaningfully come to grips with this problem, we have in the past year slipped back.

Now it may be the explanation is that we had weather conditions in some past year that did not make it possible to harvest the necessary amount of cones and therefore we did not have the little treelets in 1962. But the fact of the matter is that we slipped back some six million trees.

It is also interesting to note that on the Crown lands—the responsibility of this government, Mr. Chairman—that the total number of trees planted last year was 26,602,000. In other words, here we have, 15 years after the Kennedy report, 15 years after he had warned that you had this monumental task of reforestation, a revelation once again that the total number of trees planted on Crown land is approximately 26 million. Now I have done calculations before that are in *Hansard*, but if you were to take the figure of the requirement to meet the situation as Kennedy pointed out, at 25 million trees a year you will find it will be about two or three hundred years before we have caught up on this backlog.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, another thing I want to draw to the attention of the House, is that the government has consciously accepted this as their responsibility. In 1953, we passed new legislation. This new legislation, in effect, obligated a company which was engaged in cutting from that point forward, to produce each year to The Department of Lands and Forests its cutting and management programme for the year.

This programme presumably is going to make certain that there is adequate regeneration on cutting from that point forward. But

in doing so the government accepted responsibility, the whole responsibility, for all the cutting that has gone on in the years prior to that. Now we see how little they are really doing to come to grips with it.

This brings me back to the basic point with which I started: not only is the government not really coming to grips with the problem of reforesting areas that have been cut over in the past but we have as yet had no really conclusive evidence that the government is enforcing forest management programmes which assure reforestation and regeneration for the present cut-over.

I know as a layman this becomes very perplexing because you can take a big company like Abitibi, which, for example, is doing very little in this field, you can take another company like Spruce Falls or Kimberly-Clark, which is doing considerable. Indeed you can take companies like Kimberly-Clark and Marathon literally on the opposite side of the road with their limits, and you will find on one side of the road the company operates on the basis that you cannot expect more than about 15 per cent natural regeneration and, therefore, you must supplement the other 85 per cent if you want to produce a premium species of spruce. On the other side of the line, you have a company, partly because it does not require spruce in its particular kind of production, saying that we do not need to reproduce that premium species, and that it is possible to let new growth emerge that is a less valuable species.

What is the answer to this? What kind of standards should be laid down? I repeat; we should have a standard regeneration clearly laid down so that the government knows, so that the companies know, what is expected because as I said before in this House, until this government lays down standards, some of the companies are not going to do anything.

Now last year, as I mentioned a few moments ago, the hon. Minister came in not with an overall standard, but with a policy which makes it possible for the government to enter into an agreement with each company. I ask the hon. Minister, what has been the experience in the past year with the companies. What sort of agreements has he entered into with them? For example, in an instance like Marathon and Kimberly-Clark on opposite sides of the road, so to speak, up in the Long Lac area—is the hon. Minister content to say to one company that very little reforestation is required and accept from another company their basic policy that 85

per cent reforestation to ensure a regeneration of spruce is required?

We want some information from this government on this extremely important basic policy so that the hon. members of this House and the public in this province of Ontario will have some assurance that we have ceased to drift in terms of perpetuating for future generations this great natural resource of the province of Ontario.

I hope the hon. Minister will speak on that, and if, perchance, he forgets, I shall remind him after I have concluded my remarks.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I will not speak on this now unless the hon. member is quite agreeable. On that particular point, if these estimates are passed and we get the money we are asking for we assume full responsibility for this sort of thing, both on the company-performed part as well as on our own.

Mr. MacDonald: That, Mr. Chairman, is the most evasive possible reply. The government assumed full responsibility in an Act last year; the passing of this estimate is completely irrelevant. I asked the hon. Minister what has he done in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We have to have the bodies to do it.

Mr. MacDonald: What has the hon. Minister done in the past year in terms of agreements with the companies with regard to adequate regeneration programmes? That is my question. Does the hon. Minister have any answer beyond that which he has given?

Perhaps the hon. Minister might like to consider his answer after the end of my remarks.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes, I think we had better leave that.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to proceed from that to the context in which I think this settlers' problem, as it emerged at Kapuskasing should be considered. Another issue that we have dealt with in this House many times in recent years is the fact that northern Ontario has been carved up into great forest empires that have been handed out to companies until there is very little unlicensed land or forest area available for new industry.

This past fall I had sent to me, for example, the statement of a certain industrialist, a manufacturer in the forest industries somewhere between Port Arthur and Nipigon, in which he quite bluntly said if they did not get assurance of a continuity of supply that they were going to cease operations.

Now, this is not a new thing. When the first meeting was held of the Northwestern Ontario Development Association a few years ago, it was a private meeting. The press was not in it but a lot of stories got into the papers afterwards that one of the most controversial issues discussed was the question of where new industries, the range of secondary industries that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) is now pleading for, were going to build if they did not have a continuity of supply.

These industries are not willing to act as beggars, so to speak, to take what might be given them in year-to-year negotiations with those who now have been granted the limits. The government has never faced up to this issue of assuring these people a continuity of supply. You had—in this one instance the name of which escapes me—just a few months ago proof of the fact that it is a continuing problem.

Indeed, a year or so ago, when I was at the Lakehead, I spent an hour or two one afternoon with the president of one of the companies, and he once again emphasized in no uncertain terms the fact that he had pleaded with this hon. Prime Minister's predecessor, and presumably he had pleaded with the hon. Prime Minister and the Ministers involved, to come to grips with this problem, to recover from these great empires some of the limits that have been conceded to these companies in northern Ontario sufficient of this Crown land so that they will have some available for new industries that want to come in.

If this government wants to do something meaningful in developing secondary industry, I suggest that this is something that they should tackle. There is no point in leaving great empires to companies who are giving more and more evidence that they are unwilling to build the roads and to get into the hinterlands of these limits. They are leaving the trees and the forest cover to be destroyed by disease and over-maturity and other factors while they cut in a more economical area closer to their mills.

If the companies are not going to use these great empires, let us reclaim some of the limits and have something available for new industries that want to establish themselves and provide employment and boost our trade and all the other things that the government has been doing so much talking and propagandizing about. I—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): What about the industries that are there now? What would you do with them?

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon? Mr. Chairman, the relevance of the ex-Minister of Lands and Forests' comment escapes me.

Of course we have got industries there, they have all of the supplies they want. What I am talking about is that many of them are on limits that are so big that they exceed the company's needs. What I am asking this government to do is consider the proposition of reclaiming some of these limits, or at least working out some procedure to assure a supply of new material to the existing secondary industry and many others that have indicated that they would be interested in coming in. New materials simply will not come in until they have been guaranteed a continuity of supply—not on sufferance from one of the big companies that happens to be up there now, but on some assurance from this government and from this Department of Lands and Forests. This has not been done and the hon. Minister is painfully aware of what I am talking about. He must have been every time he has gone to the Lakehead besieged—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It is not as clear when you explain it.

Mr. MacDonald: It's not as clear—oh, I know it is not as clear and I will tell you why it is not as clear. These big companies in here are one of the greatest contributors to the slush funds of the Tory party and therefore you are not willing to upset the status quo which might make it possible for a few more people to come in, providing more jobs. This is maybe one of the areas where it is a little murky and the hon. Minister would like to clarify it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: However, let me proceed from that point, Mr. Chairman, because we have another problem closer to the explosion in Kapuskasing, or the factors that contributed to this. Increasingly you will find that these companies, because they have cut off from economical areas closer to their mills are interested in the proposition of buying a greater proportion of their requirements rather than cutting it on their own limits. And they are willing to do it for another reason, Mr. Chairman, because if they cut it on their own limits the cost may be \$25, \$30, indeed in some instances it might go as high as \$35, or \$40 a cord. They are interested in exploiting the little settler to whom they will pay a maximum of \$16, \$18 or \$20—at the outside, \$20.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): You say this is true for all the province.

Mr. MacDonald: I certainly know it is true in every area where they are giving out these permits. Are you saying—pardon?

Mr. Gibson: I say that you don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. MacDonald: I say I do know what I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Gibson: How many years have you lived in the north?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I am interested in hearing this quip. I will defy any man from the north to indicate to me that he has visited more areas of the north than I have every year for the last eight years. Never mind how many years I have lived in the north.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Why don't you go to the North Pole and stay there?

Mr. MacDonald: That is the sort of adolescent quip we would expect from the Boy Scout from Bruce county.

Now let me come back to this. There is a tendency on the part of the companies to seek a growing proportion of their cut from settlers rather than from cuts off their own limits. Indeed, up in your own area, if I may say to the hon. member for Kenora, Mr. Speaker, in O and M at Kenora two or three years ago when I discussed it, as much as 25 per cent of their cut was coming from off their limits. Some of it was even being brought in from—I believe I am correct—from the Manitoba side, but certainly it was not from off their own limits.

This, Mr. Chairman, is creating the problem that we face. Here you have companies that have their own limits on which they are less inclined to cut because of the cost, but they have working forces there. They are more inclined to purchase from the settlers, partly because they can get it for less, partly because these settlers are unorganized; they can be readily exploited. As I shall say in a moment, this government ignores statutes on the statute book which would protect the settlers because it is their obligation to protect them. They have refused to accept this obligation and they bow to the giants in the field.

The net result is conditions that create a situation which is basically explosive. You

create a situation in which companies have two groups of employees. One is their real employee, most of whom are in the lumber and saw union. The other is people who are not legally employees. They are the settlers who are cutting in various fashions but are supplying them with a growing proportion of their requirements. And they can play off these sets of employees, one against the other.

If the government wants to come to grips with the situation and avoid this kind of explosion, here is one thing that they have got to face up to. But before I come directly to the Kapuskasing development, let me just dwell for a moment on another at the Lakehead. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Chapple) refuses to do battle on behalf of these people, so I return to it once again. You have in the Lakehead area—maybe the hon. member for Kenora has never heard of it—but you have a group of settlers there who have been battling for justice—

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): A small number out of the total.

Mr. MacDonald: They are called the United Pulpwood Farmers Association, whose president is Mr. Hennessey.

Mr. Chapple: And how.

Mr. MacDonald: I drew this to the attention of the House last year and asked the then Minister what he was going to do about it. I drew to his attention, for example, that in The Revised Statutes of Ontario, chapter 270, there is The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act. I notice that the hon. Minister this afternoon mentioned this in passing but, he was really going at high speed when he passed it because he gave no further consideration to it.

Now what does this Act say? Let me put it in the record once again:

Upon the recommendation of the Minister, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council made regulations

(a) governing the sale and the supply to any company of pulpwood cut by any settler or pulpwood cut from the lands of any settler;

(b) fixing the times, and quantities that may be purchased by any company within any stated period having regard to the requirements of such company for such periods;

(c) fixing the prices to be paid by any company to any settler for pulpwood cut on the settler's land and controlling the method of measuring such pulpwood;

(d) respecting any other matter necessary or advisable to carry out effectively the intent and the purpose of the Act.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, at some stage in the past—and I have forgotten exactly when The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act was passed—the government saw fit to put on the statute books the law that would give them the power to protect these little people who were being exploited by the companies. It is very interesting to listen here, Mr. Chairman; we have the hon. leader of the Opposition saying that is right and we will have the hon. member for Fort William grumbling against these little men of the north whose cause he has refused to espouse.

Mr. Chapple: The companies have been looking after them a lot more than the hon. member thinks they have. He does not know what is going on.

Mr. MacDonald: You are always on the side of the companies. Of that we are certain.

Mr. Chapple: And the companies have done a big job—the biggest percentage have, at any rate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: I draw to your attention the fact that this statute says that the government has the power of fixing the prices to be paid by any company to any settler for the pulpwood cut on the settler's land and controlling the method of measuring such pulpwood. In other words, they have got complete power. The interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is that in the province of Quebec the government has comparable legislation and they are exercising it so that the minimum price that can be paid to these settlers is not a price that this impotent little man—impotent in terms of dealing with a big company—can negotiate, but a price that I think is fixed at the \$23 or \$24 level.

Mr. Chapple: Up our way it is \$27.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, all I know is that I have had letters from these pulpwood settlers there and they are not getting anything like \$27.

Mr. Chapple: Yes, they are. The hon. member just does not know what he is talking about; he never did anyway.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Oh, there is a brilliant statement.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, before I leave this particular aspect of it, I have recently had a letter from the president of this company who said that when there was a change in Ministers—he had given up with previous hon. Ministers, in writing letters and asking as to whether there was any possibility of the government implementing The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act—he wrote this hon. Minister. Hope springs eternal in the human breast, so he wrote this hon. Minister asking whether he would implement the statute available for this government to use in protecting them.

Do you know what happened, Mr. Chairman? He did not even have the courtesy of a reply.

I wonder if the hon. Minister will give us some indication, when he rises to discuss this, as to what he is going to do on that issue.

Mr. Chairman, it is in this broad field that I come to this Kapuskasing question which the hon. leader of the Opposition has raised and which the hon. Minister has dealt with to some extent. May I say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister's statement to the House this afternoon is the clearest indication of why, if we are going to settle this issue, we must have something approaching an independent inquiry. What the hon. Minister has done this afternoon is to bury the basic point that is clear to anybody who wants to look, to bury it in a detail of explanation of policies and statistics, the net effect of which is to say we have a very good policy and it is working well. The only conclusion one can draw from that is that the hon. Minister is the only person who really believes that to be the case.

We have had a spate of articles in the papers in recent days pointing out just how ludicrous is the situation, up in this area, of the trafficking in licences which are issued, pointing out that the law is being violated. Mr. Chairman, I am going to do my very best this afternoon to recognize that we are dealing with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests, because in the explosive situation that blew up in the tragedy of a week or so ago the problem is that basically the responsibility for the situation rests with this government.

When the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) announced that the strike had been settled he criticized labour, he criticized management, he called upon both of them to be more co-operative, and then he spoiled all his statement, and the satisfaction that we had in getting a settlement, by saying in effect that

everything was fine as far as the department is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that it is the neglect, the sins of omission and commission, of three or four departments of this government that created the situation that made for the blow-up in northern Ontario: The Department of Labour, The Department of Health in a shocking disregard of conditions under which human beings have been living up there, The Department of Energy Resources, because it was Hydro which devised contracts which have made it possible to create this situation, The Department of the Attorney-General—and now The Department of Lands and Forests.

The hon. leader of the Opposition, for example, has pointed out that this government had been warned. Not only were they warned but they were warned in words, Mr. Chairman, that are so painfully prophetic that I think the House should be reminded of them.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: What page?

Mr. MacDonald: Page three.

Two years ago when the Goldenberg Commission was sitting and the Lumber and Sawmill Union tried to present their brief to the Goldenberg Commission—because it was dealing with safety, and they have a lot of problems with safety up north—they made reference in their submission which finally got to the government. This is what they said:

We are a responsible union and we have had no major strikes in our industry since 1946. We have been instrumental in keeping labour strikes to a minimum, even in non-union companies, but we are fearful that this will not last forever and some day we will have a blow-up which will make the Toronto one [the immigrant strike] look like peanuts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how much more prophetic could any group have been? Just as in the instance of the immigrant strike here, they struck because of conditions on which this government had been given detailed information by the Canadian Federation of Labour; they had ignored it until the blow-up came so that the government basically was responsible.

So in this instance of Kapuskasing, two years ago, in representations that affected some four or five departments of this government, details were given to the government and they were ignored *in toto*. I will say without any fear of contradiction that, if you have a situation in the north that resulted

in three lives and now charges that hang over the heads of 19 people and others, basically this government is responsible for it.

The condition was created through circumstances that this government, in its usual smug ignoring of problems that are raised by people, permitted to continue until it blew up in their face. Then government spokesmen make sanctimonious, self-praising statements that labour should do this and management should do this, and ignore the fact that the basic problem is rooted in the inaction—in the sins of omission and commission of the government itself.

Mr. Wintermeyer: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, I am not going to read into the record any more than what the hon. leader of the Opposition already has done with regard to the Act. The Act is very, very explicit: If a settler is given a licence, then he must do the cutting himself; if he does not do the cutting himself he must get permission from the Minister; if anybody else gets it, he must be a bona-fide settler.

I listened to the hon. Minister get up and, in completely irrelevant comments, refer to bona-fide settlers and these agreements with regard to bona-fide settlers in connection with two or three of the companies in the north country. This is the whole problem. The government has never supervised this so it does not know how many of them are bona-fide settlers.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Oh, yes, we do.

Mr. MacDonald: They have not supervised them.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They are.

Mr. MacDonald: And as a matter of fact this is another reason, Mr. Chairman, why we must have a Royal commission. We must have a Royal commission. When the hon. Minister comes in and unloads on us some thousands of words which say the situation is all fine, when the facts are staring us in the face that the situation is anything but fine, obviously this government—and this hon. Minister is a professional at it—is going to try to cover up the mess instead of cleaning it up. They have not adequately supervised licensing before and they are not going to do it now. This is why we have got to have a Royal commission.

As a matter of fact, one of the unfortunate features of this situation, so I am informed by persons who are conversant with the law—is that there will not even be a coroner's

inquest after the deaths up there because in the instance of murder charges there is no coroner's inquest. There is merely a preliminary hearing.

What I would like to know—not necessarily from this hon. Minister, I do not know how one separates various aspects of this settler problem out, it is all part of the one problem—is there going to be a full opportunity for evidence to be submitted in the preliminary inquiry before these trials? Is there going to be full opportunity, for example, for those who are willing to testify that the police knew that the settlers had weapons? And there are people with affidavits to prove this. Is there going to be a full inquiry, for example, that will permit, either at a preliminary inquiry or something else that this government is going to establish, when the 100-odd witnesses that are now available to prove that what this hon. Minister just a moment ago denied to be a fact, namely that these people were not bona-fide settlers.

There are cases in the north, for example, of a man who has been on crutches for years but who was able to get one of these licences and then sell it. There are cases of women—now I do not know whether it is the widows in the category that the hon. Minister was talking about or not—who got a settlers' licence.

There is at least one case of a retired man with three sons, all of whom are working, the man and the three sons all have licences. There is no point in the hon. Minister coming in here and trying to kid the public that these have not been transferred or they have not been sold.

Of course, what is most dangerous of all, those whom the hon. Minister referred to rather euphemistically as “the leaders of the group” were outsiders who came in. They came in to head up so-called co-operatives. They were jobbers who bought the licences and having collected a whole lot of them in violation of the law, which this hon. Minister and the department ignored, then they began to let out the cutting rights to people at the most exploitive kind of cutting prices. The prices ranging from three, four or five dollars up to nine dollars.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: He sounds like a fellow adherent of his party who talked this way, but before an inquest he had nothing to say. That is ridiculous evidence. You do not know whether that is a fact or not.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I will not be drawn aside with this particular point in regard to the alleged ridiculous evidence, or

lack of evidence, on the part of Arnold Peters. But I will tell you this: if there is any man who finally has made this government face up to the high-grading issue it has been Arnold Peters. You people have been stirred into action after refusing to do anything about it for years. In other words, illegality is ignored when it suits the Tory party. We will pursue that at the appropriate time.

In summary of this particular problem of the settlers which we have been dealing with in bits and pieces all afternoon, I would say that this government which refuses to set up a Royal commission to get to the bottom of it, is not only going to be responsible for what happened in the past, but it is going to be responsible for the perpetuation of conditions which will create grave danger of explosions recurring in the future.

We must have an investigation. If we do not have an investigation it is one more reason why this government should be out at the next election so that others might investigate a situation as a result of which three people have been killed.

This is the tragedy of it, Mr. Chairman. We have been telling them for years, for example, that they were not doing an adequate inspection job on underground tunnelling on pipes. What happened? Five men had to be killed in Hogg's Hollow and you had their blood on your hands before you would move and set up an investigation. The Ontario Federation of Labour gives you full details as to the exploitation of the immigrants in Toronto and what happened? You had one of the most explosive strikes in Ontario history before Carl Goldenberg was appointed to solve it.

Now you have this situation up in the north with three people dead, 19 charged with non-capital murder and some 200 to 300 more charged with rioting. All this created by the conditions that this government has tolerated. Now this hon. Minister, who, I repeat, is a professional at covering up messes rather than cleaning them up, comes in and gives us a lengthy statement which clearly indicates that the government is going to do nothing.

I repeat, though I do it with no real confidence the government will move, that the pleas that have been advanced by the union, the plea now that we should have a Royal commission, should be conceded to so that you can consider all the departments which have played a part in the ramifications of this, and see if we cannot get it back into a position where it can be corrected.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101:

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, before dealing specifically with vote 1101, I should like to comment briefly on the recent tour of northeastern Ontario for the hon. members of this House.

As we all know, Mr. Chairman, this tour was conducted by The Department of Lands and Forests and to that department I think a great deal of credit goes for the success of the tour. There is no doubt that those who were present on the tour appreciated this opportunity to visit this important portion of our province and the hon. members will benefit from the knowledge and experience gained through the course of the visit. I sincerely hope that this knowledge and experience will contribute to more enlightened legislation by this government insofar as northern and northeastern Ontario are concerned.

What particularly interested me during the course of this tour was the similarity of the geography, economy and the social activities of northeastern and northwestern Ontario. Northeastern and northwestern Ontario are hundreds of miles apart. In fact those of us from northwestern Ontario almost consider northeastern Ontario to be part of the southern portion of the province.

However, in many respects northeastern and northwestern Ontario are alike in that both areas have long been neglected by the government of this House. It is regrettable that legislation for the north is basically enacted by the representatives of the rural areas and the large metropolitan centres of the south. I cannot help but think, however, that these tours of the north by the hon. members of the House will inevitably result in increased understanding of our particular problems and I hope sensible and constructive legislation will be forthcoming in the future.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my thanks, and the thanks of the Liberal members who were on the tour, to the department which made our trip so well worthwhile in every respect. I think we were all impressed by the competence and courtesy of those in the department with whom we came into contact.

Now in dealing with the subject of the personnel department, I should like to reiterate some of the remarks I made last year. It seems to be that in this department we have a particular element of dedication and sincerity on the part of the civil servants with whom one comes in contact. There is little evidence of indifference and much evidence of enthusiasm and an honest desire to do their

tasks well. All this, Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that the salaries in this department do not compare in any way with those you would find in private industry or other fields of employment.

This is, of course, regrettable and something should be done to rectify the situation. But what this government has done recently, I am told, is to raise the rents paid by those members of the department who are living in departmental housing units. This in effect amounts to a salary reduction in my opinion, and will not contribute to a great increase in departmental morale.

Mr. Chairman, it comes as no surprise to any hon. member of this House that to a very large extent the continued existence of all of northern Ontario is dependent upon our forests and our forest-based industries. A good many of the larger centres in the north exist only because of the pulp or paper operation or logging operations in one form or another. Unfortunately, some of these industries were established many years ago when the prevailing view of both businessmen and economists was that the primary industries must be established as close as possible to the source of the raw material used. This naturally led to the creation of many one-industry towns in the north whose very existence is dependent upon the primary industry concerned.

That is one reason, sir, why we of the north are so concerned with the future of our forest-based industries. As these industries flourish or die, so also does the north. Were these industries to fail, the economy of the north would likewise stagnate to a very large extent. These are the facts that must be brought home to those of the south and east who control our Legislature. This is a subject that should be of grave concern to all of us today, and particularly the hon. Minister of this department.

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated in this House before, we have seen ominous signs of latent trouble in our forest-based industries. The worldwide demand for paper, for example, goes up approximately three or four per cent a year. The capacity to produce paper is increasing at a substantially greater rate.

Added to this is the fact that Canadian paper is relatively expensive paper, although no one would question its quality. We cannot continue to compete with these nations which provide low labour cost and cheap raw materials unless substantial breakthroughs are made in Canadian manufacturing methods. The forest-based industries in this

province have made tremendous technological steps of their own but greater efforts are required to effectively utilize our forest products.

This government, I say, should spare no effort to assist these industries to economize and to diversify as rapidly as possible.

To illustrate the gravity of this problem, Mr. Chairman, I need only say that Canadian newsprint exports fell off in 1962 in spite of increased productive capacity. Only a few of Canada's foreign newsprint customers consumed a greater quantity than in 1961. This, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the decreased value of the Canadian dollar and the lower cost of buying Canadian products abroad.

I am not saying for one instant that our paper industries are doomed. Such is not the case, not because of the efforts of this government, but because the industries themselves have fought a relentless battle to compete in the jungle warfare of present-day trade. This government has contributed little, if anything, but interference, harassment and inequitable taxation. Too long has The Department of Lands and Forests looked upon our forest industries as a source of funds for the coffers of that department rather than the economy as a whole.

For many years now in the north we have been faced with the problem of the pulp and paper industry vis-à-vis the saw log industry. Both of these operations are vital to our economy and both must be fostered and encouraged as much as possible.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is time that this department, with all its brains and manpower, found an equitable solution to this conflict. There is no excuse for the failure of this government and this department to find a solution whereby these industries might exist harmoniously in the same area. I suggest that now is the time to formulate some programme whereby all concerned could operate with some guarantee of a future.

I suggest that such a solution might call for some exercise of one's imagination, perhaps some foresight. I also appreciate that it is probably for this reason that nothing has been done by this department.

Now I should like to turn to the role of the individual citizen, the small man in our forest-based industries. This is a subject on which much attention has recently been focused by reason of the unfortunate events in the Kapuskasing area. Ignoring private sales by individual landowners for the moment, the average citizen has little chance

to benefit from the enormous natural resources which after all are the heritage of everyone in this province. I am fully aware of the fact that it is incumbent upon us to conserve and protect this heritage for our children and their children to come. This duty must not be forgotten and should be incorporated in any cutting plan formulated by government or by industry. However, too often this department has seen fit to adopt methods which would lead us to believe that our forests are the property of The Department of Lands and Forests rather than the people.

I think one must concede that those who consume our forest resources should pay a reasonable price for this privilege. There is no need for this department to extract its pound of flesh in every case.

I think I can safely say that our statutes and regulations with respect to the issuing of cutting permits to settlers are like our liquor laws—to a vast extent ignored. These permits once were, and still are, absolutely essential to those individuals who must find some means to supplement their income in order to live. Within reasonable limits these permits should be continued, but I submit it is time for a uniform practice in this regard throughout the province. Too often I have heard instances of private trading of cutting permits, the issuing of permits to permanently employed people, or even to individuals who could not properly be referred to as residents of this province.

It is time, Mr. Chairman, that these permits were issued on a basis of priority, taking into consideration such things as whether or not the man is actually a settler, his employment status, his marital status and the general situation in his family. Permits should be issued to those who need them, not on a first-come first-served basis.

I am equally cognizant of the fact that a fixed stumpage rate on cutting permits will likely lead to poor cutting methods. I am aware as well, that a fixed-rate works hardships in many cases where the permit covers a poor cutting stand. One possible solution to this handicap which has impressed me is the stumpage appraisal method of fixing rates. This system was tried on an experimental basis in my riding during the past year. As those concerned in the department are aware this experiment initially met with determined and vociferous opposition by reason of the rates in question being raised in every case above the prevailing fixed stumpage rate. This iniquity was subsequently ironed out and the system as now applied provides a flexible

basis on which to set stumpage rates. Such factors as topography, quality of the cutting stand and distance from the markets can now be reflected in the stumpage rate paid by the cutter.

I suggest that this system, Mr. Chairman, if applied in relation to the fixed rate now in existence in a particular area, might well contribute to the cutting of poor or over-mature wood which now goes to waste.

It should be a source of great shame to this department that too often in the past, great stands of timber were left to die and waste away because of inflexible cutting regulations.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I am growing increasingly skeptical of the tender system of purchasing a cutting stand. Superficially this would appear to be the most sensible method of effectively disposing of and utilizing our standing timber. Unfortunately the one item of cost which the bidders find most flexible and accordingly subject to price cutting, is the wage paid to the hired cutter. These bidders, in order to bid low and still make a profit, are compelled to reduce wages to bare subsistence levels. I suggest to the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, that no system is fair when the increased revenue earned by the department actually comes out of the wage-earner's pocket. If the tendering system must be used, then adequate protection must be given to those who are actually employed in the subsequent cutting operation.

At this stage I should like to say a few brief words about scaling in forest products and the measuring of the wood cut. There are many possible ways this can be done depending on local conditions, the type of wood and the type of industry involved. At the moment in many areas there is great duplication of function in this respect, resulting in duplication in costs on the part of government and industry. I would urge the department to continue its efforts to find more efficient and economical methods of measuring cut wood for private or industrial consumption.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to turn to a subject which is of paramount importance to me and to many of us in the north; namely the Indian population. For years now this House has been appraised of the situation as it exists in the Indian settlements of the north, but until recently the government has neither recognized the problem nor done anything about it. I would refer this House to portions of an article written by one Ted Dinsmore in the *Toronto Daily Star* of

January 17, 1963. Mr. Dinsmore wrote a series of articles which I believe well stated the problem we must face with respect to the Indian problem. He states, for example, and he is referring specifically to Red Lake, of which I have spoken on many occasions—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt for a moment. This appears to me to be another general statement given prior to consideration of any items in the estimates, and we are striving to conduct the business of the House in an orderly fashion. The Whips have been in communication with one another to arrange a list of speakers for the budget debate; all these comments can be made as a general statement in that debate, and I think this speaker is out of order.

When he started referring to the northern tour I assumed he was speaking on the first vote, because he was the first speaker subsequent to the introductory remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, and I assumed he was speaking under the main office, ordinary expenditure, which is the first vote. It became obvious to me, as I listened, that he was not and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this speech could very well be made in the budget debate where it belongs; or on any one of the items, if he relates these various items as we proceed through the estimates.

Mr. Gibson: I appreciate the kind remarks of the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman. What puzzles me then, if I am not permitted to discuss the Indian problem under main office where the policy is made, where do I discuss it? I am sure that we do not consider Indians as fish and wildlife or under conservation authorities or forest protection. I would think that I should have the opportunity to discuss this matter, which after all was initially raised by the hon. Minister himself. I am only covering a subject on which he himself touched.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The rules, Mr. Chairman, are clear. The budget debate and the Throne speech debate are designed for this purpose, where any matter can be discussed. If you want to relate to the actual vote of money in any of these estimates, all right, but I only point out to the hon. member that if this is permitted subsequent to the address it is possible to have another 90-odd speeches in this House going along the same way and we would be here forever. We are at this item of business, in supply, discussing and voting money. That is the purpose of dealing

with the estimates in this way. There are numerous opportunities for the hon. member to deliver his speech and discuss these matters, but not here.

Mr. Gibson: Well, Mr. Chairman, I take it then that the hon. Prime Minister has the attitude that the problem of the Indians in the north is of no concern to this particular department, and I have no right to speak of the problem of the Indians in the north under the estimates of this department. Is that the attitude the hon. Prime Minister takes?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: In speaking very quietly about a procedural matter, I refuse to be drawn into a debate whether we are going to terminate in this House any discussion of the Indians. Of course we are not. I point out that the hon. member can speak about this in the budget debate.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate some of the observations of the hon. Prime Minister, but the hon. member for Kenora is very much to the point when he suggests that he is prepared to segregate his comments to the appropriate subject, and surely somewhere in these estimates there is an opportunity to discuss the question of the Indian population.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The Indian population can be discussed but not necessarily under The Department of Lands and Forests. If there is a place under the estimates where we are voting money for Indians, there is the general budget debate in which to discuss it.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Then, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is purely procedural. It has nothing to do with the propriety or impropriety of what the hon. member chooses to discuss; that is not the point of question. The point of question is: Are we going to conduct the affairs of this House according to the rules or are we not?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, what is item No. 7—annuities and bonuses to Indians—in the first vote? It occurred to me you might—Mr. Chairman, I am going to—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Come on, act your age.

An hon. member: As long as he does not act your age.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, would it not be appropriate for the hon. member to

ask the hon. Minister responsible what is meant by annuities and bonuses to Indians?

Mr. Wintermeyer: The hon. Minister himself said he was going to employ some Indians under his ranger programme. Now, we are quite prepared—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will leave it to Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: We would ask the member to refer to any certain item he wants to speak on in vote 1101.

Mr. Gibson: Item No. 7, 1101.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7?

Mr. Gibson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this subject was raised by the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, that particular item deals with compensation paid annually by the province to the government of Canada for their disbursements to Indians in connection with the ceding to the Crown in the right of Ontario of a large area lying north of the Albany River. It is a special contractual item.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the hon. Minister a further question. He mentioned an agreement with the government of Canada relating to the agreements or arrangements between the province and the Dominion. Under what estimate would that particular agreement fall, or the monies involved in that particular item?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The one that I referred to in my earlier remarks—well, the Game and Fisheries item would probably cover most of them.

Mr. Gibson: Well, thank you. I presume, then, that I will be able to discuss Indian problems under Fish and Wildlife? There is no such estimate as Game and Fish. Mr. Chairman, if I may I would like to turn to another subject under vote 1101 and I challenge the hon. Prime Minister to question the relevance of this subject.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will not challenge the hon. member as long as it is under that vote. It is not a matter of challenging him, it is Mr. Chairman who is conducting the business of this House. Ask the question.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I turn now to another aspect of the operations of the head

office of this department, namely, the procedure whereby licences of various kinds are distributed to the various issuers who in turn sell these licences to the general public.

Needless to say, the monetary value of these licences is extremely high, and I suggest that it is the responsibility of the department to see that the privilege of issuing licences is granted only when the issuer is of proven reliability and then only under circumstances where there is some assurance that the public monies involved will be adequately protected.

To illustrate past procedure in this regard I can do no better than to refer this House to an editorial published in the *Kenora Miner News* earlier this year. This editorial reads as follows, and the title is "Action Needed":

No government department commands higher respect throughout this area than The Department of Lands and Forests. The scope of its operations, covering as it does wildlife, fisheries, forest protection, Crown lands, etc., make it by far the biggest single operation in the province.

The department is admired for its aggressive and progressive measures protecting fish, fur and forests. It is dedicated to the fullest possible use of our natural resources on a perpetuating basis. Happiest of all the men wearing the familiar green uniform command the highest respect on all sides for their knowledge, ability and fairness.

Revelations made during a two-day court case completed here on Wednesday which showed a pathetic lack of common business sense in the departmental policy came, therefore, to the citizens as a most unpleasant shock.

The presiding judge was mercifully lenient in his somewhat scorching remarks during the trial, recognizing no doubt that the forestry witnesses were victims of an unbelievably lax policy. Evidence produced at the trial might be summarized as follows:

A letter of application was mailed from Vermilion Bay to Toronto. An accounting department official, after scanning records to see how many issuers were in the area, passed along the application to the Minister's office.

In due course the applicant was told by letter that he was being recommended for appointment. He was never officially appointed. In due course a parcel of licences was shipped by parcel post to Vermilion Bay. In the succeeding 18 months licences to the value of \$8,600 were thus shipped

without certain knowledge by departmental officials that licences and funds were not being handled in the manner prescribed in their own booklet of instructions given to each of the issuers.

This led the judge in dismissing a charge of failing to account against the accused to remark: How can the department say it was a fraud when the department knew others were issuing licences?

And again: Every section of the book was deliberately broken by the very people who require a monthly accounting. Without doubt, Kenora staff members were dismayed at this week's events.

They have long asked for a change of policy from Toronto head office. They are hopeful that this week's revelations may be decisive.

Common sense is needed in revamping licensing practices which in the main is the chief flaw in the present system. Adequate field work should quickly solve most problems.

Careful screening and proper instructions to issuers, the use of registered mail to ship licences and the prompt collection of accounts together with the receipt of accurate licensing records from issuers is not too much to expect especially when sums ranging upward from \$8,000 are involved.

I have since heard from an unofficial source that the head office of the department has now, to a certain extent, tightened its procedures in this regard and will be in closer touch with the local offices which, after all, have the best knowledge of the situation.

If such action has been taken, I commend the department, although I suggest there is no excuse for the past behaviour in this regard. If the necessary changes have not been made, Mr. Chairman, I need hardly say anything to add to the condemnation contained in the editorial to which I have just referred.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would like to say to the hon. member on that point that to the extent there is anything in the procedures of the department that needs improvement it has been done. We reviewed the situation. What was said there, to a very considerable extent, was that lack of production of the proper evidence that could have been made available had the proper officers been called and produced their records.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, if I might raise another subject under vote 1101. I assume that the hon. Minister's salary falls under this

particular vote. Is it correct that the hon. Minister's and Deputy Minister's salaries fall under this particular vote?

With the permission of the hon. Prime Minister I should like to comment briefly on the hon. Minister and the Deputy Minister—or the recent Minister and the Deputy Minister. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that these two gentlemen formed the most potent one-two combination in government departments in this province in the past.

I think I might say also, Mr. Chairman, and I wish to be fair about it, the former hon. Minister, and the Deputy Minister, Mr. McDougall, are men whose integrity I have never questioned and I do not think anyone in this province has ever questioned their particular integrity. Under the aegis of these two men this department reached a new height, I think, in public prestige and in morale within the department. I am sorry to note as a result, Mr. Chairman, as a result of the recent Cabinet changes that I can no longer say that.

I regret saying this, but I think the appointment made by the hon. Prime Minister was met with dismay, I will go so far as to say horror, both amongst industry, citizens of the province and, I might also say, for the members of the department. I am sorry to say also that his influence is early seen in the department as in the press release issued by the department and under the signature of the hon. Minister.

This is the first one, November 3rd. Now, this is the type of thing issued for publication in the newspapers of this province. This is the type of release designed to build the prestige of the department and to inform the public of what is going on. Here are just a couple of paragraphs from the first release:

When the whole world is talking of war the Hon. A. Kelso Roberts, QC, in his new portfolio is discussing peace.

The new Minister of Lands and Forests indicated today the forward spirit of his administration when he said, 'After leaving the army and completing my law course at Osgoode Hall as a man I went north. From that early milepost in my life until I was appointed in August of 1955 as Attorney-General I maintained constant business and other contacts in the north country, including the Northwest Territories, with our mines, forests and hardy and friendly people and gained a good deal of intimate knowledge of that vast country.'

Now, that is certainly a relatively modest statement on the part of this hon. Minister.

Turning, if I may, without interruption from the noise from the north—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would ask him if—I will answer him afterwards.

Mr. Gibson: Now, with the permission of this House I should like to refer to the next press release which I thought was a dandy of relevance to the activities of The Department of Lands and Forests. This one was issued December 1, 1962, for publication in our newspapers to edify the public about the operations of The Department of Lands and Forests. I quote:

The generally favourable attitude towards Kennedy he found [referring to the hon. Minister] in the British Isles and European countries plus a noticeably active export trade enjoyed in all our countries impressed the Hon. A. Kelso Roberts, QC, Ontario Minister of Lands and Forests on his recent vacation trip abroad.

I imagine he heard something about that statement from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Oh, no! No, he did not.

Mr. Gibson: I continue:

Equally pleasurable [he said] were the prominent Canadians he met abroad in embassies and trade missions, among these were the ambassador, Jules Leger, in Rome, brother of Cardinal Leger of Montreal, Ambassador Reve and his assistant, Mr. Gaulton of Sarnia and Dublin, and Colonel Clement of the Canadian Army there.

All relevant to the activities of The Department of Lands and Forests under whose letterhead this stuff is issued.

Mr. Roberts attended the presentation of a plaque to General Sean McEwan, Irish Army Chief of Staff, by members of the Canadian Corps of Signals who served under him in the Congo with United Nations forces. This plaque was made of Ontario white pine—

And we finally get the operations of The Department of Lands and Forests:

This plaque was made of Ontario white pine.

As they say in my part of the country: Big deal!

The Irish leader Eamonn deValera told Mr. Roberts of his desire to introduce more representative Irish literature into Canadian libraries.

Printed on paper, I assume, which was made from wood supervised by The Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Roberts also attended a session of the Dáil Eireann, the parliament of Eire, and expressed himself as amazed at the number of members' questions on the day's order paper—an even one hundred.

Now, I quote, this is a direct quotation from the hon. Minister dealing, of course, with the operations of The Department of Lands and Forests:

I am the only living political representative of St. Patrick in the world—the Honourable Mr. Roberts, member for St. Patrick's riding, told Mr. deValera, who advised him: Do not let that get away from you.

This is all relevant to the operations—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: —on that after his 50 years' experience, than yours after about five months.

Mr. Gibson: Now, that is a clever remark coming from a man who has not lived in the north for 28 years and knows less about it than probably any number of people in this House.

Now do not let that get away from you.

Now attending Ireland's four courts—

Again relevant to the operations of this department and published under the letterhead of this department for publication in our newspapers:

—attending Ireland's four courts, Mr. Roberts met Judge Mernahan who has relatives in Toronto—

That's interesting:

—and registrar Joseph McDonnagh as well as the Lord Mayor of Dublin and the Attorney-General, both named O'Keefe—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: A lot of good Irishmen.

Mr. Gibson: I am surprised he did not make some remarks in that regard.

—and the Hon. Mr. O'Meran who holds a post equivalent to that of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

Second reference to the operations of The Department of Lands and Forests.

One thing that puzzled the Ontario Minister however was the unique appeal to tourists offered by the merchants in France. They gave a 20 per cent discount on all purchases to bona-fide tourists from outside their country.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gibson: I would not want to speculate any further on that particular remark.

Mr. Roberts' further comment on merchandizing abroad has to do with the frequent appearance of one country of supposedly native manufactured goods actually made in other countries. Made in Japan, it seems, is not at all peculiar to goods sold in Canada and the United States. Italy offers seemingly native merchandise made in England and in France; it is made in England, or made in Italy. It is the same over most of Europe and bespeaks a healthy export market at least, the Minister felt.

Now this particular thing came out in the weekly newsletter of The Department of Lands and Forests for December 1. I ask this government and I ask this House and I ask the people of Ontario, what right has any hon. Minister to publish this to be put in newspapers throughout the province? What relevance has it got to the operation of The Department of Lands and Forests?

Let me carry on, if I may.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Thanks for the re-run.

Mr. Gibson: The hon. Minister seems to have an inexhaustible supply of these newsletters which, up until this change in the Minister, were sensible, reasonable things, albeit that they were full of political propaganda.

We have a news release of December 8 from Fort William. These things are written by members of the department, and presumably are read by the hon. Minister. This is about a Northern Ontario Tourist Out-fitters' convention in Fort William, held I think in early December or late November. The first item that caught my attention, and, as I say, written by The Department of Lands and Forests:

The Minister in his remarks to the NOTO delegates, some 200 of them from all parts of the north, displayed a broad knowledge of the north and its problems and possibilities.

Well, I certainly commend the public servant who wrote that, he was probably well-looking after his job. Anyway this particular release goes on for some five pages, telling about the hon. Minister's remarks and his knowledge of the north and his particular qualities and what have you, and so on and so forth. And at the last page, page eight of this press release, right at the bottom, one inch of this particular press release, tells

what went on at the NOTO convention—one inch!

Keeping in mind that this is the type of thing that should be used to educate our public and to inform the public about The Department of Lands and Forests, I think the hon. Minister owes the public some explanation in that respect.

Directing my remarks specifically to the hon. Prime Minister of this province, I would like to refer to a letter which appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, last December I believe, I cannot give you a date. It was written by one Douglas M. Fisher, MP, with whose views I must admit I am quite often in agreement. I will not say that I would personally use his wording but I must read this letter:

Oh God! Oh Toronto! What did you do to those beyond your periphery? In your editorial on the Provincial Cabinet changes, October 26, you say about Mr. Kelso Roberts: now he is taking over the Lands and Forests Department where the work is largely routine management, this frees Mr. J. W. Spooner for promotion to the Municipal Affairs Department where there are many problems to test his reputation as a sound administrator.

Has never a hint reached you that forestry is the basis of our northern economy? Have you never heard of the terrific pressures on the use of our forests in the broadest sense? Have you ever appreciated the challenge that one programme alone, ARDA offers the Ontario government? Have you no appreciation of what those Ontario folk from Huntsville north and west feel about their bush problems?

This is not a party bleat despite my party label. Both Mr. Spooner and his predecessor, Mr. Clare Mapledoram, found the Lands and Forests portfolio a tough, rewarding one, and each has made a contribution to some enlightened policy changes. Much more needs to be done and has to be done. So what do we get, Mr. Kelso Roberts. If he could not see organized crime from his Toronto vantage, how is he going to separate the woods from the trees in the Lands and Forests Department?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, you are quoting a good source now.

Mr. Gibson: May I admonish the hon. Prime Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, and you, after all, sir, were on this tour through northeastern Ontario and saw some

of this country. May I say to you, sir, that this Department of Lands and Forests is the most highly respected and the most important department of his government in the north. We hear little from The Department of Highways, we know nothing of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, we know nothing of what he is doing but we do know everything that is done—

Mr. MacDonald: Too much time in Japan.

Mr. Gibson: —but we do know everything that is done by this particular department. As a direct result, sir, as a direct result to three-quarters of the geographical area of this province—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Get out another newsletter, have another dinner.

Mr. Gibson: I am sure your newsletter will be along the lines of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. So I say to you, on behalf of the people of the north, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the hon. Prime Minister, that this appointment and this department is regarded as paramount to us. We resent this particular department being used as a repository for cast-off political opponents—

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: That's very, very—

Mr. Gibson: We resent this department being used as a garbage heap for you in your own internecine warfare. We suggest to you, sir, this department should be given the attention and the credit and the leadership which it deserves.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to answer. All I am going to say is that I am delighted today to say that last Saturday at Dryden, the home town, I believe, or the practising town, of the last speaker, there was chosen as the standard bearer of this party a young man who is going to 'clean him up' at the next provincial election.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): We have heard you on that before and you were wrong then.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a question and I feel I am in order. I agree that we should get down to a semblance of orderliness in the procedure because if not it

is going to disrupt the whole procedure in the following week.

My question concerns comparison of last year's—1963—estimates with this year's. I think I am in order to just make a point and ask for an answer to the question.

In the 1963 estimates the total asked for was approximately \$31 million, but it has increased, and the hon. Minister is asking for around \$38 million this year. I noticed in the booklet that was on our desks, "Highlights of '62", that we had capital and ordinary disbursements totalling \$20-odd million, with our total receipts around \$22-odd million. This gives us a deficit of some \$6 million. I would think that the natural resources of this province should at least be breaking even on behalf of the people of this province, or supplying some revenue to be directed into the more needy areas of government.

In relation to these changes, I would ask the hon. Minister—because he is asking for another \$7 million to spend in the 1964 estimate—if he anticipates a great increase in the revenues. Or is this going to be trend in this department, that we are going to now go into an increasing deficit each year from this natural resource? I notice by the booklet on statistical and administration information, that it was in the last four years we started this trend. Previous to that the province did enjoy some revenue from this great natural resource. I would ask the hon. Minister to comment on this particular.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think to some extent what my hon. friend has said is really a matter of bookkeeping, because a few years ago revenues from water power sources were transferred to another department. In that way approximately \$3 million of revenues that had been formerly coming into this department went to some other department.

Then very shortly after that conservation authorities were transferred to this department. We do quite a considerable amount in that field, spend quite a considerable amount, and while ultimately the great work of conservation is going to pay great dividends and is indirectly paying it today, these things do have some effect on the year-to-year bookkeeping.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I should like your ruling at the outset. I should like to also make some comments with respect to the situation in Kapuskasing. Some speakers have spoken already today. It is difficult to restrain all of one's comments under one particular branch or another, and I would

think, sir, if you will permit some latitude at the opening, the same remarks would not be necessary under a future vote. I have no intention of abusing the rules of the House; at the same time I should like to make some comments with respect to the whole problem.

As I see it, Mr. Chairman, a good part of the remarks could be made under the timber branch, yet at the same time there are some matters which seem to me to be a matter of administration and this would be directly related to the first vote. I wonder if you would like me to make those comments at this time, or if I will be permitted the latitude later, if I refrain until then.

In the last few days there seems to have come over the House some type of an acute awareness that we are out of order in certain places. I do not wish to be out of order, but I would hope that I will not be restricted from making my comments because of this apparent desire to live completely within the rules of the House. I ask your ruling at this time.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to say to the member, that if you have further remarks to make I think they would have to come under the question of timber grants, rather than now; after all, there has been a general statement by each leader and I think it would be better to confine your remarks—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: All right. Then I hope that when I am to make them at that time, somebody will not stand up and say I should have made them earlier, because this is the reason I was asking for the ruling now.

Mr. Chairman: Will you speak now then?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: You will permit me to speak later on.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, if we wish to ask questions regarding the Kapuskasing matter will that come under timber grants?

Mr. Chairman: We are now dealing with different items of vote 1101. Is 1101 carried?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, these hon. gentlemen are asking for your assistance and direction. Now are you ruling that under 1108 you are going to allow a further and complete discussion of the Kapuskasing situation as it relates to this department? Is that your ruling?

Mr. Chairman: I do not think we can allow a general statement on it. You yourself have

made that statement, as has the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Wintermeyer: So do you mean there will be no further discussions?

Mr. Chairman: There will be a question period.

Mr. Wintermeyer: And that question period will be when?

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest in 1108.

Mr. Wintermeyer: All right! And are you going to allow a broad opportunity for questions during that vote?

Mr. Chairman: I would say so, yes.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, may I ask, on item 9 of 1101, the advisory committee to the hon. Minister: who is on this advisory committee?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The advisory committee or statutory committee, at the present time, or up until a very short time ago, consisted of gentlemen, some of whom are—their term is just about to be renewed or changed. But I will give you the list. It is as follows: Dean J. W. B. Sisam, Faculty of Forestry at the University of Toronto, is chairman and he is on a three-year term commencing January 1, 1961. Other members are Mr. A. B. Cooper of this city who is one of the senior executives of the labour union that is connected very actively in the wood production, wood business; Major-General H. Kennedy of Ottawa, who was the father of the report referred to earlier by the hon. member for York South, who gave him rather an inferior title. The Major-General, he also is on a three-year term commencing January 1, 1961; Dr. J. R. Dymond, not my hon. friend on the left here but a very well-known man in the field of fisheries and wildlife and general forest work, he is now living in Toronto; Mr. G. Godwin. Mr. G. Godwin is vice-president in charge of woodlands for the Ontario Paper Company. Mr. G. Henderson who is secretary of the conservation council of Ontario, he resides in Toronto; Mr. J. W. McNutt, president of William Milne and Sons Limited, North Bay, and well known to the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy); Mr. E. A. Perry, manager of the Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines at Timmins; Mr. C. A. Boyles, deputy general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia in the Toronto office. They are on two-year terms which would just be ready now for re-appointment. Mr. W. Hodgkiss, who is the immediate past president of the Ontario Federation of

Anglers and Hunters, and he is of Terrace Bay.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I notice in travelling expenses in item two, in the 1962 public accounts, it gives travelling expenses of the hon. Minister. When the hon. Ministers put in their travelling expenses, are these just expenses for trips in connection with their own department or some government department or do they also include particular political visits to riding associations? Are they included in these travelling expenses?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not know of any such situation. It would not be in my case anyway.

Mr. Troy: Well, I know of one situation where the hon. Minister himself came up to my riding. I do not mean the hunters and anglers convention, but the little trip he had to Mattawa. Would that be under The Department of Lands and Forests expenses, or from his own pocket, or the pocket of the Mattawa Conservative association?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Where it was in the political field it would be at the political level. Where it was in the public interest and public service of the department it would be on the department.

Mr. Troy: I will have to wait until I get *Hansard* to get that answer.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1101 agreed to.

On vote 1102:

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments with respect to vote 1102. I think I have raised it before, but I believe this is the place where I might speak of the problem of algae in our lakes. There have been resolutions which have been, I believe, forwarded to the department dealing with this problem.

My understanding is that there are detergents which are being sold in Ontario which have a mineral base and which in fact encourage the algae in our lakes. I think it is becoming a serious matter, sir; I think it is one which, if not dealt with immediately, will be of serious consequence to future generations. It was my privilege during the past year to stay at one of the better resorts on Lake Ontario and to notice some days when it was not possible to enjoy the waters of the lake because of the ugly smell and unseemly conditions of the beaches. I wonder if the hon. Minister would be able to advise

me whether or not any action has been taken or will be taken during this session to control the detergents that are being sold in the province and which promote the growth of this algae.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The Water Resources Commission is doing a great deal of research and work in connection with this problem. Actually our department has been interested also and recently gave some facilities for research. There is a very good article on this whole thing in a magazine which I have here in my hand which I would be glad to send over to the hon. member, because I think it gives the story quite clearly there.

I do think I can say that there has been a considerable improvement. It may not be entirely due to the results of practical application of research—it may have something to do with natural causes too—but I think there has been a very considerable improvement in sections of the Great Lakes over what it was a short time ago. I will be glad to send this over to the hon. member for Wentworth if he would like to look at it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am interested—I would be interested, of course, in seeing the article, but I am particularly interested in the comments of the hon. Minister where he says there has been an improvement. Do I understand from that that the amount of algae in our Great Lakes has decreased over the past, say, year or two? Is this a statement of fact?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, as I say, I think there has been an improvement; but again natural conditions might cause recurrences and I am not an expert in that field. I think where the hon. member would get the most expert advice on the matter is by a visit to the Water Resources Commission offices where they have libraries and where there is a very excellent and continuing research job going on.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is so; but it would seem to me that any legislation would have to come from a Minister of the Crown, and it would seem to me that this department could in fact pass a law similar to the one we have on margarine, where we control certain aspects in the sale of margarine. Certainly it should be possible, if it were desirable, to ban the sale of these mineral-based detergents if in fact it is going to help this situation. I think it is a serious matter and I do not think it is one that can be discussed properly under the Water Resources Commission.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They are doing research on the whole problem.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me put it another way then. Is the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests aware of the resolution which came from the county of Wentworth, which I understand is being endorsed in the city of Hamilton, which deals specifically with this problem and which makes specific recommendations insofar as the sale of mineral-based detergents affect the growth of algae? Is he aware of that resolution?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I am aware of the problems in connection with these detergents and I am also aware of the fact that a great deal of research and work is being done on them by the Water Resources Commission.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, we will leave it at that then. The hon. Minister says he is aware of it, but I suggest to him, sir, that it is not enough just to be aware of it. I agree with this research, but in the meantime I was of the opinion that the growth of algae in our Great Lakes was increasing; it is becoming of considerable importance to municipalities with sewage disposal plants who are unable to properly treat the sewage because of these detergents. I think it is a serious matter.

I would think, if there were this much research going on that I have been led to believe this afternoon, that surely it should be possible to give the hon. members of this Legislature a report of what action can be expected to correct the situation. I do not think, sir, it is enough just to do research.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Again, I have no desire to be technical, but the Ontario Water Resources Commission comes under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. We have also an hon. member in the House who sits on the Water Resources Commission and I know that the control of pollution is a very large part of their job.

Algae, from the point of view of this government, is considered a problem of pollution, and I am sure that any question the hon. member wants answered about what in fact is being done, and what action is being taken by the government in this regard, could be given to him from an administrative point of view. It simply is not being handled by The Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I thank the hon. Prime Minister. I see the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is in the House today. I hope that he

will be able to give us some type of a report when the appropriate estimates come before the House. I have no desire to press it here if that is where I should be pressing it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: If the hon. member asks the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) during the Municipal Affairs estimates, I am sure he will tell him.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question under item 6 of The Park Assistance Act. I see where he has allowed \$300,000 this year. How many municipalities made use of this Park Assistance Act this past year?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I did not get the question.

Mr. Spence: I see in vote 1102, item 6, Parks Assistance Act, \$300,000 for this coming year. How many municipalities made use of The Parks Assistance Act this past year?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Seventeen municipalities were involved.

Mr. Spence: I must say, Mr. Chairman, a good many rural municipalities feel that the regulations are quite severe for them to make use of this Act. The requirements necessary for them to get a grant seem to be too rigid and they would like the department to reconsider some of those regulations.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think that is a very good point. Our whole policy is to improve and extend our recreational facilities and I think that is a good point. If the hon. member has any particular one he wants to bring to my attention personally I will consider it.

Mr. Spence: I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. Gibson: The hon. Prime Minister has expressed views that this debate should be restricted as much as possible within the strict confines of each estimate. I would like a ruling on whether or not the problem of the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes falls under 1102 or 1103.

Mr. Chairman: It comes under 1103.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, on conservation, the appropriation for ordinary expenditure this year amounts to \$1,264,000, capital disbursements for \$5 million. Now that is over \$6.25 million. According to the public accounts for the fiscal year ending March, 1962, the ordinary appropriation for that year was \$1,090,000, capital expenditure \$4,432,000, and there was a total

amount unexpended in that year of \$3,200,-767. Last year the estimate at that time for the year ending March, 1963, was roughly about \$6 million for ordinary expenditure and capital expenditure.

The question I would like to put to the hon. Minister is this. How much of that amount that was voted last year is still unexpended? How much did he spend of his appropriation last year out of a total of \$6 million?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Spent approximately \$3 million out of the \$4.5 million.

Mr. Thomas: Was that out of capital expenditure or the ordinary expenditure? Which was that out of?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is the capital we are referring to.

Mr. Thomas: How about the ordinary?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It was all used up.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister if there are any grants available for the establishment of public arboretums? Arboretums, that is tree farms.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No.

Mr. Innes: There is nothing available. If it was established by a community?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: What is the hon. member's second question?

Mr. Innes: If it was established by a municipality?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, we have no grants.

Mr. Innes: There is nothing available whatsoever. In the grants to conservation authorities, what jurisdiction does this department have in regard to the acquisition of lands and are they acquired outright by the authorities? Do the authorities have complete jurisdiction over the expropriation procedures?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: In connection with the checking of it, public works is requested to audit all the accounts and matters in relation to the transactions in connection with the land purchases.

Mr. Innes: Yes, but I am speaking of land that will be expropriated to expand an authority. Does the department have any jurisdiction over the terms of the agreement with the property owners, or has the authority—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think, if I understand the hon. member's question, the authority does the expropriation.

Mr. Innes: Yes, and it has complete control?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes.

Mr. Innes: The department has no jurisdiction whatsoever over what the authority does?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Oh, we would have jurisdiction in this sense. As you know, the personnel of the authority is made up of different people representing different interests and the government has representation. Then, of course, the whole thing has to be approved at our end before it is completed.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, following the disastrous floods in northern Ontario in 1960 and in years before that because of the floods in the Nipissing watershed, we tried to set up a conservation authority in that area. Unfortunately, to my mind, the shortsightedness of the representatives of the municipality of North Bay did not permit us to get the authority set up. One of the stumbling blocks, sir, is as the hon. Minister very well knows, that in the Nipissing watershed there are a large number of townships which are unorganized, and, of course, there would be no contribution from those townships for the authority. That was the reason why we failed. We had very fine support from the former director of the conservation branch and we still have it from the new director, Mr. Barnes.

The people of the flood plains of Nipissing, particularly in West Ferris and up along the Veuve River area, and in other sections, such as in the south arm of the lake, are quite concerned with conservation. However, as I say again, we have so many unorganized townships. The Department of Lands and Forests or the government of this country got a great amount of revenue from the forests that were there years ago. Now much of that land is denuded of forest. It is not only a problem of keeping water back this year, particularly with the water table so low—and I understand likely to be low for many years—we also have the problem of the storage of water.

Is there any possibility of the provincial government itself assisting in the development of the conservation authority because of the great number of unorganized townships?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say to the hon. member that we could make a study of the watershed, definitely, in that area, if it is thought advisable to do so. If the hon. member, in his capacity as a member up there, feels that this is something that he would like us to do, let us have something in writing on it, enough for us to take a look at it, and we will co-operate if it is advisable.

Mr. Troy: Thanks very much, sir. Those that were the prime movers in the project had hoped to get a conservation authority set up and then work from there so we would have some body that could deal officially with it, but I will accept the hon. Minister's advice and act as the go-between between the people of the area and the department.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: What the hon. member is suggesting really might be a bypassing of the present legislative setup for this sort of thing. Following the proper procedures he could get what he wants accomplished.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, on this particular vote, we take a good deal of criticism from the Opposition and I think it is very timely that someone should give the government a boost in connection with the conservation branch.

As you know, it was this government which initiated the legislation in 1946 which established The Conservation Authorities Act. Since that time, as the hon. Minister has pointed out, we have established in co-operation under one Ministry instead of having areas in the province of Ontario and they cover a wide area. To be specific, they cover over 20,000 square miles and the member municipalities number 445. I think this is something that we should all be very proud of.

I have often spoken in the House on conservation over the last 10 years. I have suggested from time to time that possibly we should combine the matters of conservation under one Ministry instead of having them divided, although on January 1, 1962, when we put the conservation matters under the Minister of Lands and Forests I think we solved that problem to a great extent.

Here in Metropolitan Toronto, the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority is, to my mind—and I have visited many of them throughout the United States and Canada—one of the finest conservation areas on the North American continent. The hon. members might be interested in knowing that we have over 10,000 acres.

Mr. Troy: Is it on the estimate, this question?

Mr. Cowling: What was that remark, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Troy: Is the question on this estimate?

Mr. Cowling: Yes, we are on conservation authorities.

This is a great and tremendous area and I would like to pay credit to Mr. A. Barnes, the director of the conservation authorities branch. I would like to commend Dr. Ross Lord, the chairman of the Metropolitan Conservation Authority, and his staff and other members of the authority who are doing such an excellent job.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. members of the House might be interested in some of the phases of this set-up in Metropolitan Toronto. For example, in 1962 we have several areas—one is called the Albion Hills area. During 1962 we had 202,576 visitors. In the Black Creek area we had 140,000 people visiting. In the Boyd area we had 235,000 people, and so on, for a total in 1962 of 892,362 people. That is nearly one million visitors from all over the province.

As I have told you we have 10,696,000 acres in which the conservation authority is interested. One of our features, and this is something that will certainly be tied into the 1967 centennial celebration, is our pioneer village. The popularity of the pioneer village continues to grow; it is attended by not only our own Toronto residents, but also by people from many parts of Canada and the United States. The attendance in 1962—

Mr. Gibson: What has this—

Mr. Cowling: Just listen and learn.

Mr. Gibson: What has this got to do with—

Mr. Cowling: Just listen. I have been sitting here for hours listening to you mouthing about certain things. I am going to tell you something now, so just smarten up, and listen. You fellows from the north country are just fine, but we have many things here in Metropolitan Toronto that are pretty good too. I suggest you come down when the weather is fine, and see some of these areas; brighten up a little bit.

To get back to the pioneer village I was talking about, the attendance in 1962—I will tell you where it comes, we are dealing with The Conservation Authorities Act under this particular item. In that I think the

Metropolitan conservation area is appropriate. Is that right Mr. Chairman? May I proceed? Thank you for your kind attention.

I have not any questions about this. I am going to tell you about the future. The future. The Metropolitan Toronto Authority is now well launched on its flood control programme; substantial evidence of this work will be built up steadily as the years go by. It is hoped that the Clairville dam will be started within a few months, and many others will then proceed.

While the matter of lakeshore development and erosion control does not fall within the direct scope of our activities, we cannot help but be interested in the face of conservation along our great waterfront. It has been said that this is a partnership—and I think that is very important, Mr. Chairman—comprising as it does 23 municipalities in our region, the Metropolitan region, the government of Ontario. To this partnership has been added the government of Canada, in our flood control scheme.

The authority has never failed to appreciate the support of its partners in the work of conservation; it should give satisfaction to all of us to witness the growing expansion and the use that the population of this great area makes of our areas. We are very happy in our new association with The Department of Lands and Forests, which has been in effect since January 1, 1962. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has been readily approachable, and has made the resources of his great department constantly available.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, under this vote comes the conservation of the fish resources. There is a movement on foot in our area to have the French River waterway linked up with Lake Nipissing, so it could be used for pleasure craft. If it were opened up, and we were able to get around the Chaudiere Falls, would there be a possibility that the lamprey eels from the Great Lakes then would come into the Lake Nipissing area and have a devastating effect on our fish resources?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Our offhand view on that, and I just want to consult—if you want expert advice consult with Dr. Clarke—but I do not think that the lamprey threat would be agitated one way or the other by the project you are talking about.

Mr. Troy: Under this vote then does come also the pollution of our waters affecting our fish resources. I have complaints from a resident of North Bay. He is an operator in

Timagami, and complains about the great number of fishing huts on the lake. There seems to me no regulation and no law which could compel these people to clean up garbage, or even remove the huts in the spring, and as you very well know that is a real tourist paradise. Anything that would in any way deteriorate the tourist possibility of the area is a serious problem. I do not know if the same situation applies in the Lake Simcoe area where they have a large winter fishing industry, whether they are compelled to remove the huts and clean up the area or not. Is there any regulation or law that compels these people to—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think what my hon. friend is getting at is the winter fishing problem perhaps, in one or more facets, and it is quite a problem. I noticed in today's *Toronto Globe and Mail* that apparently the retiring Lieutenant-Governor has been presented with a fish hut with the coat of arms and so forth on the entrance. Whoever presented him with that must have figured there was some merit to the business. Actually there has been a feeling on the part of the officials in the department, the game and fisheries branch, that in certain areas from the standpoint of biology, and the quantity and availability of fish, winter fishing could be beneficial.

There has also been a feeling on the part of local residents in the area, and in some cases it has been quite overwhelming on the part of the local people, that this is something that should be expected. There has also been protest from what you might call the summer cottagers. Summer residents, in some cases by organized protests against what they allege as possible vandalism, possible pollution and possible depleting of the fish, spoiling the summer fishing.

The expert advice on this, in the areas where we are allowing winter fishing, is that it is more positive to allow it than to not do so after taking into account all these things. We do have a certain amount of supervision in some areas; we have even made use of the scooter machines that go about on sleds to help in supervising, to see that there is not undue pollution, and that on the surface there is not undue garbage and so forth—of a different type than that mentioned by our hon. friend from Kenora left around. Also, on the subject of vandalism, to watch and check on that sort of thing.

I am not one who believes the average Canadian who wants to get out on the ice and fish is imbued with the idea of vandalism, or that he is going to be a law-breaker and

use the cloak of fishing for that. I am not worried about that. I think if he is a vandal he is a vandal whether he is fishing or doing something else. I do not really think that is a factor in it; that it should be sufficient to stop progress, if it is that, to go on in this sort of thing. I think it is becoming generally more popular. It is part of our winter recreation, and on balance at the present time in those areas where we have permitted it, we have done it after due consideration and we think that it is justified.

Mr. Troy: I have no objection to that. We in Nipissing are getting more and more winter fishing. The question was, though, in the removal of the fish huts at the end of the season, that it is recorded as this gentleman reports in the Timigami area that the huts are just left there and there is nothing that compels—apparently there is no regulation or any—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There is a new Act that is waiting proclamation, and it is not intended to proclaim that Act, as my hon. friend probably knows, until we have had it in front of the game and fish committee of the standing committee of the House, but once it is passed there and is proclaimed we can certainly have regulations to meet these sort of situations.

Mr. Chairman: Could I have vote 1102 passed?

Mr. Chapple: On vote 1102, Mr. Chairman, under item 5, grants to conservation authorities, you find that these conservation authorities have a great deal to do with the development of areas on which conservation is being practised, such as the growing of trees and so on. Recently in relationship with the province's attempt to develop the ARDA programme in relationship with the federal government, it has been suggested that this particular conservation authority can be worked into this programme through the assistance of The Department of Agriculture.

Can the hon. Minister give me any idea as to what co-operation The Department of Lands and Forests is going to give in this direction? What are your plans? Are we going to have any real co-operation with The Department of Agriculture in this regard so that a policy can be developed along lines which will improve conservation and also bring up the different programmes which are being developed, in the general rehabilitation of farm areas for purposes of farm rehabilitation?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member for Fort William that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) has a committee, as perhaps he is aware, and it deals under ARDA with projects such as he is mentioning. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot get an advance from our department and work with ARDA for something else.

Either we deal with it if it comes within the field of Lands and Forests, if it is not one to go to ARDA, or if it is one that goes under ARDA, then the whole thing is dealt with in that one direction.

Mr. Chapple: Yes, but I think the idea with The Department of Agriculture is that as few organizations be formed as possible to handle this. Does the hon. Minister have any plans in this direction about deciding whether it will be handled by the conservation authority or will a new organization have to be formed to do this particular job? What has the hon. Minister in mind, and what are his plans?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say that it is under the hon. Minister of Agriculture, under his vote, as to where it would go, in the situations where, as the hon. member is mentioning, the question really gets to ARDA.

Mr. Chapple: But the hon. Minister has no plans—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I mean in relation to our own things that come to us directly and not the combination that the hon. member is talking about, we deal and can deal with those.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Mr. Chairman, about 10 days ago there was a meeting of ARDA in the Lakehead cities to which some of the forestry officials were asked and attended. I think, as the hon. Minister knows, both Agriculture and Lands and Forests departments are working very closely together on the ARDA programme. Mr. Norman Harrison, the agricultural representative at the Lakehead convened this meeting, and he is in very close association at all times with your tree nursery farm, which is under the hon. Minister of The Department of Lands and Forests, and is located in Fort William.

These departments are working together to find out the best methods for the growing of trees on sub-marginal farms at the Lakehead and I expect they will be in touch with the hon. Minister to see that all phases of this programme are co-ordinated. I believe this

programme comes under the federal Minister of Agriculture first. Then he requests the Minister of Agriculture of Ontario to handle it through his department. I understand at the Lakehead meeting, there were forest officials and others intent on getting the programme started. There is a very close liaison between the two departments.

Mr. Chapple: Mr. Chairman, I know all that the hon. Minister of Mines is talking about. The information I am trying to get is: Does the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests know about it, and how far is he going to co-operate by making it possible for The Department of Lands and Forests to have a conservation authority or some other organization formed to co-ordinate this whole deal? That is all I am asking. I know everything that the hon. Minister of Mines is talking about, and this has nothing to do with what I am talking to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests about.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I will repeat it if necessary. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has this committee; and representation on this committee by The Department of Lands and Forests is maintained. If matters come to the Lands and Forests in relation to this field, and they think it should be brought before this committee of which the hon. Minister of Agriculture is in charge, it is put before the committee. He has two there right now.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1102 agreed to.

On vote 1103:

Mr. Gibson: I must say I was not much impressed with the last remark passed by the hon. Minister in respect to me being cleaned up at the coming election. May I suggest, sir, that in the first instance he look to himself, and secondly, if his party is as confident as he seems to be about the results, let us call an election and see what happens.

Mr. Whicher: We will be calling the next one.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Gibson: May I say, Mr. Chairman, that as a newcomer to this House and not being experienced at this type of political warfare, I am impressed by one particular thing in that the hon. Prime Minister, not in my time, has never so much as said a word in this House, and as a newcomer

all I can conclude is that he has not got the guts to call an election.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is very polite, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, that might not be polite but in my part of the north that is the way some people talk in situations such as this.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Oh, no, they do not.

Mr. Gibson: Now, if I may turn to a subject which has already been ruled in order, I would like to discuss briefly the problem of the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman: This comes under vote 1103.

Mr. Gibson: This is vote 1103, is it not? You called 1103.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gibson: I take it, Mr. Chairman, that I am in order? If I may turn to the subject of the sea lamprey problem in the Great Lakes, sir? This is a problem, a scourge, that has existed for a good many years. A scourge that has been magnifying itself and has reached proportions which I think require critical examination from all departments of this government.

The sea lamprey problem has caused a reduction in the Great Lakes commercial fishing to a stage now, or to a level, to which I do not think it has been for some many years, if it ever has been low as it is now. This problem was best stated in an article dated June 8, 1962, in the Kingston *Whig Standard*, the newspaper for which the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has shown great respect. I hate to take the name of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs in vain. The article reads:

One definition of conservation which is often given by Ontario's Minister of Lands and Forests, Honourable J. W. Spooner, is the wise use of natural resources. When shocking statistics reveal the depletion of lake trout in Lake Superior that definition seems to have been overlooked.

Whether the belated recognition of the seriousness of the situation by the International Great Lakes Fishery Commission and The Department of Lands and Forests will do much good for commercial fishing or the lake trout only time will tell.

It is significant, Mr. Spooner has admitted, that things are so desperate that even the most optimistic cannot foresee even a minimal lake trout fishery established at Lake Superior before 1970. It would be enlightening to know why the authorities have waited so long to act.

Over the past ten years they have been equipped with statistics which reveal a steady decline in production figures. In Canadian waters the catch went from 1,389,000 pounds in '52 to a meagre 44,000 pounds in '61. In U.S. waters the catch has dropped from 2,380,000 pounds to 298,000 pounds. The lamprey eel is blamed most of all by officials for the state of chaos which reigns today. Mr. Spooner says there is some optimism that the lamprey eel will be controlled by this year. But our hopes that the control would be effective before the lake trout population was reduced to the point of collapse, had been crushed.

Now not all fishermen or biologists are convinced that the lamprey eel is by any means the whole reason for the collapse. Some blame smelts and others blame the greed of commercial fishermen, and the latter suggestion may have had a great deal to do with the depletion of the lake trout. Commercial fishermen may have been greedy in that they have continued to fish heavily for the species even in the face of warnings that the schools were declining for whatever reason.

More important, however, is the revelation that The Department of Lands and Forests has been hoping that the problem would go away. Why, if the situation was so serious and was recognized as such, did not Mr. Spooner's department impose the restrictions it had announced at least five years ago? Surely it has a greater responsibility than just to sit by and hope that things will turn out well.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. If the situation was as serious as it states in this editorial, and I am sure it is, what does this government propose to offer to these fishermen, such as in the Killarney area where thousands and thousands of dollars have been invested in fish processing plants and in trawlers, and in boats, nets and other related equipment? What does the government offer to the fishermen on the Great Lakes? What can they say about the future of these people in view of the laxity and the procrastination in the past with respect to the sea lamprey problem?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, ignoring the ignorance from which the hon. member seems to speak, I will just make a definite statement in connection with lamprey control.

As you may know from the wide publicity given this matter, I am sure the whole House knows this except the hon. member for Kenora, it has been so serious that an international commission with an annual budget of over \$1 million supported by the United States and Canadian governments and by the province of Ontario, has been working on this; and the states bordering on the Great Lakes have been organized and are operating to eliminate or control this predator which is in international waters. Our staff is keeping close watch on the work of this commission.

Until results are evaluated on Lake Superior, they will not give immediate attention to Lake Huron or other lakes. The present method of attacking the sea lamprey is to poison the spawning streams, with a special poison developed for this purpose. It is highly selective and is used in concentrations which have only a slight effect on other fish in the treated stream, and none at all in the open lake. It has been stated that the effectiveness of the control measures taken against the lampreys, including barriers, electrical and mechanical weirs and poison, would be shown by reduced numbers in the spawning run of 1962; this has indeed proved to be the case, a reduction of about 80 per cent has been observed.

It is believed, however, that the 20 per cent lamprey remaining should and can be reduced by continuing the control measures.

No less authority than Dr. Clarke of our department, who is a Ph.D. and has had many honours put upon him, is the man who is working on this. And to listen to such tripe as just came from the hon. member for Kenora really makes you wonder how on earth the people of that area would elect such a person. In spite of our best efforts, however, it is doubtful that sea lamprey can be completely eliminated from our Great Lakes.

Our department is, therefore, as a part of the international programme, developing a selective hybrid lake trout which should be more resistant to the sea lamprey and therefore a successful substitute for the lake trout.

In spite of disease which decimated some of our valuable experimental hybrid stocks, good progress was made and we were successful in the selection of the characteristics necessary to the survival of the hybrid. Our losses by diseases are strictly

related to overcrowded facilities which it is hoped we can correct.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, might I say a word on this subject?

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Lanark.

Mr. G. E. Gomme (Lanark): Well, Mr. Chairman, we have not any sea lamprey where I come from but we have another problem that I would like to ask the hon. Minister about. We have a very great tourist area and very fine lakes. I might mention a few—Mississippi, White Lake, Bennett's Lake and Christie Lake.

Mr. MacDonald: Otty Lake.

Mr. Gomme: Yes, I believe you have been around there once or twice but we are going to eradicate you.

Mr. MacDonald: I have been there for 15 years and I will be there for many more too.

Mr. Gomme: But however, Mr. Chairman, our problem is this: Some years ago the department instituted a programme of having their biologists prove that there was enough natural restocking in these lakes to look after the vast amount of fishing that was going on. We have ten fish and game clubs in the area and none of them is satisfied that it has been proven to them at all, and I think the department should return to the procedure they had before, where they restocked these lakes, particularly with pickerel. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the department is taking that under consideration and can do something for this area?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I thank the hon. member for the nice polite way in which he puts his question and I want to assure him that his politeness will get immediate attention; we will plant pickerel in those lakes.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I want to be very polite too because I had every intention of bringing this matter up before the last hon. member spoke. In our area, with which the hon. Minister is very well acquainted, he was there just a week or so ago, we have many small lakes and I had it drawn to my attention that they do need pickerel and bass restocking. I was going to ask him: How do I go about getting some of these fish put in the streams and lakes?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Taking my hon. friend at his face value we will see that—

Mr. Whicher: How high a value is that?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We will see that the proper authorities come up and discuss that matter and see just what can be done.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word on the lamprey eel. Coming from the area I do, where we have the famous Dorian fish hatchery, one of the finest in Canada, I have had a lot of experience of seeing the stocking of Lake Superior, Lake Nipigon and these other waters that are so famous.

The hon. member for Kenora mentioned about what has been done to wipe out the lamprey. Hundreds of thousands of dollars, I imagine, have been used on these poisons. I watched the Kaministiquia river where these little lamprey are down in the mud with their mouths sticking up—they are suckers. When this poison is spread on the water—and remember it does not harm other fish—you will notice those little lamprey become filled with that poison, turn in circles, and come to the top and die.

Then you will notice the seagulls sitting on the banks, apparently this poison does not have any effect on them. They will gorge themselves on these lamprey until they cannot even fly. But it is just one of the methods which Lands and Forests are using to try to overcome this lamprey scourge which is a very destructive thing indeed, and has proven so.

Also the electric barriers. I have seen them in the rivers up there—they are put there at great cost and they have done a great deal of good in killing the lamprey. And I want to compliment The Department of Lands and Forests, the fisheries branch, on these methods they have taken at great cost to try to obliterate this scourge known as the lamprey. They have made great strides to date, but it is still a very, very serious thing as the lamprey destroy game fish and our tourist trade suffers. Lamprey affect commercial fishing as well.

Mr. Troy: The hon. Minister already told us all this.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I also want to say another word, sir, about some very rude remarks that were pointed at the hon. Minister. Where they come from I do not have to tell you but I think they are very discourteous and uncalled for.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have known the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests for a great

many years, in fact went to school with him in the town of Belleville. He is a northerner, do not forget; he spent years in the Cobalt country, in the mining business, a solicitor for many of the mines in Cobalt. He spent some years up north of Nakina at O'Sullivan Lake Mines, and he also spent time in Red Lake. He knows fully the problems of mining, and also lands and forests.

So when I hear a young member in the Opposition, whose years denote that he has had very little experience, and he has only been in this House a few months, rudely attack a man of that kind I think that he should be given a lesson in courtesy and should be told by somebody that this is not very becoming to him or the dignity of this House. I just wanted to say that in the hon. Minister's defence because it is factual and true.

An hon. member: The hon. Minister was just as rude to him.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman: I am sorry that I did not use the desired level of politeness when dealing with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, and I am deeply sorry that the hon. Minister of Mines is offended by it. But what these two hon. gentlemen forget is that I was sent down here by the voters of the district of Kenora to constructively serve in the Opposition of this House, and I intend to do so.

If I may turn to three separate items which I propose to ask in a brief form of the hon. Minister. Firstly, has The Department of Lands and Forests considered the possibility of using a point system in issuing hunting licences of various kinds? Secondly, in view of the present status of the duck population in Canada, has the department considered taking up a serious study of the duck population and duck problems in this province? And thirdly, does the department have any plans for introducing further conservation officers into the areas of the north where there are so few officers to cover the large area of land?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: On the first question, the point system. I suppose my hon. friend is thinking of the demerit system of the highways or something of that sort. I hope we will not have to get to that. We are trying hard and I must say we are getting tremendous co-operation from fish and game angling clubs, particularly hunting and angling clubs, in the training of individuals. The department itself does a lot of training

of novices in the use of firearms and the care of firearms and the safety factor involved in their connection.

There are, I know, many facets to this. There is the facet in southern Ontario where hunting—and I hope it is only very limited—on farms or across farms has caused anxiety to the farmers. I think we can work out—will work out—some plan to assure a fund, perhaps out of a section or portion of the licence fee, to give protection to people who are the victims of that sort of thing. I think we will find they are pretty isolated transactions. The use of firearms and training such as the junior forest rangers will get people in close contact with nature and will go much further towards sensible hunting and the use of firearms than any demerit system.

I might also say in regard to the question of conservation officers that we get personnel and we are using them and extending our services in that field. I think in the estimates this time we are asking for some additions for that very purpose. The matter of distribution, of course, will be a question of where they should go. That is certainly, definitely, a matter that is carefully and constantly being studied here.

On the question of the duck population, like all other wildlife population, this is under constant study, and I am sure we would have some literature available to forward to the hon. member to help him considerably to bring himself up to date on some of these subjects.

Mr. P. Manley (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, a year ago I raised this question in the House, and I was joined by yourself, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. W. E. Johnston) and, I believe, the hon. member for Lanark, and we made representation to the hon. Minister about this very serious problem of the beaver and the damage that it is doing to farm lands in eastern Ontario.

Now, I know in the county of Stormont we have a big population of beaver doing extensive damage to good farm land, and there doesn't seem to be much done about it. I am wondering with the representation that has been made to the former hon. Minister, if your department and if you are taking steps to take care of this menace that is so widespread in eastern Ontario. I would like, if you could give me an answer at this time, to know what you are doing or what you propose to do in order to help those farmers in the situation they find themselves in at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The department has taken definite action in the beaver problem, by the appointment of Conservation Officer Bruce Turner as an addition to the Kemptville establishment—that is the area that my hon. friend is speaking of, I understand—to deal primarily with the problem of poor management, with particular reference to a programme to increase the harvest of beaver by local trappers.

During the past fall we instituted an active trapping programme to relieve the pressure on the type of complaints that have caused my hon. friend to bring this question up.

Mr. Spence: I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister the plight of the Lake Erie commercial fisherman. I think over the last two or three years I have brought this to the attention of the ex-Minister, and, of course, he was very sympathetic and interested and I felt that he was willing or was going to try to do something for the fisherman. But I believe this has been forgotten, because nothing has been done for Lake Erie commercial fishermen in the last three years.

I might say that they have tried to do something for themselves this year. They went on a daily quota, and they did improve their price for fish, but still receiving a very low price. Each year and every year I think the former Minister of Lands and Forests told me that the production of fish in Lake Erie was going up. I know he was telling me the truth, but today there seems to be an over-supply of fish, or there is some great injustice going on in the buying of fish from the Lake Erie commercial fishermen. I think there should be a real examination and a thorough investigation of this whole industry.

I was quite impressed when we set up a Department of Economics and Development, and when the hon. Minister outlined it last year I thought this was going to be the golden era for the province of Ontario. I do not know if he has done anything. I talked to a few of these commercial fishermen, a few days ago, but they have never seen any of the officials of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development whatsoever. I would like to hear from this hon. Minister of Lands and Forests if he is going to take any action to assist the Lake Erie commercial fishermen.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, Mr. Chairman, the problem of the Lake Erie commercial fishermen is, first of all, divided into two sections, the west end and the east end of Lake Erie, and they are certainly not common to both. I have had dealings with the

spokesmen of both these associations and with the processors. The Department of Economics and Development has been called in, studies have been made and will continue to be made to endeavour to assist by working out a more satisfactory situation.

As you know, this winter certain restrictions were put into effect with the agreement of the people concerned, which I hope will be of some help. At least it is being studied carefully just what the effects of that will be. Rough weather on Lake Erie, perhaps, had an excellent effect without the regulations, but these have taken place this year.

I think my hon. friend would agree that restricting the licences, restricting the number of people fishing, plays a part in this, but I must say that, personally, I do not want to see that restriction carried on to a point where it becomes a monopoly. It seems to me there is a ground there where we can reasonably restrict without completely prohibiting anybody getting into this business. Perhaps the proper yardstick would be no new licences unless, and except, when old licences have been cancelled or turned in or something of that sort—perhaps not even to issue new ones to replace all of them, but I do not want to suggest that we are going to be completely rigid about that sort of thing.

On the other hand, I feel that in the enterprise system in which we operate we cannot take away entirely from people the opportunity of advancing their position. All these things have to be considered in the whole field of economics and competition. But I can assure the hon. member that we are studying it and we will always welcome, as I have found in my experience with him, any assistance that he would care to give from his own practical experience.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the hon. Minister, anything I could do to assist in giving some assistance to this industry, I would be only too glad to do. But I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he is still handing out gill net licences. As the hon. Minister knows, the fishermen went on a quota basis last summer in order to raise the price of fresh fish and they had good results, and I understand that the department is still issuing new gill net licences which is defeating the purpose of the fishermen. I wonder if that is true.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, as I said, on the basis there will be no extension of this, I will not say at all that there would not necessarily be some replacements. It was in

that field the policy would be to restrict, but certainly I am not going to say to this House that under no circumstances will anybody get a licence.

Mr. Spence: Well, I mean not too many new licences until these fishermen get a fair price for their product. I do not think that new licences should be issued if there is an over-supply of perch for the market.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: What I am trying to say there is, I think any issue would be based on cancellations or surrendering of licences so that we will not find ourselves extending them.

Mr. Spence: Thank you.

Mr. L. Quilty (Renfrew South): Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting back here in the corner trying to be very polite. I see we have to be very polite today or we will be told off. I have a couple of questions that I would like to ask the hon. Minister. The first one is, what method is used in determining the persons who receive the right to issue hunting and fishing licences?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Perhaps I had better get the question. I thought the hon. member was asking about the right to issue. I thought the hon. member was talking about the policy in regard to the right to issue. Am I right on that?

Mr. Quilty: Yes, sir.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think there is a little bit of cross-play going on here in regard to another phase of the matter.

The issuing of licences is based on public convenience. It is based also on reasonable numbers in areas and not perhaps to make it so that everybody has one. It is also based on the requirements, bonding and accounting and the capacity of individuals to keep proper books and to do their job so that they do not cause headaches to the department after they have been allowed to do this work.

On the other hand I recognize, too, that from the standpoint of outfitters and sporting store people that it is a convenience or would be a convenience, perhaps, to be able to issue these right along with their sales. I do not think we can go that far, but my own tendency would be to, shall I say, loosen up rather than tighten up in relation to the issue so long as we can be sure we do not,

by so doing, get some people in there who are going to really be headaches by reason of their incapacity to keep books and make returns and handle the monies that get in their hands that way in a proper manner.

Mr. Quilty: Thank you, sir, I will remember the answer to that question and ask one of my constituents to reapply. He has been turned down several times and as a matter of public convenience, I am convinced that he should have been granted the right.

Before asking my second question I would like to read a paragraph from your weekly report in the district of Pembroke regarding wolves—we are back on that subject again. It is written by Mr. Tait from the department in Pembroke. He says:

Wolves active in the upper Ottawa area. Many wolves have been seen recently along the Upper Ottawa River in the vicinity of Des Joachims, Stonecliffe and Deux Rivières. The wolves' objective is to chase a deer on the river ice and then very rarely does the deer escape.

Wolves active in the Upper Ottawa in this area as well. There have been two instances of this in the past week. A few days ago a former employee of The Department of Lands and Forests at Stonecliffe who is now a licensed trapper overtook a single wolf on the highway just west of Deux Rivières. He struck the wolf with his car and then killed the dazed animal with an ice chisel which he had in his car.

A day or so later the road superintendent of the North Bay division of The Department of Highways while on patrol observed a pack of 10 to 12 wolves on the highway near the same area.

He chased them along the highway for a considerable distance before they finally left the roadway. This proves the fact that in quest for survival the wolf can become very bold indeed. As for the question, are wolves on the increase, the answer in its entirety can be very involved.

The question I would like to ask the hon. Minister, from the wolf studies based over the last few years, does the department consider that it has learned anything by which it can control not only the numbers but the spread of wolf packs?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that that question has been a very live one before this advisory committee about which the hon. member for Bruce asked, concerning the personnel, earlier today. The

various viewpoints on this have been expressed before this committee and a study is proceeding in connection with it by experts in the department.

I think the hon. member comes from a part of the country in which the problem—he knows something about it from a practical standpoint and he realizes that these predatory animals such as wolves, despite the fact that lots of bedtime stories are told about them, actually do play a part in the game harvests of this country and this province. Therefore the problem is proper distribution and control as to numbers, but certainly not the extinction of them.

We do work on the basis of the bounty system and we try to control it in that way too. But the advisory committee at the present time has that subject and I think that it will get before this standing committee of the House with a certain amount of intelligent background and presentation in order that the members of the committee may discuss it and deal with it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I had a question I wanted to ask the hon. Minister, but I cannot withhold some comment on that half truth he uttered a moment ago, namely that the right to issue licences will be granted to a person on the basis of public convenience. I suggest he take his tongue out of his cheek and tell the other half of the story.

I had rather an interesting instance in my own riding about two or three years ago, the only one of this nature brought to my attention. It was a clear case of public convenience. There had been an issuer of licences in this area, but it had lapsed for some reason or other. There was a man running a sporting goods store in the area. He was a well-known and respected person, and he applied in the normal course of events—

An hon. member: How did he vote?

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact I do not think his political associations are known; they certainly are not open. The point is he was a respectable citizen and could do the job. The beginning of the hunting season was approaching and he had heard nothing, so he got in touch with me. After all, I was the elected representative—I had defeated a gentleman by the name of Bill Beech—and he got in touch with me and said, "What about this?"

Well, I traced his application through the department, and do you know where it was? It was sitting on top of the Minister's desk.

This is not the present hon. Minister; it was a predecessor. It was sitting there on the Minister's desk waiting for an okay. He had to go back and get the okay from the Tory machine in York South. And the man, very angrily—I think they lost a vote instead of gaining it in this instance—was rather shocked at the shoddy, petty, patronage basis upon which it was handled.

Anyway, he eventually got in touch with me and said, "Thank you for your assistance." He also said, "I met somebody [I will not name him, he is a well-known Tory in the area] who said 'Oh, you are wasting your time, you are going to the wrong person; you should go to Bill Beech.'" You see, I was elected, Bill Beech was defeated. But if you wanted to get a licence, even though you had all the qualifications and were meeting public convenience, the one thing lacking was that the applicant had to get the okay of Bill Beech who was the dispenser of Tory patronage in the area, as the defeated Tory candidate.

Mr. Singer: Did he get the licence?

Mr. MacDonald: I think he eventually got the licence, because he was so obviously the person to get the licence, in the area. But it sat on the desk of the hon. Minister until they got a clearance from the local dispenser of Tory patronage. Now would the hon. Minister take his tongue out of his cheek and give us the full story?

I have a question which can be dealt with rather briefly, Mr. Chairman. It was just the provocative comments of the hon. Minister that made me relate to the House this little story.

I have been in receipt of some correspondence, as I suspect other hon. members of the House have, from the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping. Quite frankly, I know nothing about this but I am curious to know what the government's reaction to it is. They have, in the second of a number of recent letters, stated that in their view the Ontario government should undertake a full-scale instruction programme to demonstrate the use and advantages of the Conibear trap. They go on to say that the government should determine how the cost of the humane trap to trappers can be reduced. Secondly, the government should prohibit the use of the leg-hold trap on all Crown-owned property and simultaneously, they say, take one or other of the following steps: (a) undertake research to perfect a full size range of Conibear traps, or (b) make illegal on Crown property the trapping of all animals for

which the Conibear trap is not now satisfactory.

Would the hon. Minister inform me as to what the official view is with regard to these representations?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I would say this: The Trappers Association are a pretty good association of responsible people; I mentioned them earlier today. I had the pleasure of meeting a lot of them personally, and they are a pretty sound lot of people. We do have certain courses of procedure that they are expected to follow.

Of course, we would not turn down any just out of hand, any suggestion such as was made by this society for the prevention of cruelty in that particular field. But we are not too worried about the general practice; I think it is reasonably good. I am satisfied that the people who are doing it are the type of people who certainly are not going to inflict unnecessary cruelty on animals.

However, there is always room for further suggestion and, if this is something that was felt advisable to bring before the standing committee of the House, why certainly it should have a chance to be looked at there. Perhaps that committee might want to make some representations.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has

come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that when this House adjourn it shall stand adjourned until two of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue in the afternoon with the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests. We will have a night session tomorrow night and we will go back into the estimates of the Attorney-General tomorrow night.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 of the clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Fifth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Morrow	911
Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. R. C. Edwards, first reading	911
Department of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Whicher, first reading	911
Statement re legislative grants to school boards, Mr. Robarts	912
Supplementary estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis	926
Supplementary estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond	928
Supplementary estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Roberts	933
Supplementary estimates, Department of the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Allan	933
Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Roberts, continued	933
Recess, 6 o'clock	952

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1963

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery students from Swansea Public School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West) from the standing committee on private bills presented the committee's fifth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. Pr3, An Act respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr10, An Act to incorporate the Association of the Chemical Profession of Ontario.

Bill No. Pr11, An Act respecting the Esther Taylor Wood Trust and the John Taylor Evans Memorial Trust.

Bill No. Pr26, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on the following bill:

Bill No. Pr3, An Act respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that **Mr. A. W. Downer** (Dufferin-Simcoe) be substituted for **Mr. R. Belisle** (Nickel Belt) on the standing committee on private bills.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): **Mr. Speaker**, before the orders of the day, the hon. member for York South (**Mr. MacDonald**) has asked the following questions.

1. Have applications been made since 1960 by three St. Catharines business men for revival of racing charters?

2. If so, who were the applicants and were the applications granted?

The answers are as follows: Many inquiries have been directed to The Department of the Provincial Secretary respecting the charters of racing associations and revivors over the years. Among these inquiries were some from the area generally known as the Niagara Peninsula. A review of files discloses that these inquiries include some made by men who presumably fall within the classification of "St. Catharines businessmen".

No application was filed by any of these men for the revivor of the corporate powers of any corporation. For the answer to two, see answer one.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question. Perhaps the hon. Minister is not in a position to answer it at this moment. In his estimates he stated that there were 21 instances in which power for revivor had been granted. In how many instances were actual applications made and a refusal given by the department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: None; subject to this qualification, which also appears in my statement, in respect of the Chesley Driving Park. That was an application which, I believe, had reached the formal stage but which was refused. The other 21 were, to my knowledge, all the applications which had been filed and now have been granted.

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. members to the supplement to the *Financial Post* dealing with the city of Brantford. I would like the hon. members to read the feature report of one of Canada's most diversified industrial cities. I would also like to remind the hon. members that Brantford is the telephone city, and the first city in the Commonwealth to fluoridate its water supply.

I draw your attention to the splendid advertisements and the progress of the Cockshutt Company and the Massey-Harris Company, which is now in the process—the steelwork has been erected—of erecting a \$13.5 million plant. Brantford is indeed growing.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). The question is this: Will the hon. Minister summarize for this House the main findings and recommendations of the Price-Waterhouse inquiry into the operations of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Brantford, I would point out that this was not in any sense an inquiry into the operation of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission.

Price-Waterhouse and Company carried out a functional audit respecting the day-to-day business operation of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. Having three years of operation, the commission felt that an objective survey would be valuable to them and, at the request of the commission, Price-Waterhouse and Company undertook the work.

This type of functional audit is in accordance with good sound business practice and in no way does it constitute, or is it intended to be, an inquiry. It is hoped that the advice of this reputable and experienced company will assist the commission in laying down guide lines for the future.

Mr. Gordon: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, please. Could a copy of this report be given to each member before the estimates of The Department of Health

are brought forward, instead of having this report die, as I understand it has been allowed to do?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is not proposed whatsoever. This was not an inquiry. It was not a report in the usual accepted sense. This was a business procedure adopted by the commission itself to assist it in its daily operation. I cannot see, sir, at this point why this should be distributed to every hon. member of the House.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Why not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Because this sort of thing is going on all the time in our various departments, Mr. Speaker. In my own department I frequently call for some outside body to take an objective look at some phase of my operation. They have two choices, they can either report to me verbally or put the report in writing. And because I may want their findings and their opinions for a future date I expect them to put them in writing; therefore, they do so. But these reports are not made available to every hon. member of the House. I have never known this to be done before.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I suggest, if I understand the discussion properly, that this was an inquiry, or at least an examination, if you will, that was requested by the Hospital Services Commission itself. Now surely this is a public institution; the report has been made by a reputable accounting firm; I can see no reason whatsoever why it should not be made available to the representatives of the people, who are financing this very institution.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, in reading the transcript of the debates yesterday I notice that there was an error in the initials of one of the members of the advisory committee, which had been read to the House by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts). I am rather surprised that he would not know the initials of a very prominent member of his party, also a very prominent lumberman. In the transcript it said the initials of Mr. McNutt were W. F. So that it will be corrected before it goes into *Hansard*, the initials are J. W.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a statement I would like to make. Today we

have mailed out the regulations covering legislative grants to the school boards for the coming year and it seems to me that this is an appropriate time to tell the hon. members of the Legislature about the plans and policy this government has in regard to changes in the grants system, and in our educational system in the province. This statement I would like to make at this time.

In introducing the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan, 1964, as it will be called, I wish to make it clear that we have not simply adopted one of the "foundation" plans developed for use in other jurisdictions. This new grant plan has been designed and fashioned to fit the varying conditions of our own province and thus overcomes, for our situation, the weaknesses of the other so-called "foundation" programmes. It is an entirely new grant plan and represents, in our opinion, the biggest of the many steps this government has taken towards a fuller equalization of educational opportunity throughout our great province.

This year, 1963, will see the implementation of the final stage of The Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grant Plan of 1961, which was designed to assist homeowners and farmers by reducing taxes on the basis of school population. That far-reaching plan became effective in 1961, covering that year and the years 1962 and 1963. The grants under this plan were paid in addition to the generous increases made each year in the total general legislative grants paid to school boards. It was the culmination of a series of far-reaching grant programmes extending back to 1943.

During the time I was Minister of Education, it became apparent to me that it would be advantageous to make a close examination of our grants programme with a view to devising a more comprehensive plan tailored to the needs of today. With this in mind, I instituted very wide-reaching studies into the whole question of provincial assistance to education.

During the period that these studies were being carried on, briefs and comments were independently prepared and published by various organizations, including the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ontario, the Anglican Bishops of Ontario, the United Church of Canada, the Inter-Church Committee on Protestant-Roman Catholic Relations, the Moderator's Committee of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Federation of Catholic Parent-Teacher Associations of Ontario and the joint brief of the Ontario Separate School Trustees' Association and L'Association des Commissions des Ecoles Bilingues

d'Ontario. I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my warmest thanks and appreciation to the many people who have worked so hard and in such an understanding and restrained manner in preparing the ideas and beliefs of their groups regarding this very important question of education in our province and its financing. The discussions which I have had with these groups concerning the contents of their briefs have been carried on in an atmosphere of utmost amicability. We are all aware of the very delicate nature of many of the questions which must be examined and dealt with firmly if proper solutions to these problems are to be found. We are, I think, all aware of the very deep-running opinions held by broad sectors of our population, extending back over a century, in relation to these questions. That we, in 1963, are able to discuss intelligently and dispassionately, with a view only to seeking a proper solution without rancour or prejudice, is in my opinion a great tribute to the individuals concerned and a great mark of the maturing of our society.

As a result of these many consultations and the studies carried out over a period of some 18 months, it is the intention of the government to introduce an entirely new school grant plan, effective in 1964. The Ontario Foundation Tax Plan, 1964, is designed to incorporate the most desirable features of the existing grant plan and in addition takes entirely new and very fundamental steps to equalize educational opportunity throughout the province.

In this year 1963, certain provisions will be made preliminary to entering upon the new plan next year. One of these is the completion of the programme of residential and farm school tax assistance grants referred to above. The other new provisions—which have been incorporated in the grant regulations and which I say have been mailed either last night or this morning to all school boards—are also part of the initiating stage of the new plan for 1964. The main purpose of the changes in 1963 is to achieve much greater equalization at once, thus providing a more gradual transition to the new plan, by giving substantially greater assistance to those boards most in need. In total, with these changes, the amount estimated to be paid in school grants in 1963 will be increased by more than \$32 million.

First, in order to get this whole problem in perspective, I shall make reference to what has been done in the province during the tenure in office of this government. Legislative school grants, of course, go back

to the beginning of our school system. It was, however, in 1943 that the present very broad provisions designed to equalize educational opportunity across this province were first introduced by this government. Just 20 years ago at this time, in 1943, school grants totalled \$8.4 million. For the coming year these same grants will total \$233,300,000, which gives some measure of the magnitude of the changes made commencing in 1943. This, of course, is not the total cost of education to the provincial government. It is estimated that this coming year these costs will reach the huge total of \$395,532,000. The comparative figure to this for 1943 was only \$14.2 million. These expenditures, in addition to providing an equality of opportunity in the province never before enjoyed, and indeed never before envisaged, also provide for realistic teacher salaries, adult education, assistance to libraries, and correspondingly increased assistance to our universities and other institutions of higher education.

What I am about to say deals with the matter of school grants as affecting public, separate, academic secondary and vocational secondary schools. The disparity in the ability of communities in Ontario to support these forms of education is, of course, the principal problem. It is similar in all of the schools mentioned. In some communities there is a great deal of industrial assessment, either corporate or personal. In others, there is none. This is true of both public and separate schools. Therefore, in formulating a system of grants it has been necessary to take into consideration the financial strength of the individual school section.

The school grant system in Ontario has always been based upon the ability of school boards—public, separate, and secondary—to provide certain basic standards, and also upon their financial resources to meet this demand. Of course, with the new approach developed in 1943 this became much more evident. And I think I should mention here the matter of “financial equity” or “equality of opportunity.” Never in the history of our province have we made such strides towards the accomplishment of this objective as we have since the termination of World War II. The extent to which we have made available and placed within reach the finest of opportunities in elementary and secondary schools for all of our children will be, in my opinion, assessed as one of the great accomplishments of our time. In all of the briefs submitted in the last few months from all sources, there has been an acknowledgment of what has been done. To reach equality of opportunity we must first recognize the disparity of wealth

and financial means in the 4,000 school sections across the province. I shall deal with this in more detail later. It is sufficient to point out here that we have poor school areas in our public, separate and secondary school systems. Our school grants have been devised to help equalize opportunity and to rectify these disparities. In many of our public, separate and secondary schools, in recognition of this situation, the province pays grants up to 95 per cent of the total cost of education. The result of this policy is shown in the growth of fine new schools, elementary and secondary, across the province and particularly in parts which, from the standpoint of assessment, were the poorer areas. In every part of Ontario the evidence of the policy of equality of opportunity and financial equity may be seen. There are, of course, many items entering into the determination of these matters, some of which I shall mention later. Among them is the fact that a dollar goes farther in some places than in others, because for instance, of vastly different costs of living in the various areas.

In treating with these matters it is a great mistake to believe that separate and public schools have been differently dealt with. They have received the same treatment. Subject to the provisions of our Constitution, The British North America Act, by which we are all bound and to which I shall refer later, all have been dealt with in exactly the same manner from a standpoint of grants. Where a school board, public or separate, has a low assessment which may result not only from the absence of corporation taxes but from low residential and farm assessments, then that school board receives larger grants which, as I have said, may reach up to 95 per cent of the board's authorized cost in order that it may provide the standards required by the department. Across the province, in recognition of this fact, in 1960—the last year for which complete data are available—provincial grants provided 58 per cent of separate school costs and 34 per cent of public school costs, and provincial grants per pupil were \$111.07 for separate schools and \$102.36 for public schools taken on the average. If we were to compare any public or separate school with comparable assessment, then they would receive exactly the same grants. If we were to pick out public school boards or school areas to correspond exactly with the separate school board areas in the province, then their grants in total and by percentage would be exactly the same as separate school grants. All boards receive exactly the same treatment. There is exact financial equity if we compare schools with

similar assessment. This has been carried into the treatment of schools in similar municipalities. It may be that in some municipalities the assessments of a public and a separate school may vary per pupil and per classroom. In such case the grants vary and are greater for a school having lesser assessment. If, of course, the assessment in a particular school area increases per classroom and per pupil, then, of course, the grants decrease. The results of these policies are to be seen across the province and particularly in the fact that we here in Ontario have opened a new school or a substantial new addition every day of every week of every year, Sundays and holidays included, for the past 15 years.

(Applause)

I would like to refer in more detail to the variations of need of school boards even within particular municipalities and the way this need and ability to pay can be measured in different ways:

1. One factor is a calculation of assessment per classroom for elementary schools, and assessment per capita for secondary schools. These values provide the measure of the resources the particular school board has to meet its obligations.

2. A second factor which can never be overlooked is the number of children to be taught. This is brought into the plan through the computation of average daily attendance, and the basing of grants thereon. Therefore, these two items—1, and 2—are the principal bases upon which resources and needs are determined for school grant purposes.

3. Developed within the past few years is another test or yardstick of need. This factor has become very important in fast-growing municipalities and is known as the "growth-need factor." The very rapid growth of school population in recent years in some communities—a population which had, in many cases, been relatively static for long periods of time—led to the introduction of this factor. The importance of this factor can be seen from the fact that today we have nearly three times as many children in our schools as we had in 1945, although our total population increase in that period of time is only 60 per cent. The incidence of this growth is, of course, uneven. The problem, however, is common to both public and separate schools, and to both elementary and secondary schools, and accordingly imposes a heavier burden on some municipalities than on others. The development of school grants to recognize growth-need has been largely pioneered in

Ontario. Very few, if any, other jurisdictions have built such a factor into their grant structure.

4. Another very important factor introduced in 1961 is the residential and farm school tax assistance grant programme. This plan differentiates between residential and farm as compared with commercial assessment. In commercial assessment as we all know taxes are treated as a cost and deducted for income tax purposes. On residential and farm assessment, on the other hand, there is generally no such allowance. This plan, therefore, was aimed at lightening the burden on the home-owner and the farmer.

5. A fifth very important factor introduced in recent years is provincially equalized assessment. This was adopted to help reduce the inequalities of assessment in different municipalities and, at the same time, to leave untouched the autonomy of the local municipality to assess properties within its boundaries. It should be pointed out that our experience has shown that provincially equalized assessment provides a very reasonable yardstick for a grant system, as we have used it. However, it would be entirely unsuited for levying a common tax rate across the province, as proposed under some foundation programmes. Such a common tax rate would require a provincial assessment of all properties of all municipalities at frequent intervals, which would naturally be regarded by the municipalities as a grave curtailment of their autonomy.

Any system of school grants in Ontario must have regard to section 93 of The British North America Act and particularly subsections (1), (3) and (4), which read as follows:

93. In and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:

(1) Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union [that is, at the time of Confederation]:

(2) [This subsection is not relevant.]

(3) Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any Act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman

Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education:

(4) In case any such provincial law as from time to time seems to the Governor-General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor-General in Council on any appeal is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section and of any decision of the Governor-General in Council under this section.

The effect of this enactment is to "entrench" any legal right or privilege with respect to denominational schools as such existed on July 1, 1867. To begin to get the import of of section 93 for Ontario, one must read The Separate Schools Act of 1863 (26 Victoria, 1863), which was in effect at the time of Confederation.

In Ontario this constitutional enactment has been subject to a host of legal interpretations, as most of you are well aware, and time will permit me to give only a very general reference to this section. In effect, this section of The British North America Act makes this test of any enactment passed by this House:

Does the statute enacted prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of person had by law in the province at the union?

Thus, for Ontario, the constitution of our country has generally meant that the provisions of The Separate Schools Act of 1863 became unalterable.

In other words, The Separate Schools Act of 1863 became entrenched. This fact can only be changed by an amendment to The British North America Act, which is completely impracticable. Even if such a change were desired by the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario, for example, or by the Protestant majority, for that matter, the fact that the enactment affects minority rights of other groups in different ways in other provinces would make any constitutional change a practical impossibility.

There is a further complication. The rights and privileges in The Separate Schools Act of 1863 in practically all instances run in favour of the individual and not in favour even of the majority of the class of persons

referred to as the minority. The majority of such minority might in fact desire a certain enactment, but any individual—a member of such minority—could successfully object to such enactment as prejudicially affecting a right or privilege running in his favour by reason of section 93 of The British North America Act. In other words, our courts would declare it to be *ultra vires*.

Briefly, the basic right of the individual member of such minority to allocate his taxes as he sees fit to either public or separate schools is inviolate. Neither the provincial government nor the majority of the minority can interfere with this right: That constitutional right is one which cannot be abrogated; and it must, therefore, be accepted as a fundamental condition of school finance in Ontario. This fact makes it necessary, for instance, to treat elementary and secondary grants on a different basis in some cases.

The conditions referred to above, because of the entrenchment of The Separate Schools Act of 1863, are peculiar to Ontario. For instance, while either a municipal council or the Minister of Education may amalgamate several public school sections, no such power exists with regard to separate schools. This right runs to any number of persons, not less than five, being the heads of families and freeholders or householders resident in any municipality, and being Roman Catholics, who may form a separate school board. The rights to amalgamate separate school areas, or to dissolve the same, rest with them in the local community, and with no one else.

Section 2 of The Separate Schools Act, 1863, confers the right of electing school trustees for the management of a Roman Catholic separate school on any number of persons, not less than five, as described above. It should be pointed out that this right does not run in favour of the Roman Catholic minority in the province but only to those of such minority who reside in the public school section of a municipality. They have complete authority.

This underlines the relatively personal nature of a large number of rights and privileges which are "entrenched" by The British North America Act. I mention these things to illustrate the fact that what we do in Ontario must, of necessity, be quite different from that which may be done in other provinces and, most certainly, in the states of the United States. A very grave error may be committed by comparing what is being done in Ontario with what is being done in other

provinces of Canada, or in any state of the United States, which are not affected by an enactment such as The Separate Schools Act, 1863, or by any other enactment which might have been in effect here, in Ontario, at the time of Confederation. In other words, the effect of section 83 of The British North America Act depends entirely on the law as it was in each province on July 1, 1867.

The first necessary step, therefore, in considering the Ontario grant system, or any changes therein, is to premise the same on the law which is binding, as it must be, upon us all. As stated before, these constitutional rights cannot be abrogated and we must accept them as a fundamental feature of school finance in Ontario.

I shall now refer to the matter of corporation taxes as they may apply to separate schools. And by corporation taxes, I mean those taxes which arise from assessment which produces school taxes in our local municipalities; I am not referring to corporate income tax. At no time will I refer to corporate income tax, when I do refer to corporation taxes. This has been the matter of very much debate, and considerable litigation. I have referred to the right of the Roman Catholic individual as "entrenched" by The British North America Act, to allocate his taxes to either separate or public schools. There has been little, if any, problem in the operation of this provision insofar as it relates to *personal* assessments—residential, farm or commercial. The matter of *corporate* assessments, however, has presented very great difficulties, and difficulties not considered at all, I would say, in the Confederation settlement.

With the growing industrialization of the province and the creating at an ever-increasing rate of corporate entities, this has become a very real problem. The first effort to deal with this problem was made in 1886, in an amendment to The Separate Schools Act, and which has been interpreted to mean that the Roman Catholic shareholder would have the right to allocate the taxes as related to his ownership in such corporation. This has never worked satisfactorily. It should, however, be pointed out that this apparent injustice has been partially recognized and corrected in the existing grant system, and particularly since 1943, with the coming of a vastly increased provincial grant system.

Assessment per classroom and assessment per capita have tended towards equalization. In other words, the lack of corporate assessment is reflected in the need factors to which I have referred and accordingly is compen-

sated for by the payment of larger grants. However, it would provide for better satisfaction all around if there was a reasonable method of ascertaining the ownership of the Roman Catholic minority in corporate organization in the province. The impossibility of making the principle of the Act of 1863 work in the year 1963, with our complicated corporate organization, can be illustrated by the simple example of one company, for instance, and this is not uncommon, holding stock in 25 other companies, all of which are subject to assessment for school purposes. This, of course, is in addition to the fact that, by reason of the operation of stock exchanges and the constant purchase and sale of shares, it is a complete impossibility to ascertain ownership of all the shares at any given time.

May I refer to the effort of the Hepburn government to meet this situation by amendments to The Assessment Act in the year 1937? The efforts made by that government to find some solution to the problems of separate schools were confined entirely to amendments to The Assessment Act, and not by any change in the grant system. From the outset, therefore, the effort was doomed to failure and, as a matter of fact, the effort was and is acknowledged to have been a complete failure.

These amendments were passed by this House on April 9, 1936. After operation for less than one year, on March 25, 1937, they were repealed as unworkable. Premier Hepburn himself gave the reasons. He stated that the legislation was a failure because of our particular corporate structure and the complexity of interlocking and holding companies. He therefore stated, and I quote, that: "I find that the Act does not work and it will not work under present conditions." What was said in 1937 is completely true today. Unfortunately, the failure of the 1936 legislation and its repeal in 1937 ended all of the efforts of the Liberal administration of that time to deal with the problem.

In 1943 came the clear recognition that the fundamental problem was the disparity in wealth among the various school boards of the province—both public and separate. At that time, it was realized that the proper approach was through a modern and generous grant system which would recognize, in an adequate way, the financial resources and deficiencies of the various school boards of the province. If the Hepburn plan had been workable, it simply would have had the effect of decreasing the local resources of one board by increasing the local assessment of another

board in the same municipality which, I think you will agree, in all would have been a classic exercise in utter futility. The actual solution was then, and is now, to be found in the transfer of provincial revenues to local school boards on a basis which provides for equality of opportunity throughout this broad province with all of its varying conditions. That principle is recognized by this government as fundamental and, in the consideration of this problem, must be treated as basic.

As I have pointed out, and shall elaborate upon later, we have many and varying conditions peculiar to Ontario, stretching from our highly industrialized areas to pioneer conditions.

All of this, sir, is complicated by the unalterable constitutional requirements with reference to denominational or separate schools which simply have to be recognized in their finest detail. Above everything else, it is our duty, if we are to survive, to equip all our children in the very best possible way for service to their country and themselves. No one will dispute this. But, in achieving this, we must be meticulous about observing and, indeed, safeguarding the rights and privileges conferred by section 93 of The British North America Act, in letter and, as well, in spirit.

Also, in considering a grant plan in Ontario, one must be aware of loosely applying to the province of Ontario "foundation programmes," so-called, which are in effect, or which have been in effect, in other jurisdictions. As I have pointed out, conditions in Ontario vary greatly from those in other jurisdictions—in Canada or in the United States.

For instance, in Ontario the constitutional conditions imposed upon our province are totally and completely different than those which are imposed by the American Constitution on, say, the state of New York. Again, I point out that section 93 of The British North America Act has little meaning unless it is applied to the laws in each particular province as they existed on July 1, 1867. Accordingly, there are some points to which I should like to make reference, which must be intelligently considered in arriving at a plan which will meet the many and varied requirements of our province.

So-called foundation programmes became popular in the United States many years ago. Most of them have either been discarded or greatly modified. In applying the principles of these plans to Ontario, grave errors can be committed if reliance is placed in main on the formula used in other jurisdictions.

What may be termed the basic formula would require the province to specify in detail all the elements of an "ideal" or "adequate" school programme, then to select one of the "better" or "more expensive" school boards in the province and, on the basis of its expenditure, establish "unit costs per pupil of average daily attendance." The province must then set the mill rate to be levied by every school board. If any school board spends more than this, then it must raise the money by additional taxation—if permitted to do so.

Another approach used by some foundation programmes is to pay all local taxes into one fund called the equalization fund. Into this fund are also paid all provincial grants. Then each board gets back a fixed amount per pupil of average daily attendance, whether it needs more money or less money, and regardless of the amount it has actually paid into the fund. Some boards on this scheme receive "negative" grants, that is, pay in more than they receive from the fund; others receive more than they can spend, and are forced to levy much higher taxes than they desire.

The sheer impossibility and impracticability of applying such a plan to Ontario is very evident from the following illustrations of difficulties which would be encountered:

1. One cannot assume that the "unit cost" figure is a direct measure of the quality of education in each case, and it is a serious mistake to believe that raising the expenditures of all boards to this minimum level will ensure the raising of the quality of education to the desired level.

2. No rigid formula of fixed unit cost and fixed local tax rates can possibly work satisfactorily in a province like Ontario with our wide variations in municipal structure, in local conditions and wealth, and with nearly four thousand school boards operating every conceivable type of school, from the one-room rural school to the large and highly complex systems of large cities and suburban townships.

3. I have referred to provincially equalized assessment and the fact that it does work reasonably well in a grant system. On a fixed mill rate basis, however, the situation would be chaotic, and the only answer would be for provincial assessment and its application in every municipality in Ontario. The gravest of misunderstandings between municipalities can arise through the translation of provincially equalized assessment into local assessment; for instance, 20 mills of equalized assessment in one municipality might mean

15 mills on its local assessment and in another municipality might mean 70 mills on its local assessment. The effect, therefore, of a common mill rate becomes completely meaningless to the man in the street. The only answer to this objection would be a provincial assessment department which would impose its own assessments for every purpose in every municipality in Ontario.

4. If one were to accept the form of foundation programme I am referring to, the government would fix not only the unit cost of the programme but would define what it deems to be adequate and also fix the contribution made through local taxes. Local autonomy, of course, would be destroyed. In addition the school boards and, hence, the province, would be deprived of the good ordinary commonsense which runs with school boards which are elected and responsible to the people of the community in which the school is.

5. Such a proposal would result in a great centralization of power in The Department of Education. It even would lead to uniformity in teachers' salaries across the province without regard to cost of living and other circumstances which inevitably apply.

6. One of the phenomena of these times is the increasing burden of education costs in our urban and populous centres. A few years ago these were the areas where there were few problems. Today their problems are staggering. Concentration of industry, such as we have had over the past 20 years, has brought with it the problems of concentration of population in these areas. Industrial assessment and income therefrom is necessary to help pay these costs. One can at once see the grave injustice that would be created by trying to pour all municipalities and school boards into a common form. For such a municipality to pay its taxes into a common fund and then receive a lesser amount on the so-called unit cost basis would be completely impracticable in Ontario.

7. Finally, I need only refer to the effects of The Separate Schools Act, 1863, and the entrenchment of its provisions by section 93 of The British North America Act as already referred to. It would be completely unconstitutional—and the subject of court action on the part of any member of the Roman Catholic minority who desires to take it—to have taxes raised and levied by a local school board and paid into a fund to be used elsewhere in the province or for another school board in the same municipality. Not only that, but the majority or any member of the

majority could also challenge the same because, sir, the same Act states that assessment for public school purposes cannot be used for the support of separate schools nor can the assessment of separate schools be used for the support of public schools.

It is not necessary for me to go further to illustrate that a loose use of the expression "foundation programmes" can lead to results which are not only completely impracticable but also completely unlawful in the province of Ontario.

In considering grant plans for this province, one must be careful not to destroy the local autonomy of our school boards. If a board can operate economically and provide a satisfactory standard of education, that board should not be encouraged to spend more money simply for the sake of uniformity. The real incentive is to lower the mill rate through economical operation. Again I point out that a foundation programme based upon uniformity alone stifles initiative and prevents the steady growth and development of improvements in education at the local board level.

Further, in fixing unit costs there must necessarily be excluded transportation and capital outlays from current funds and, as well, debt charges. Some school boards in settled communities are completely debt-free and have no other extraordinary charges. On the other hand, practically every school board in a rapidly growing area is faced with increasing capital outlays and debt charges for new schools. In rural areas, too, transportation costs play a large part in expenditure, particularly for secondary schools.

It might be pointed out that in some of the western Canadian provinces, as well as in certain American states, the government has arbitrarily imposed larger school units. In other words, they have wiped out the smaller school boards. I point out that in Ontario, aside from every other consideration, as already indicated, The Separate Schools Act of 1863 would preclude any such possibility for separate schools.

So within reasonably short compass, the foregoing is an outline of some of the matters to be considered in dealing with the school problem in Ontario. It is in consideration of these things that the government proposes a new grant system effective for the next calendar year, 1964. Accordingly, I desire now to give to the House the following outline of the principles and effects of what will be known as The Ontario Foundation Tax Plan, 1964. The principles of the new plan have been evolved so as to incorporate the most

desirable features of our existing grant plans with a view to equalizing educational opportunity throughout the province.

The Ontario Foundation Tax Plan has been designed to fit our own particular conditions here in Ontario—such as our nearly 4,000 school boards, some located in isolated areas with lower enrolment and some in our fast-growing and ever-changing industrial urban communities. The basic requirement of the plan is flexibility and ability to adapt to varying conditions. We must provide each school board with sufficient revenue to finance adequately the educational programme which it deems essential and sufficient for its local community, and at the same time we must not remove its important responsibility to the ratepayers and citizens who elect it.

The new grant plan proposed is for a five-year period commencing in 1964, and has been designed in three sections. These sections are independent except for the general condition or limit that in no event should the total provincial grant from all sources exceed 95 per cent of the cost of operation of any school board in the preceding year. This is already defined in the present grant regulations.

Section 1, basic tax relief grant: This section is designed to give general or basic tax relief throughout the province and on a common scale. The formula will be a flat grant per pupil of average daily attendance. The present Residential and Farm School Tax Assistance Grant will be incorporated in this section of the new grant plan.

On section 2, special or stimulation grants: this section is designed to encourage the efforts of school boards to provide special services such as textbooks, evening classes, milk, auxiliary classes, and also encouragement to move towards desirable changes such as larger units, change of municipal status and the like. The general principle in this regard is the continuation of the present policy of deliberate stimulation of school boards through financial as well as other means to experiment continuously in the ways and means whereby the school system may be progressively improved.

There is much talk these days of the two major cultures of Canada and with this in mind it is of great interest and importance to note the development of conversational French in public schools. We are all deeply interested in the development of greater understanding among all Canadians. This is revealed by the growth of the desire for conversational French among the people of the province.

There are now 113 public and separate school boards in the province teaching oral French to English-speaking pupils, all of course with the consent of The Department of Education. This is helped by the equalization grants given by The Department of Education, which are open to all boards, public and separate. The desire for an understanding of French and to be bilingual, which has very great implications on the national scene, springs from the people themselves within our school areas.

Regarding section 3, equalization grants: this section is designed to recognize the existence of a wide variation in local ability to support education. The provincial government will compensate for such discrepancies through the provision of equalization grants which increase as local wealth decreases and, conversely, decrease as local wealth increases, either from board to board in any one year or, in the case of any one board, from year to year as local resources may vary.

By incorporating an equalization section as one of the major elements in the Ontario foundation tax plan, the provincial government accepts the principle that it has the responsibility of providing additional financial help where needed and in amounts inversely proportional to local assessment wealth per classroom, or assessment per class unit, to all school boards without sufficient local financial resources to provide the type of education programme desired by their communities. The equalization aid will vary from the minimum for the wealthiest school boards, which obviously need little additional help, to the maximum for the poorest boards, which just as clearly find it extraordinarily difficult to raise even a few hundred dollars from local resources alone.

The principle adopted is essentially that of tax-sharing, with the province providing, through its wider taxing basis, the revenues which the poorer school boards are unable to secure locally. The delegation and sharing of responsibilities for education otherwise remain unchanged and local autonomy in school affairs will not only be maintained but strengthened.

Now the first section of equalization grants—and there are three categories—the first is corporate tax adjustment grant for all elementary schools.

The development of industry and commerce has, as already outlined, led to a very great development of the corporate entity and corporate assessment. It should be pointed out that while the Roman Catholic minority

has, and it must be admitted with some justification, complained about the impracticability of applying the right of direction of taxes to corporate interests, there are many localities where separate schools receive the majority of corporate assessment while the public schools receive little, if any. Therefore, this provision applies to both public and separate schools.

It is proposed to supplement, by way of a corporation tax adjustment grant, the revenues of any elementary school board—public or separate—which is receiving a lesser proportion of school tax paid on corporation assessment within the local municipality than the proportion that its residential and farm assessment bears to the total public and separate residential and farm assessment. At the same time, of course, the total assessment of the public or separate school board receiving such supplement will be increased by an equivalent amount for the calculation of other equalization grants.

In other words, the principle is to treat both types of schools in exactly the same manner with exactly the same type of corporation tax adjustment grant. By this method nothing will be taken away from either a public or separate school which it is now receiving, nor will any constitutional right or privilege be infringed upon to the slightest degree. I feel that, by the introduction of this provision, the controversy in connection with corporate taxes can be regarded as being finally settled with positive justice to all concerned.

I have made mention before of the impossibility of applying the right of the individual to allocate corporate taxes in accordance with the formula of The Separate Schools Act of 1863. Yet there is the undeniable fact that separate schools, by reason of the fact that this formula is unworkable, are denied corporate taxes which might run to them if such formula were applicable and workable.

It is true that compensation is made, as has been described, by means of increased grants to both public and separate schools so affected and they have both been treated in exactly the same manner. It still does not remove the sense of the injustice that this tax cannot be allocated.

After canvassing every possible approach to the matter, by all odds the fairest yardstick for assessing what both public and separate schools should receive in this regard is the yardstick of residential and farm assessment. It is a method of assessing the wealth of both. If either public or separate schools are being deprived of corporate

assessment, it would seem that the assumption that such group of school supporters would be entitled to participate in such assessment to the extent that such group possess residential and farm assessment is the fairest. There are, of course, bound to be inaccuracies, but nevertheless in searching for a reasonable yardstick this seems to be the fairest, and when taken across the board in the province will undoubtedly be the most accurate.

To make this determination it is necessary to introduce a new column in the assessors' forms and I shall introduce an amendment to The Assessment Act to so provide. As I have indicated before, this will in no way interfere with the workings of the Act of 1863 which has been entrenched in The British North America Act. It will not take one cent of assessment away from any public or separate school. It will simply mean that corporate assessment will be allocated by way of grants to the school sections, public or separate, up to the proportion indicated where such is lacking.

The second section is the recognized extraordinary expenditure grant.

Recognized extraordinary expenditures, consisting of debt charges, capital outlays from current funds, and costs of transportation, require special treatment since the load varies widely among boards otherwise equal in need and otherwise equal in local resources. The formula to be used under the Ontario foundation tax plan will be a percentage of the total recognized extraordinary expenditure, running as high as 90 per cent of the total amount for the most needy boards, graded according to growth-need and to assessment per classroom or per class unit.

Finally, there is the school tax equalization grant, the third section.

This part comprises the basic equalization or "foundation" grant to which the other grants will be added in order to obtain the total grant payable to a board. It is a major element in the Ontario foundation tax plan, 1964, in regard to equalization of the burden of meeting current operating costs. Equalization is secured under "B", which I have just mentioned previously in regard to all extraordinary expenditures.

We will intentionally avoid the pitfalls of relating this plan to uniform mill rates or fixed uniform unit costs for the reasons explained earlier, but we will retain the flexibility necessary to meet the varying needs and circumstances of school boards throughout our province.

We recognize that units will vary according to local circumstances and type of school—for instance—and in developing the formula will include classifications which compensate for differences in salaries, maintenance costs and the like. Our experience in Ontario has demonstrated the necessity of dividing our schools into classifications mainly related to population and assessment. For instance, at the present time we have four classes. The necessity of these classes is dictated by the vastly different conditions existing throughout the province.

These present classes are: (1) schools in municipalities with population under 14,000; (2) urban municipalities with population about 14,000 but under 100,000; (3) urban municipalities with population over 110,000; (4) the metropolitan area, which is treated as a unit in itself.

In the new formula it is probable that we shall be able to reduce this to three classifications. Nevertheless, in any formula to be devised the difference of conditions which I have mentioned precludes the possibility of simply having one class.

The principle of this basic equalization grant is that the government will guarantee to each school board in the province sufficient revenue from this provincial grant to enable it to meet a satisfactory level to recognize operating costs. Rather than fix uniform unit costs and uniform mill rates, which simply could not work in Ontario, we shall specify the "ceiling" or "maximum" up to which the government will guarantee a reasonable, proper and sufficiently variable revenue from provincial grants which, together with local taxation, will meet the requirements. By this method we shall ensure complete equalization of revenues for schools up to the levels specified for grant purposes.

This equalization grant will, of course, vary according to the wealth of the board. In other words, we shall retain the experience we have gained in the past and, likewise, retain the principles which we have developed providing for equality of opportunity in this broad province.

The total equalization grant from the three parts of this third section which I have mentioned will be added to the amounts calculated under the other two sections. The total grant will vary from the minimum for the wealthiest board up to 95 per cent of the cost of operating in the case of very poor boards. Stability is ensured through the basic tax relief grants and flexibility is secured by setting limits or "ceilings" in terms of mills, in terms of per pupil amounts,

and in terms of the actual cost of operating, but without imposing fixed amounts or tax rates upon any school board.

The grants being calculated will vary according to the circumstances up to the maximum specified. No school board will be forced to levy the maximum number of mills specified, or to pay any amount into a provincial equalization fund. Indeed, a school board may reduce taxes if so desired. Similarly, no school board is forced to spend up to the per pupil amount specified, and may drop below these levels or exceed them without penalty.

From the point of view of the provincial taxpayer, the plan is equally flexible and fully safeguarded; the total amount of aid the province wishes to provide can be controlled. What has been designed and attained is a form of partnership between each local school board and the province, preserving the autonomy of each and permitting each partner to pay the share which best fits his needs and purse.

The question that now remains for me to deal with is the suggestion that our secondary schools be made denominational in the sense that we have separate schools in our elementary school system. The suggestion includes the extension of the concept of denominational schools into our teachers' colleges and I think would also be bound to include our university system. If this concept is accepted even in part, it would of course mean the recognition of all denominational secondary schools, both Protestant and Roman Catholic.

One need only examine the political history of our province and our country to realize how very controversial these matters can become. I might say that I am delighted with the very wide coverage and discussion of this topic in the press and on television throughout our province in the last few months. I can say with all earnestness that it is my intention, and that of the party I lead and the government I head, that this matter should be discussed without creating ill-will, rancour or bitterness among the various groups in our province.

I adhere to the belief that proposals made in good faith can be discussed and can be determined in good faith. Such a course as has been suggested would constitute a complete reversal of policies followed by governments under all political parties for the past hundred years. The strength of these public policies is fostered by the fact that the hon. leaders of both the Liberal and New Democratic Parties sitting in Opposition have opposed this proposition.

Some hon. members: Shame, shame.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: As one charged with the very great responsibility of financing education in this province and finding the vast sums which are now necessary and which will be necessary in the future, the financial implications of such an idea are frightening. The difficulties which the Roman Catholic minorities are having in financing separate elementary schools and which we are planning to rectify with the grant system which I have outlined, would be magnified many times over by the extension of a separate school system into our secondary schools, both academic and vocational, our teachers' colleges and our universities. The duplication of facilities from a financial point of view is not only impractical, but impossible. I do not believe this problem can be oversimplified. One very good reason is that our society simply has not enough wealth to support a dual school system beyond the elementary level, or a multi-denominational system at any level.

From an educational point of view as well it could only lead to a lesser degree of excellence of instruction as a result of poor facilities, smaller concentration of students and, thus, less diversification of courses and the necessity of spreading our teachers over a wider and wider area.

By putting these ideas in this way I do not wish to imply that there is not a very necessary place for religious and spiritual concepts in our educational system in all levels. On the contrary, I feel that in the materialistic days in which we live and when man is trifling with such enormous forces of destruction, the importance of religious and spiritual values for our young people has never been more apparent. I think that we might draw certain lessons from the development of our universities and perhaps in the recognition of these developments lie the ideas for changes that could come about in other areas of our educational system.

Most of our universities had their beginnings in denominational colleges, which, over the years, have evolved a system of close partnership. I could point to the University of Windsor, the University of Waterloo, Laurentian University, and McMaster University of subjects, with their facilities available to all. Surrounding these non-denominational institutions teaching a vast variety of subjects, with their facilities available to all. Surrounding these non-denominational universities we have denominational colleges, whose interest and objective is to

develop the spiritual and religious lives of the adherents of a particular faith.

It might very well be that this principle could be extended into our secondary schools and teachers' colleges, where religious knowledge options, carrying credit standing, supervised by the clergy of the faith concerned, might be provided. This is a very large and important subject, which cannot be dealt with without long and careful thought and consideration. However, I would be very happy to institute the necessary discussions in order that this concept, which has served so well in the development of our university system, could be closely examined and evaluated in relation to that area of our educational system lying between Grade 8 and the universities. This could be done without in any way affecting the basic rights, privileges and responsibilities in our school system.

Mr. Speaker, I have presented in detail to the hon. members of the Legislature the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan, 1964. I have done so, secure in the knowledge and belief that the plan will be acceptable if, on the part of all, there is goodwill, tolerance and freedom from prejudice and that these factors prevail in an assessment of these equitable proposals.

Thus with all the people of Ontario joined together in honour and harmony, with their rights continued and inviolate under a school system operating to provide equal educational opportunities for all, as a united province within the bonds of union of our great Canadian confederation, our achievements will be even greater, our accomplishments will be similarly dedicated, for the benefit of all, in the years ahead.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think it is traditional that on occasions when statements of extra importance are made in the session that you do ease the normal rules of this House and permit a comment. I will try to confine myself, sir, to the normal limitations of such a comment and be as brief as possible in the knowledge that I am sure you will assure this House the opportunity to debate the statement that the hon. Prime Minister has made this afternoon in detail later on.

My first comment is one of commendation to the government. I personally believe that the objective that has been pursued in this brief is one that will meet with support from all sides of the House. The problems of the inequities that have been demonstrably clear to all of us as between the separate and public system, and as between the urban and

rural areas, have been the subject of much discussion inside and outside of this House.

The manner in which this inequity is to be solved as proposed by the government is in pursuance of what the government proposes to call the Ontario Foundation Tax Plan. It does vary in some character from the plan that was advocated from this side of the House on several occasions, but in substance I think it reaches for the same objective, and that is that the total revenue that is made available to a board by way of local revenue and provincial grant should in total be approximately the same in all the several systems of our educational system. I would say, therefore, that in spite of the fact that there is certain criticism of the basic type of foundation programme that we propose, on this side of the House, fundamentally the concept of a foundation programme as evolved in this statement and our own are not materially at variance.

I would point out one thing that came to my mind as we proceeded: the danger of trying to impose a former system of grants on a new system such as this will precipitate some difficulties. For example—and I have only had the opportunity to hear this statement read now—in the metropolitan area in Toronto in reference to corporation taxes, my understanding is that the proportion of residential assessment in the separate school system is about 13 per cent, or one seventh of the total residential assessment in the community. Now, the proportion of students in the separate school system is about 25 per cent. And therefore if you divide the corporate tax revenue on that basis we will still have this very substantial disparity.

But that, sir, for another day. For today I suggest to you that the objective and the goal that is reached for in this particular statement is one that merits, I think, commendation from all sides of the House. There will be an opportunity to debate this in more detail and more refinement later on. And, therefore, in keeping with the observation I made at the outset that I would confine myself to just a general statement at this juncture, I take the opportunity to thank you for acceding to my plea to make these few and brief comments.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): If I may be permitted to make a few general observations on behalf of this group, I would like to say at the outset that we are gratified that at least the concept of a foundation approach to educational finance is now apparently accepted on all sides of the House. We have

been advocating this approach to the problem of educational finance for some time. The idea was recently adopted by the Liberal Party in substitution for the previous programme it had adopted, and now apparently the government has also come round to this way of thinking.

I am, however, somewhat—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would point out to the members that statements of this nature before the orders of the day are not debatable. It is also recognized that these statements should be non-controversial. Now, if the hon. member wishes to make comments it is all right, but this must be done without getting into any matter of controversy.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I will accept your ruling, naturally, Mr. Speaker, but I would not say that the hon. Prime Minister's statement itself was entirely uncontroversial or contained no controversial, or, shall we say, political statements. However, I will not belabour that point.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am considerably less sanguine than the hon. leader of the Opposition in considering the government's statement of intention. Certainly the words "equalization" and "foundation plan" have now been accepted in the government's vocabulary, but I do not think it is by any means clear that the government indeed has a foundation plan in mind. It all turns, as the hon. Prime Minister's own statement indicated, on the interpretation of item 3(c), the school tax equalization grant. Now the hon. Prime Minister was at considerable pains to indicate methods which he considered inappropriate for measuring the need on which this equalization grant will be paid. I have listened to his statement carefully and I have read the mimeographed version of it carefully, and I find difficulty in discovering just what sort of yardstick—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would suggest that the hon. member is out of order. He is putting actual questions to me now as to what is or is not in the statement. This can be debated—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, we are in the position where, when a statement like this is made, if a person from the Opposition gets up and speaks favourably of the government, he is in order; if he gets up and speaks critically about what the government has said, he is out of order. Now this strikes me

as being a very peculiar kind of distinction, because when the hon. leader of the Opposition apparently agreed pretty completely with the government statement, it was in order.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, we will leave it to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I think I already stated it is out of order to allow debate on a matter raised before the orders of the day. However—

Mr. MacDonald: Then, Mr. Speaker, I submit you should have given your ruling before the hon. leader of the Opposition spoke.

Mr. Speaker: That is probably true. I cannot tell what a member is going to speak about or how long he is going to speak or anything else beforehand, and I would just point out to the member that if his statements were brief he would be perfectly in order.

Mr. Bryden: I would submit, Mr. Speaker, I have not trespassed on the time of the House to any significant degree as yet, and it was certainly not my intention to do so. I would merely like to make this observation and then perhaps I might ask the hon. Prime Minister a question. As far as his present statement is concerned, it is hard to see that there is any departure in principle from the old bits-and-pieces approach to school grants. I could be wrong and this will no doubt be dealt with more fully in subsequent statements by the government.

But I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister if he would care to say whether there is any regulation, either now issued or contemplated, which will spell out the actual mechanics by which the relative needs of school boards are to be determined, and on which the so-called equalization grants will be paid.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, in making this statement today, I was laying before the House the intent of the government. This statement is looking a year ahead. The draft regulations for 1963 are being sent to the school boards today. It will be at least a year before this plan is implemented and I am sure all these questions can be answered in due course. I have laid before the hon. members of this House today a broad outline of a plan which we have. Of course, these formulas will have to be developed. They will be developed within the framework that I have laid out here today.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister one question? Will the hon. Prime Minister put this statement on the order paper, so that it can be and will be debated at some specific time?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I would not undertake to put it on the order paper, Mr. Speaker. I think it is part of the policy of the government. It can be debated in the estimates of The Department of Education. There will be lots of opportunities.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Will the hon. Prime Minister give us his assurance that it will be debatable under the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, if the matter is before the House in those estimates, it can be debated.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Oh, now, that is not quite right. Invariably, sir, it has been the habit of this House when an important statement of this sort, or report, is submitted in the fashion it has been today, on the understanding that our comments will be very brief, that a specific and known and determinable time and place is provided to debate the subject matter. Now that is only good sense, surely. And if it is in a department's estimates, that is fine, but I think we have the right to know and I appeal to you.

Mr. Speaker: No such precedent has been set. Statements made before the orders of the day will at some future time be debated in full. I would like to inform all the members that no precedent has been established. I think it is quite in order for the members to discuss this during the estimates, which I believe is the proper time.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to bring to the attention of the House what I think was an important event today. It was announced today by Mr. Gordon Grundy the president of the Studebaker of Canada Company, that effective March 1 all new passenger vehicles manufactured by his company will have seat belts installed as standard equipment, in the front seats, before they leave the factory. This makes Studebaker the first automobile manufacturer on the North American continent to take this progressive step. Studebaker of Canada, I think, deserves to be congratulated in installing this lifesaving device as standard equipment in its product.

In addition I might just bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, that

Studebaker of Canada last year, with the rest of the industry, agreed to put seat belt anchor points in the front seats of all cars, and even went one step further and installed seat belt anchor points in the rear seats, also.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, may I ask in connection with that statement whether the hon. Minister is considering requiring seat belts in the cars of this province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was answering a question on this side of the House, and did not hear my hon. friend.

Mr. Nixon: I asked, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister and his department were considering requiring the installation of seat belts in all cars in the province.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that it has been considered, and no doubt will be from time to time. But I would say, in answer to my hon. friend, that I think that the indication we have had today from one of the large manufacturers is probably far more effective in obtaining public confidence in the use of seat belts.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. K. Brown in the chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman: On vote 417:

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Would the hon. Minister tell us about this? This \$10 million he wants.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, this \$10 million is to look after the sums to be expended under the federal-provincial technical training programme. The amount spent exceeded over what we estimated in the previous year, and these monies are required in that the monies to be advanced from Ottawa have not come through in their entirety. It indicates a much larger construction programme than we had anticipated. This \$10 million will look after this particular phase of the programme.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, how much was the appropriation last year and how much was spent?

Hon. Mr. Davis: My recollection is, Mr. Chairman, that the amount provided was \$29 million and we have spent perhaps roughly \$15 million in excess of that.

Mr. Thomas: \$44 million then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The number of projects exceeded our original estimates; they have progressed at a faster rate than we have anticipated.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister advise us what the timetable presently is on the cut-off date for the building of these extensions for vocational purposes under 100 per cent grant?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, after a visit to Ottawa some few weeks ago by all the Ministers of Education from across the Dominion, the matter was taken under advisement by the federal Department of Labour. And we were advised, I believe last Friday, by telegram from the Minister of Labour, that the period under this programme would be extended from March 31—the original termination date—until October 1 of this year.

Mr. Nixon: Does it mean, Mr. Chairman, that a school board that has not presently made plans for construction of this type of building might still have construction plans approved?

Hon. Mr. Davis: These plans have to be approved and the contract awarded by April 1, of this year.

Mr. Nixon: That means then that all the bills incurred in these approved plans be paid for, as long as the money was spent before October 31.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Before October 1.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 418 carried?

Mr. Singer: No. Can we hear from the hon. Minister on that? He is asking for another \$20 million.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think if the hon. gentlemen opposite would remember the announcement in, I believe it is, the budget statement, that the government was undertaking to advance the local board some 10 per cent of the grant, they will find that this is the figure that is required to look after this advance payment. It is the proposal of the government and The Department of Education to advance this 10 per cent, either at the end of this month or early in March, so that it will assist the local board in reduction of their interest rates and so on. This is the amount required for this 10 per cent payment.

Mr. Singer: Will there be a similar reduction, Mr. Chairman, in the grants for the following year by \$20 million?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The amount here, Mr. Chairman, is part of the total required for the 1963 grant. This is not an additional amount; this is the 10 per cent we are going to pay now.

Mr. Singer: So it will come off the following year?

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Will the advance payment be made in the subsequent fiscal year as well? My understanding is that what you are doing here is at least acceding to the request of the school boards, that they be given money early so they do not have to battle.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it was fairly clear, Mr. Chairman, in the budget statement that this is going to be the procedure from now on. It will be replaced next by a similar 10 per cent payment.

Mr. Wintermeyer: This is not just one year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 417 agreed to.

On vote 418:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on this section of vote 418, is there some thought that the actual grant of the money would be made available at a date earlier than has been in the past?

Hon. Mr. Davis: You mean the grants available earlier, or the regulations?

Mr. Nixon: The actual money in the bank account.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is what the purpose is here. This money will go out at the end of this month or the beginning of March so they will have the 10 per cent almost immediately.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 418 agreed to.

On vote 419:

Mr. Nixon: On vote 419, Mr. Chairman. When going over all that has been said in the Legislature previously, about the actuarial difficulties that the teachers' superannuation fund has, we certainly cannot let this pass without drawing to the attention of the

government once again the fact that the difficulties are not being improved by this grant of \$1 million per year. According to the reports last year, the fund is becoming actuarially unsound at the rate, I believe, of \$7 million a year, even taking this into account.

Not being an expert on this myself, I cannot comment further, but I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the department is considering any basic changes in the superannuation for teachers, having to do with those who are subsisting on minimum pension, and of those who are presently teaching, who feel that their superannuation calculation is on an unfair basis when compared with those in similar public service.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the appropriate time to debate this would be in the estimates of The Department of Education. Then I can give the hon. members opposite a full explanation of the situation of the fund, the amount of the pensions, so that they can consider the whole subject at one time.

There is a vote for this in the estimates of The Department of Education and I would be very happy to discuss it at that time.

Mr. Nixon: That is quite acceptable to me, Mr. Chairman, but if the hon. Minister would like us to distract the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) so that he could concentrate on this, we might be able to arrange that.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. Since this special contribution falls far short of the statement of facts as set out and drawn to the attention of this House in the Provincial Auditor's report, would the hon. Minister tell us why only \$1 million is being set aside this year? I do not think it is a matter which can be properly discussed anywhere but here because this is the place that the special grant is being provided.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this has been the procedure for some years. I would think the question of debating this as to whether it is sufficient or insufficient, and the status of the fund, really would be properly done under the estimates.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that is the answer. Every year that I have been here—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): It is; it's always been done.

Mr. Singer: That is the whole point! It's the way you have been doing it for 20 years and the error has been perpetuated. You are living in the past.

Mr. Chairman, just why this thing is not dealt with in the estimates, and dealt with properly, I do not know, but in the three years or four years I have been here, every year there is a supplementary estimate comes through and asks for an extra \$1 million. If you read the auditor's statement you recognize that the fund is not actuarially sound. Surely when the hon. Minister comes in and asks for an extra million dollars in the supplementary estimates he should be able to justify that request for an extra million dollars other than saying it's been done for years.

An hon. member: And don't you forget it.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): You are at variance?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Why is this, Mr. Chairman? Would the hon. Minister please tell us why this amount of \$1 million is not a larger amount? Surely this is a fair question.

Mr. Singer: If the hon. Prime Minister says we are at variance, all really that we are asking—my hon. friend from Wentworth, or myself or my hon. friend from Brant—all we are asking is that when you come in, year after year, with the same request, why you do not have a policy? Why do you let it go until the year ends and then come back and ask for a million dollars without any justification and without any policy?

Several hon. members: Right, right!

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to emphasize this point. The only people who are at variance is the government opposite and the provincial auditor because he points out, year after year, and certainly in this year's auditor's report it says:

Additional comments about the serious condition of this fund were made in my report of November 23, 1961.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have listened for many a year here, at the complimentary remarks made about the provincial auditor, and I think that they are entirely justified. By taking no action, not only this year, but in years gone past, you are saying that the provincial auditor is not competent to give you advice. I say that you should come in here with more than just paltry excuses. We believe in the provincial auditor and certainly

when the estimates of the hon. Minister of Education come down we want more than just a few lines saying why you are not doing what should most certainly be done.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister not going to give a reason for having \$1 million here when there is a larger amount suggested by the auditor? Are we not getting any explanation for the reason that it is only a million dollars? Surely it is a fair question to ask.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not objecting to the fairness or unfairness of the question. We are asking today for \$1 million. If the hon. members opposite think this is insufficient, it may be. But I am suggesting to you that the proper time to debate this is when we debate the superannuation fund, which is under the estimates of The Department of Education.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: You will have full opportunity. I would be quite happy to have a debate because I am quite interested in it myself. I would be very happy to hear the views of the hon. members opposite on what should be done about the fund.

Mr. Singer: But you are perpetuating a system and surely you can tell us why you are perpetuating a bad system.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all!

Mr. Chairman: Vote 419 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Mr. Chairman: Vote 615 carried?

Mr. V. M. Singer: Wait a minute. Wait a minute!

Mr. Chairman: Well, speak up, then.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, these supplementary estimates were brought in without any notice to the House and if you are just going to read through and call a vote number and say, "passed", you are not even giving us an opportunity to look at them.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 615, then.

Mr. Singer: Well, just take it easy!

Mr. Chairman: Vote 615, item 3.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, on vote 615, item 3, I had a question on the order paper concerning this foundation. I was wondering if the hon. Minister could give us any information as to how much is in that fund at the present time and how much has been spent?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, if the House sees fit to vote this \$200,000 item, there will be—I believe the exact amount is \$436,000 in the fund. How much has been spent I do not know.

The foundation has not yet been in operation one year so that I have received no report. A report will be received after the close of the fiscal year as is laid down in the Act.

Mr. Trotter: Has the hon. Minister not any idea of any projects that are underway, could he not give us more details?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The foundation was set up by this House as a more or less independent foundation which is called upon to report to the House, through me or through the Minister, at the close of the fiscal year. It has not been our custom to ask such foundations or commissions to give interim reports and I therefore have not got a report from them. I do not believe that it would be in order for me to ask them for a report. However, if the House insists that I ask them for a report, quite apart from the usual custom, I would be quite willing to do so.

Mr. Trotter: I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, why the hon. Minister gives a grant at this time of the year? It would seem a normal practice that this could be discussed under the estimates when they come up. I do not like this business of trying to ram through nearly \$4 million without any notice or any idea of what the whole thing is about! We have no idea and we have had no report on this.

Why is it we are suddenly giving this grant at this particular time? I agree it is a good grant, but probably it is far short. You still cannot give us a proper report on the foundation. Is it doing anything or is the money just sitting there wasting? I think you should have more information regarding this.

I have had a question on the order paper for over two and a half months, three months on this particular foundation, and we still

cannot get an answer out of the department. I do not think you really know what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think I have already answered the question. If you would refer to your order paper you will see what the question is and I simply have not got a report because the foundation has not yet been active for a year and the close of its fiscal year coincides with the close of our fiscal year, March 31. After that date I will get the report from the foundation as we do from all such bodies.

The reason for this grant being put in now? If you will recall, when this mental health research foundation was established I stated in this House that I had deliberately not included in my estimates at that time an item for this because I had hoped that there would be widespread public response and that we might be in the happy position that the national or Canada Council was in the other day when somebody gave them \$4.25 million. However, we have not been in that happy situation yet and we must move to give them money to work on; there is not any use entertaining or inviting requests or applications for projects if there is no money there. The money, the \$236,000 that they do have, was a bequest which came to the government for research and when we approached the executors of that estate they were very happy that this was the type of research the money should go to.

I asked The Treasury Department to give us this, I called it a token sum, to give the foundation some capital to work on whereby it could invite applications for projects.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I understand this \$200,000 is a bequest the government received?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is not a bequest, no.

Mr. Trotter: No, this is just—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is out of the consolidated fund of the province.

Mr. Trotter: The part that I find difficult to understand is why, when you are not sure what is going on in the foundation, you have had no report, and yet you are asking us to vote the \$200,000. Now it probably is a good thing but you, yourself, really do not know; and I do not know how you expect us to know!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, no! I would not say it; I will just keep on thinking. How in the wide world can you expect the foundation to do the job it was set up to do if we do not provide it with funds? I do not know what projects it will entertain. It is set up to entertain applications for research projects which, if it approves of them, then it must finance. This is a capital fund, if you will, out of which it may finance those projects.

I frankly do not know how much money it will spend in the first year. I know from the applications that came to me shortly after the legislation was passed that if they approved all of the projects this will not be nearly enough money. Therefore they will have to exercise judgment and discretion in approving of what they believe projects worthy of most prior claim.

This is a beginning. By the time we get the first year's report then we will have some idea of what the permanent budget will be, or what the year-to-year budget will be. But for the first year of its operation, I must frankly tell the House, sir, that I do not know how much money they will need. This is, as I have put it to the Treasury, a token sum.

Mr. Trotter: Then why do you not leave it in your regular estimates? I do not see any reason for having a supplementary estimate for the simple reason that if it came in your regular estimates you could give us some fuller report. I still say you have given us no idea of what they have been doing, what they hope to do, what they need. I do not doubt for a moment that \$200,000 is not enough, because the government is very slow on this particular item.

The foundation was announced and formed and it seems to have been filed away and now it comes to life again. I think that it should have a more full and complete examination. But this business of just trying to slip something through quickly and not having a proper debate—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no.

Mr. Trotter: That is exactly what this is. This thing has happened with The Department of Education, and now the hon. Minister's department is supposed to pour \$4 million—items that could be discussed in two or three weeks' time when this comes up. I suppose when we go to discuss it under the hon. Minister's regular estimates he will say, "Oh, you should have talked about that when it was going through in the earlier estimates."

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the hon. Minister would explain to us what special purpose the Illahee Lodge at Cobourg serves to qualify for this grant.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: These last three items, 4, 5 and 6, have been supported in some small measure by government for many years. Before the establishment of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission these organizations qualified as convalescent hospitals. However, within the terms of the cost-sharing agreement with Ottawa that could no longer continue and they were cut off.

Since we had recognized them as a government and as a Department of Health, we felt that they could hardly be just cut off because they had been encouraged, by the support they had previously received, to go into certain developments. We therefore determined as government policy to continue some support under The Department of Health directly, rather than through the Hospital Services Commission. This represents a capital construction grant of \$150 per bed and we have given this each year since the establishment of the Hospital Services Commission. In the regular estimates there is a per diem grant of 75 cents per bed.

There is sound and valid reason, I think, for putting these in the supplementary estimates, because the number of beds can fluctuate from year to year. Indeed, this year the vote I think is \$6,100 less than it was last year because one of the organizations, we found on auditing their statement which they submit to us, for this year did not need the grant and therefore we did not give it. They look after crippled children; they are all either crippled children or handicapped adults who are taken to summer camps largely for a stated period of time and they actually need a degree of convalescent hospital care.

Mr. Chapple: Well, is Illahee Lodge a convalescent home?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is a convalescent camp.

Mr. Chapple: It is a camp?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, it is a summer camp. All of these are just summer camps.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister gave an explanation for items 4, 5 and 6, and the hon. member for Parkdale was talking about No. 3. What about No. 1? Then we will come on to No. 2. Why is a grant of \$150,000 for

the heart foundation needed in the supplementary estimates?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Because, Mr. Chairman, this is a grant and it too may fluctuate from year to year, or it may not be given. It is not a regular item in our budget and for that reason it is carried in the supplementary estimates. It has been since it was granted first. A certain amount has been given every year, but it could be dropped; we feel that this is more easily done through supplementary estimates than the regular budget.

Mr. Singer: Well, what determination does the hon. Minister make—whether these should be included in regular estimates or in supplementary? It would make much more sense to me if, when we see his estimates in a few weeks' time, he has a complete list of those groups which he believes are worthy of grants. Obviously, when he brought his estimates forward last year he had not considered that this grant was necessary. What has changed his mind?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have not changed my mind, Mr. Chairman. It is customary, and it is government policy, that these things be carried in supplementary estimates. I do not make the policy alone; I am in agreement with it. I see no reason why they should go in my regular estimates; they have always been carried in supplementary estimates and there is a good deal of validity to that.

Mr. Singer: Where does the hon. Minister draw the line? When does it become government policy to include some things in supplementary and some things in the regular budget? Could he define the line to us so we could recognize it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think I have made it rather clear, Mr. Chairman; this depends on the permanence of the item. This is not necessarily a permanent item in our budget; none of these are necessarily permanent items on our budget. They are dependent largely on the amounts of money available.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Well, Mr. Chairman, does it not largely depend upon the amount of surplus that he has at the end of the year?

Mr. Singer: Well, be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of words given in explanation but it is a distinction without a difference. I would think that if the hon. Minister is able to give us reasons—as he will be I am sure, they will be just as good

reasons as they were this afternoon—for the passing of his regular estimates, he should include these items in his regular estimates. Now, can the hon. Minister tell us about this item number two which is only \$3.4 million?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is a special capital grant of \$75 per bed which has been given each year since the inception of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. This is given to help them meet extraordinary capital expenditure such as debt charges, debt-carrying charges, new equipment or other capital charges. It is not to be used for operation or maintenance costs in any way. This is an item that is given from year to year if the money is available. This is not laid down in the agreement that we have with our hospitals; this is an additional grant that is given to assist hospitals if the money is available.

Mr. Singer: Well, the hon. Minister has just said that it is a grant that is given every year, an extra \$75 for every bed every year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If we have been able to do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): You can have a vote after we have a chance to speak.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Are you through?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): The hon. member is not through; he is never through.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying to the hon. Minister of Health before I was so rudely interrupted, I would think that if this is a grant that is made every year, even though the hon. Prime Minister says it has only been done for three years, there must have been some knowledge in the mind—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I just said what the hon. Minister of Health said, that it has been since the inception of the Ontario Hospital Services.

Mr. Singer: All right, three years.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: And it is not a permanent grant.

Mr. Singer: All right, it has been done for three years. I would have thought that a

three-year pattern of grants of \$75 per bed would have been reasonably enough a part of government policy that the hon. Minister would have been able to include it in his estimates. Obviously, what we get out of this is \$31 million for The Department of Education, close to \$4 million for The Department of Health, another \$1 million for The Treasury Department; what really we get is an improper picture of the original budget so that the government when it wants to present a budget picture, takes off \$35 million or \$40 million and at the end of the year comes in and says, "Give us another \$40 million which we did not intend to put in in the first place." The government is deceiving the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I really cannot understand, Mr. Chairman, how on earth my hon. friend can read this into it at all. There are monies which we require to pay out in this present fiscal year, the fiscal year which ends on March 31. The money which I shall ask in my estimates is money that I will spend during the ensuing fiscal year ending March 31, 1964. I need this money, or I would like the House to vote this money to me, so that I can pay it out before March 31, 1963.

Mr. Singer: I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister must have known this a year ago when he presented his estimates. I would suggest, when he brings his estimates in a few weeks from now, he is probably not going to include this \$75. He will wait for another year to bring in another set of supplementary estimates.

I think all we are suggesting here, Mr. Chairman, is that when a budget is presented it be a true budget and they do not bring in \$40-odd million worth of supplementaries that they knew should have been in there at the time they presented the budget.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know of a government in this great country that does not introduce supplementary estimates every year.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask a question. As I understand it, this is an additional sum over and above the amounts that have been given by the Hospital Services Commission. Why is it differentiated? It seems to me that if we say for the past three years that it has been necessary to apply a grant of, say, \$75 per bed, for new hospitals in addition to the hospital allowances already provided, that maybe

the time has come when this should not be supplementary estimates, it should be a matter of right to all hospitals. I was intrigued, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister said we pay it if it is available. Now hospital beds, I think we all agree, are necessary, and a certain allowance must come from this government. I wonder if it is possible to amplify why it is necessary to separate this particular allowance per bed from the regular allowance which is available through the regular sources.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This money, Mr. Chairman, is money which the province finds out of its own consolidated revenues. This is not part of the cost-sharing plan with the federal government. It is not written into the agreements, nor is it even understood between the hospitals and this government that this money will be available to them.

The need for this is gradually disappearing, we hope. We are not sure yet, but the whole hospital situation throughout the province is stabilizing and consolidating to the point where, indeed, the need may no longer exist. You will note quite a difference in the needs this year as opposed to last year. This, we hope, is the beginning of the plateau which we have been hoping to reach for the last three or four years. This grant has been made, or is being made, or we are asking you to approve of it again this year, because the money is available, first of all, and because hospitals are still faced with heavy capital debt. This is being given to them in the hope that we can help relieve hospital boards and thereby municipalities of some little part of the burden of debt.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, just one brief comment to the hon. Minister and I believe him to be a sincere man. I still think this is something that could be written in as a matter of right. I would like to ask:

(1) Is this available to all new hospital construction regardless of where they may be, or is there any formula supplied?

(2) Without being unduly argumentative, I would suggest to you, sir, that the money is not available. We have a deficit of \$100-odd million, so I do not see how we can say that money is available. I think this is misleading, although I do not say it is intentionally so. I do not see how it can be available, Mr. Chairman, when we have such a big deficit.

The question that I ask you is: Is it available to every new hospital on the same basis,

or does the Cabinet decide which ones it will be available to?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it is not to new hospitals; it is paid to every existing general chronic and convalescent hospital in the province of Ontario. If new hospital beds are in operation, they too will benefit from this \$75 per bed grant. It is a special capital grant.

Mr. Chapple: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in this on the basis of the so-called short-fall involved. We had \$107 million in short-fall last year, for the year 1961-62. This \$35 million is added to that short-fall. Therefore, you must almost consider this to be a further amount of deficit which this government has incurred, but which it has not pointed out definitely to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Thomas: This is the waterfall.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into this private quarrel the Liberals have with the hon. Minister but there is one point which I think is rather valid. The hon. Minister has said he knows of no government that has not come in with supplementary estimates. Obviously this is true, but I submit that if budgeting is done in a tidy fashion by the time you brought in the same supplementary estimate in three succeeding years and you are still not certain that it is not going to be needed for the year, the correct place for it is in the budget and in the estimates of the department.

That does not mean that until, a year or so from now, you find that you do not need it you take it out of the budget, but it is in an untidy procedure. Certainly you do not persist in doing something in an untidy fashion three years in a row unless you are fundamentally untidy yourself.

Mr. Singer: You listen well.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I make bold to predict that if we were to follow the budgeting which is proposed by my hon. friend from York South and we found that at the end of the year we did not need this, then I am quite certain that either he or some of his hon. colleagues or some of his hon. friends on his right would point out that we had budgeted untidily and that we had budgeted for far more than we actually needed and therefore presented a false statement to the people of Ontario. My hon. friend from Fort William would remind me of that.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): That is a presumption.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 615 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1013 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2208:

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, a similar question can be asked here, to that asked on vote 419. The provincial auditor, fine man that he is, has pointed out that this is not a tidy way of doing business. In his report he says that arrangements should be made to fund it over a reasonable period of time. My question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) is: What steps has he taken to fall in line with the very sound, solid advice of the provincial auditor?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I would inform my hon. friend that I do fall in line with the sound, solid advice of the provincial auditor. He suggested an actuarial study be made of the matter. Such is under way.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2208, agreed to.

This completes the supplementary estimates.

Mr. Whicher: That is just another mess we are going to have to clean up. No wonder we are going to have to borrow a bit of money.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1103, page 74:

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands Forests): Mr. Chairman, on vote 1103, before further questions come, I would like to take the opportunity of dealing somewhat further with the question that was asked by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy) in connection with the lamprey. The reference to the Chaudiere—I think he referred to the Chaudiere Falls—would obviously be to the French River. There are lamprey in Georgian Bay and at present the Chaudiere Falls is a

barrier and so are several falls lower down. So far as we know, the French River does not affect lampreys and there are no spawning streams in the lower reaches. However, it has to be admitted that once you bypass a barrier, especially with boats, to which lampreys can attach themselves, you never know what will happen. They are native to Lake Ontario, and neither the Welland Canal nor Lake Erie were suitable waters for them.

In fact, it took them—and when I say this I am speaking on the authority of the experts who advised me—it took them the best part of a century to get to the upper lakes, but they did. Therefore, if the present falls are circumvented by tramways, the lampreys will not come. If there are canals, they may come. If they do not do it at once, they may still do it over a period of time.

Present prospects are that lampreys will be controlled in the Great Lakes, but not eliminated, so that there will be some potential always remaining in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Nipissing also asked a question appearing now on page 894 of *Hansard*, and on reflection I imagine that he was referring to that startlingly fine banquet which was held at Mattawa a month or so ago. I want to assure him that was a banquet tendered to me by the local Progressive-Conservative Association. I do not wonder that he is a little disturbed about the very large crowd that turned out in that part of his riding on that occasion.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): I am not wondering, I know what the effect of the visit was and would be on the people of Nipissing, but that is not the point. I am wondering who paid the expenses for the hon. Minister to get up there, that was all.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: If the hon. member wants to know how I got up, I got up by car. On that particular occasion I was working right through the north as far as Elliot Lake and into Killarney, working both on Saturday and Sunday as well as on the three previous days.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): How are things at Elliot Lake, pretty dead?

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, when this particular vote was before the House, I think the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) had spoken about licences; he asked the question what were the conditions for the issuance of a vendorship? I have had some

concern about that too, because I can recall a certain resident of Verner applied for a vendorship of licences.

This particular resident had a restaurant which is open many hours of the day and night, available to tourists or others who want a licence and the licence was given to some other resident and it was reported to me that one was recommended by the clerk of the township. It happened that the one I had written about was recommended by the reeve of the township, whose politics I do not know, but I know the politics of the clerk. I also know that the reeve also happens to be president of the hunters and anglers association and I thought that that would be even more of an argument in favour than the fact that one was a member of a political party.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think the one the hon. member is referring to is going through the office at the moment, is it not? That particular one?

Mr. Troy: No, I do not think so, not that one.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I thought with the hon. member's usual persistence he renewed it and I was having a look at it at the present time.

Mr. Troy: I hope the hon. Minister looks at it favourably.

In regard to this particular section 2, number 8, there is a grant to the Ontario Trappers Association. Now the Ontario Trappers Association have been quite fortunate the last few years by having the co-operation of the department and particularly the advice and the knowledge of Mr. Currie, who has been allotted to them. I notice in the report of the recent trappers' convention that it was reported Mr. Currie was to be transferred to another position. Will the hon. Minister be allotting to the association someone of similar capacity and knowledge as Mr. Currie, so they will continue to improve in their operation?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I have great respect for the gentleman the hon. member mentions, Mr. Currie. I know he is doing an excellent job, Mr. Sam Currie. Now if we have something better for him I am sure the hon. member would be the last one to object to that. I can assure him there will be no deterioration in the work that that splendid sales store or auction place, whatever the proper name is for it, up at North Bay, because we regard that as an extremely good way of dealing with the disposal of our trappers' furs.

Mr. Troy: I am glad Mr. Currie is being promoted. My only question was, will the hon. Minister have someone to replace Mr. Currie and assist the trappers' association as he did?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say that certainly we will not be changing the policy in that respect by moving him.

Mr. Troy: My last reference under this particular vote has to do with the fish and wildlife.

Some years ago when I was down at Lake George, New York, I saw that the state of New York had moving about the lake, I think two or three times a week, a barge which was pulled all over the lake to pick up the garbage from the various camp sites and the various camps. Again, the president of the Timagami association has brought up this point, that there is no garbage collection on that very fine lake.

I am sure that particular operation could be included on a great many of our lakes, using barges to go all over the lake to pick the refuse and other debris and other garbage from the lakes. I just suggest it to the hon. Minister because it is a matter of concern, as a great number, not only the cottage owners but the tourist operators—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am not aware of that method, but we will look into it.

Mr. Troy: Thanks very much.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask something about item 9, the payments of the wolf bounty, \$50,000. Now I understand from this you are spending \$50,000 here to get rid of wolves. How much are you spending in order to investigate or make a study of them? I brought this up last year.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: As I said yesterday, Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of work going on in that connection through the medium of the advisory committee and it is my intention that we will have the benefit of their study as far as it has gone, as I said yesterday also before the standing committee of the House on fish and game.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I have really nothing against wolves at all, but yesterday I understood the hon. Minister to say that he did not wish to get rid of them all because they helped with the animal life, it was necessary that we still have wolves for a balance. Why is that? I mean, I cannot understand it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That comes under the general study of harvesting of the animal crops and the various factors that deal with—take the deer, for example, if you allowed the deer to just go on multiplying they would destroy a great deal of our forests over a period of time. The wolf has a part to play in that whole pattern. But I would rather let the experts tell you the real story on that.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. I have been told that research has been carried out in Lake Erie as far as the fish industry is concerned. Does this come under the provincial government or is it a federal research programme? And is there a report of this research programme that is being carried out on Lake Erie available to the hon. members here?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Great Lakes commission is doing a study in connection with this—that is a combined effort. We in this department are constantly, of course, in touch with this on a very practical basis, and we did have, I think, The Department of Economics and Development in for a period in relation to the picture in Lake Erie, the situation in Lake Erie. There is some information on page 96 of this latest statistical book under Great Lakes fisheries research, the hon. member might want to look at.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, yesterday when I raised the matter of the algae, quite properly I was told that the problem maybe should not come under conservation. But related to that problem, I wonder if any studies have been made or any information is available with respect to the fish life in perhaps the Great Lakes and more particularly the area close to the big urban developments which put a considerable amount of this type of refuse into the lakes. Have any studies been made which would tell us that the fish life is perhaps increasing or decreasing in these areas and, if so what is the situation at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Perhaps the hon. member would look at the same page. On page 96 there is quite a considerable amount of detailed information and I would only answer the question further in this way to say that this particular branch is constantly working in that field and is constantly collecting information as far as it is possible to get it in relation to these changing situations.

I do know there have been many stages over the last several years and one was quite a favourable change when the smelt industry, which was practically of very little consequence commercially two years ago, suddenly developed into a very substantial industry in Lake Erie, and previous to that it had been in the more northern lakes and not at all well developed in Lake Erie. So these things do move around in cycles to the extent that these actions of the fish—which appear to become more amazing, the more they are studied—are being watched. But I do not think we have yet reached the position where you can tell with absolute certainty what these movements will be in detail.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I realize that perhaps maybe the survey such as I speak of has not been taken. What I am really trying to determine is the effect of this pollution, particularly in these areas. I do not think the movement of smelt is as relative as perhaps the supply of this fish life, and if no studies have been made that is fine. I am just wondering if they have been made—if we can say with any certainty that this pollution is having an effect in these particular areas.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, again, the hon. member is now directing his question particularly in relation to the effect of pollution. Well, certainly there has been work going on on that effect, and in some connections it has been found that, quite the opposite of what might have been anticipated, fish can thrive on certain types of things that are certainly polluting in other respects, and turn out to be even choice as the result of it.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, when we were discussing vote 1101, we were told that the Indians came under this vote—1103, under wildlife and fish. I do not know how they get the Indians under there, but my question regarding them is this—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. member will get us back now on the right track here and that will help us all.

Mr. Trotter: Could the hon. Minister give us some idea of how many Indians are employed by his department, and what efforts are made to give the Indians employment in his department?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, Mr. Chairman, yesterday I made a statement in connection

with the Indians during which perhaps the hon. member was not in the House.

Mr. Trotter: I was here.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I will not need to repeat what I said then for his benefit. But there are approximately 160 Indians on the payroll of the department on a general basis, and of course in summer time that number is increased. For instance, in the fire protection field where they do a very great amount of work, that number is substantially increased and if there is a really serious fire hazard it would be increased by very large numbers. They are called upon to help in that particular field of activity on very short notice and are very glad to do that. It varies, of course, and I think it goes from as many as 500 or more employed for varying periods in a normally busy year in that type of work.

I think we have one or two actual deputy rangers, we have forest rangers, we have conservation officers, and of course the standby fire crews, and that is all in the field of direct employment. I mentioned yesterday trapline work and that sort of thing, which is all for the benefit of the Indian. It is done to help the Indian; it is not done at all with the idea that he is getting a handout. It is done to make conditions under which he is operating better, so that he and the people engaged in that type of work can gain a better living. And that is the way the Indians as a whole want it, I am sure.

I see the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) listening at this time and he comes from an area where they certainly are a proud and haughty group and they do not expect the white man to hand out things to them, they expect to be given and treated as equals.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned that the Indians are sometimes used as conservation officers. Do they get much training for that type of work? And I might add, do the Indians who are employed have much training?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They are entitled to come to the ranger school and take courses, and some of them have done that. Our present position at the moment, as I said yesterday, is to encourage in the field of education and the field of direction, such camps as I mentioned yesterday, which I hope will be a reality towards leading young fellows of about 17 into directions for their future lives which will be helpful to them, and in time perhaps, be helpful to all people associated

with them. We are certainly aiming in that direction.

Mr. Trotter: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a field where this department could do something and it is evidently going to attempt to do something, and I for one will watch what it does for the Indians. I do think on future occasions in discussing the estimates that there be a more appropriate place than under fish and wildlife to discuss the Indians. I felt it should have been at least under the main office. I hope that despite the fact that we are discussing Indians under fish and wildlife, that you have more sense of their value to the province of Ontario than would be indicated by where we are discussing them.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a plea to the hon. Minister that he consider increasing the grant to the Jack Miner migratory bird foundation. I notice the grant is the same this year as it was last year. Now, the sanctuary is so highly regarded by people across the border that even the city of Detroit had a Jack Miner Day, or had declared in the past a Jack Miner Day. Now, it is a real tourist attraction in our area, and is also something of prime educational value to the students of the local county as well as those coming in from the state of Michigan. In looking over the estimates I do see that the trappers association one year ago received \$1,000 and this year received \$5,000, and probably for a good reason. For that reason I think that the Jack Miner migratory bird foundation should be given added consideration. It is a tourist attraction, it is educational in value, and it is something unique in Ontario.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): May I inquire from the hon. Minister why it is considered necessary that game wardens wear revolvers?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I understand that that has been the practice. I am not so certain that it is essential myself and I would be glad to have a good look at that to see if it is necessary for protection. There may be very good reasons for it. On the other hand I would not advocate the use of it if there was not a good reason for it. I will look into that.

Mr. Sopha: I find it very objectionable. In a democracy where we are not accustomed to the overwhelming coercion of the state, it is sufficient that we arm our policemen, and in fact there is a good and respectable body of opinion in this country that even policemen ought not to be issued with weapons.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Of course the fact of the matter is: would you like to go through the bush day in and day out without any arms?

Mr. Sopha: I do. The answer is I do.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: You go through the bush from your home down to the police court.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, the answer is I do go through the bush day in and day out when I am on my own property and I have never felt the necessity of carrying or wearing any type of firearm. I am merely calling attention to the fact that you see these people from The Department of Lands and Forests all over the place downtown in Sudbury, you see them in the courts wearing their revolvers.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: On ceremonial, if you are speaking about ceremonial, I will go along with you.

Mr. Sopha: They are not ceremonial. You take your own time to make your own speech and let me have my say.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: You take it out of context. It is the custom.

Mr. Sopha: That was an extremely informative answer, I hope all my hon. friends heard that. He said it was the custom for them to wear them. In other words they have been doing it for 20 years—as long as this government has been in office. There is no other reason for it, no other reason for it.

I have heard a great many people comment that The Department of Lands and Forests is by no means an arm of the police force, they do not have to exercise a great many coercive powers and if they find somebody with a few trout over the limit, or a moose or deer shot out of season, they do not have to take the revolver out in order to hold the person up to get the offensive game or fish away from them.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That does not happen in Sudbury does it?

Mr. Sopha: Instead of looking into it, I think that having called it to the hon. Minister's attention then he in his inimicable way having dealt so reasonably with it, that it would take a simple precept—is that what it is called in this department? They issue a simple precept and say: hereafter when Department of Lands and Forests people are within the bounds of urban communities and are not

walking through the bush they shall not wear firearms. It is as simple as that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, might I bring something to the attention of the hon. Minister which I think might be helpful?

This was contained in a letter to me and I think it might be a worthwhile suggestion as far as Indian labour is concerned. It says:

I have been reading about the ideas of trying to get work for Indians so that they can get some kind of revenue, and some means being found for their betterment.

Indians are at last being recognized, which I believe is long overdue. Really I do not think the Indians should be brought out of our north country which is their natural habitat and they love it and do not want city life. But I do think living conditions should be made to help them where they are.

One thing that I was going to tell you was about the two-storey houses the government built at Gull Bay. Well, of course, the Indians will not heat the upstairs so they all live downstairs around the stove so that the upstairs is a loss. At Macdiarmid they built low, one-storey cottages which I believe is the right thing for them and not too big.

One little thing that would help would be to have The Department of Lands and Forests try and collect all skins of deer and moose brought back in the fall by hunters and deliver them to the closest Lands and Forests' bases and fly them to the reserves to be made into moccasins by the Indians.

I imagine he figures on the Indians tanning them at the forestry bases and flying them in to the Indians to make moccasins.

I think they are right. Indian moccasins make wonderful souvenirs for tourists. The moose population is going down and the Indians I meet tell me that they have no hides to make into moccasins.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The moose population is not going down.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The moose population! I do not think it is either, that is probably a mistake. But the Indians claim that they have no hides to make into moccasins.

—and I think it would help the Indians to earn a living in the way in which they are accustomed to and it would also help our sales to tourists. If all hides were returned

to the department bases and they in turn were tanned and sent to the Indians to let them do their work on moccasins in which field they are highly skilled, it would add a great deal to the Indians' income.

Now, I thought, Mr. Chairman, that that might be something that would help out because I believe that many of these deer and moose hides are destroyed—they are of no use to anybody but a tourist who is going to have the animal stuffed—and if they were tanned and sent in to the Indians it might create quite an industry in their making them into moccasins and different articles of the kind which they are so skilled in doing. I thought I would pass that on to the hon. Minister, as a suggestion for the benefit of our Indian population.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: If my hon. friend will allow me to say so, that particular project is presently being discussed between the Indian Affairs department at Ottawa and our branch in connection with this fund-sharing arrangement I mentioned yesterday.

Mr. Sopha: I do not know of any industry that this government ever created or fostered to assist Indians. Take, for example, the Winnipeg goldeye that is fished in a lake, I just forget the name of it now, north of the town of Kenora—

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. Sopha: It is not Lake Winnipeg at all. A lake in Ontario north of Kenora. As a matter of fact the CBC—when was it, a year ago, perhaps a little longer—the CBC had a half hour programme on fishing the goldeye. The goldeye, as was pointed out by the late member for Kenora, Mr. Wren, is then transported by air to Winnipeg where it is processed.

This very tasty, delicious fish, I think I am correct in saying, is found only in Ontario waters. It never occurred to The Department of Lands and Forests, although the late member for Kenora used to raise it almost perennially, that they might establish some type of processing plant within Ontario, in the neighbourhood of that lake and employ the Indians in the off season—I do not know when the goldeye runs or spawns or schools or whatever the goldeye does—to employ them to process the fish as they showed in the CBC programme. A very fine institution, the CBC!

They showed how they are taken to Winnipeg—some private individual owns a

plant there and apparently he gets all the goldeye that are fished—and are cured and dried, processed and packed. Most of them are shipped to the States, as a matter of fact. The only place you can get the goldeye in Canada, as far as I am able to determine, is on the CPR—a fine institution, too. They are the only ones, as far as I can see, who purvey the goldeye. There might be a market for the goldeye in Canada, if this department took the initiative to establish some type of processing plant to employ these Indians. I think that is true for the whole area north of Kenora and Sioux Lookout, where they live pretty close to the state of nature. This department has never done anything to foster anything in the way of a local industry.

Very interesting—the comments of the hon. Minister of Mines. I can still in my mind hear the voice of the late member for Kenora, as he used to tell this House about his ideas of the establishment of some sort of a tanning industry, or some industry for the making of moccasins and other things. In fact, I recall one time that he advocated that the beaver pelt, of which we have a tremendous amount—I do not know whether the hon. Minister told the House that yesterday while I was elsewhere engaged in the business of the province. We have a tremendous number of beaver—they are very much on the increase. As far as I know, there is no predator to keep it in check. Right now at least we are in a cycle, as far as I can see from my personal experience, where the beaver are very much on the increase.

The late member for Kenora, as I say, used to advocate—he had a very great love for the Indians, a very deep and abiding love for our red brother, the original owner of this country—he used to advocate that the provincial police might very well have, as part of their uniform they might have a beaver hat. I am speaking very seriously now. The police might be issued with a beaver hat; and these beaver hats could be made by the Indians.

But once again I say, I do not know of the establishment of any industry in or near any reserve that has helped them out. I just want to make a little public statement in contrast to my good friend who is part of our family, part of the Liberal family, and that is Senator David Croll, when he spoke in my community the other night. I was not there but he spoke on the occasion of brotherhood week, and he advocated that Indians be taken off the reserves. I will not come out in open contradiction of Senator David

Croll, who has been part of the cultural life of this community a good deal longer than I have. He is a very wise person, but I would hesitate very long before I would advocate such a measure, and I hope that it would only be done after a very extensive investigation has been made of that problem. I have some good Indian friends who reposed their confidence in me; I act for several of them in the Manitoulines, and along the north shore of Lake Huron, and I know the Indian to be quite happy with his state on his reserve.

Most frequently, the Indian, you know, is unlike politicians, he is not a very loquacious individual. You never really get within the inner mind of an Indian. Never really know what his innermost thoughts are, and because he does not tell you, he feels a great many things, but he does not articulate them into words. He will sit and listen to you, and you do not know whether he is agreeing with you or not, but indeed he is a priceless part of our cultural life in this country, and a very integral part who should be the object of our greatest trust and confidence in him, and that of course is the long story.

Maybe the hon. Minister yesterday—I do not know, as I say I was not here—maybe he told what we are doing to help the Indians, and I hope he did; but I say again, I do not know of anything this department ever did to establish any type of industry to employ the talents of the Indians, and to foster him along.

Let me end on this note: Too often our attitude toward the Indian has been that we must make the Indian as much like us as speedily as possible; we must assimilate them; we must integrate them; we must bring them into our community, as if we white Anglo-Saxon Caucasians—sometimes we get the idea that, looking over the path of human history, we have almost achieved perfection, that we are almost perfect—have to get everybody to be like us so that it will be a great wide and wonderful world, and God will be in his heaven, and we will be running this, to get everybody to be as much like us as possible.

“God forbid!” somebody said on the other side. There is a great deal of argument in that. We Caucasians have not been too successful in our ordering of human affairs, when I see us going after the Indians.

Another thing that bothers me—and I am speaking, as they say on Madison Avenue, off the top of my head—is this business in the

Patricia district and Kenora where we take the Indian children away each September from the band and their parents, and take them down to these schools at Sioux Lookout—and what is the name of the other place—well it is not important. McIntosh—yes. We take them down to the Indian shelter, and they are kept there from September to the following June and then are returned to the parents. They are brought back in the following September, so that makes it only three months of the year when they are with the band and with the family. The family unit has become broken up during that time.

I am not sure that is a good thing, in the interests of education. I am not sure that that is ostensibly and *prima facie* a good thing, to break up the family unit in the interests of education. Who knows, maybe the Indian children might be better off if they were left with their mothers and fathers, within the integral unit of the band; that is the type of thing we do in the name of wanting to assimilate our red brothers, and bring them into our community.

I hope that Senator Croll will not be—and he is a very good friend of mine, an honourable and well-respected member of our party, and a former member of this House, and a former Minister of the Crown in a former government—too angry with me for taking the opportunity to say that it is not all that patent to me and not all that obvious, the validity of what he said the other night in Sudbury about our Indian brothers.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Before carrying the fish and wildlife vote, it was about this time last year that the department announced it was closing the hatcheries facilities at Mount Pleasant even though the objection of the local staff was made quite public. Since that time, the ponds that were used in the hatcheries have been made available to the citizens of the district for fishing; the ponds having been stocked. I just wonder, since this has been going for one season, whether the department is going to extend the service, as I feel they should, or what was the result of the experiment?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I understand that the first year has been very successful, and we would expect that it would continue.

Mr. Nixon: In that place only; or will it be made available in other areas across southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well the policy will be to extend.

Mr. Nixon: Do you have any suggestion as to where the extension might be made?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We are not, at this present time, in a position to give details on that.

Mr. Troy: Is it the intention of the department or the hon. Minister to expand hatcheries in other areas; or are you going to concentrate in that particular operation in certain sections only? I know that there has been some alarm at the depletion, in certain of our lakes and streams, of the fish population. The suggestion was made that the expansion of hatcheries might be the answer.

Somebody else said that you were not going to expand the number but you were going to concentrate that particular operation in certain areas only.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, the general policy would be definitely to extend the fishing facilities. That is part of the overall programme we have in mind, anticipating a greater population and, of course, also watching to the adequacy of the stock.

Mr. Chairman: Carried—

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Before this vote is carried, I would just like to refer briefly to an incident that appeared in our district, involving Indians. I think, as we all know, we have seen increased publicity in all the newspapers of the province—which publicity is, of course, issued by this department, and which publicity indicates the department is now taking an enlightened view on the problems of the Indians, and is doing everything possible to assist the Indians.

I am referring, in particular, to the Indians who live in the White Fish Bay area of the Lake of the Woods. This particular White Fish Bay is near Sioux Narrows, as the hon. Minister probably knows. These people are living under rather desperate conditions, and have been for some time. I believe, some time ago, they applied to the hon. Minister for additional commercial fishing licences, in the area of Lake of the Woods.

As a result of these representations, made by the Indians, I understand that the local officials of the department, biologists or foresters or what have you, came. I do not know what the procedure is, but they tested the area and checked the waters in question. Their conclusion was that the area in question could stand increased commercial fishing pressure. Subsequent to that, they

communicated this information to Toronto with their recommendation that these additional fishing rights be granted. Subsequent to this change of communication, the former Minister, for whom I have the greatest respect, made a tour through the Sioux Narrows area, during which he had a number of meetings with all parties concerned. But the upshot of the whole business was that the Indians' request for these additional rights was refused. The reason given at that time by the hon. Minister was that we had not had the tests necessary before they could grant a licence; in other words they were not sure that the area could stand this increased pressure.

Subsequent to that I advised the hon. Minister the actual findings of his own department in wording which I think was mild compared to what the particular experts had originally used. The hon. Minister then turned around and hung his hat on the aspect of publicity, namely that the appearance of fishing nets in this area during the summer months, or at any time apparently, would cause a great deal of harm to all concerned because of bad public relations.

The Indians, who were quite reasonable about this whole business, then came through with the proposition that they might compromise their proposal so as to include these additional fishing rights only in the winter months, namely from October to March, when there would be no tourists in the area—and I hardly think there would be anyone who would normally see these nets while they were in.

I am fully cognizant of the fact that the tourist industry is most important to all of us. I am a firm believer in the fact that we should know what the facts are before fishing licences are granted in any area for any reason. But I suggest to the hon. Minister and to the department that here is a case where a reasonable, compromised solution would do much to show to the public that what the hon. Minister is saying, in these press clippings, about his enlightened attitude is true. I would ask the hon. Minister to reconsider the decision and accept the compromised solution offered by the Indian people in that area.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1103 agreed to.

On vote 1104:

Mr. R. C. Edwards: If I might ask some questions resulting from a publication which came to all of our desks some time in the

month of November, 1961. It was a reprint from the magazine *Timber of Canada*. It dealt with the matter of forest protection and it made some pretty serious charges. The publication stated that in fact more could be done about protecting our forest than was being accomplished. It pointed out very severe losses. I do not intend to read the article, other than to try to perhaps read one or two paragraphs to point out what I believe to be the seriousness of the charges, one of which I think should concern us.

Speaking of the severe forest fires and the losses in our natural resources as a result of these fires, the publication says:

This should not be. Our means of detection and suppression are far ahead of what was available ten years ago. With modern detection apparatus it is possible to detect any fire within minutes of origin. Such being the case it is reasonable to assume that our fire losses should be reduced year after year.

Obviously and from the figures it is evident that they are not; and why not? Because the politicians elected to the provincial Legislature are to a large extent selling our forest industry short all along the line.

Then it went on to point out that with the expenditure of more money probably on a federal basis with provincial co-operation, these losses could be cut down.

Mr. Chairman, when I received this publication I took the trouble to write to the writer of this article; because you see, sir, I sit in the Opposition and if the government was in fact being as negligent as this statement would indicate, I felt it my duty to draw it to the attention of this House. I wrote to the magazine and explained to them that I as one individual was wanting to be responsible and not wanting to be one of these so-called "politicians" full of hot air. At this point I will stop long enough to say that there are a lot of editorial writers in this country who are pretty anxious to criticize both the government and Opposition alike for being irresponsible, but as the saying goes they are not prepared to put their money where their mouth is. I did not get any answer from the writer of this article, so I wrote him again that I did not have the specific information to back up some of these charges and again I did not get an answer.

But I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister can assure us at this time that we are taking all the precautions that we should take with respect to the forests of our

province? The hon. member for York South makes an argument, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a reasonably valid one, each year when he points out that we are using up these resources. Possibly our reforestation programme is not as good as it should be, but it seems to me that the forests that are destroyed by fire are a much more serious loss. I wonder if we could have assurances this afternoon that we are successfully, or reaching a degree of success in, dealing with the problem of our forest fire losses.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, this of course is always a very important matter, the question of the loss of valuable natural resources by fire, but I am glad to be able to say that great progress has been made, as the figures which I will give in a moment will show. But even when one says that one realizes, as happened as recently as 1961, that a certain series of events occurred away above the average in respect of destruction. But even allowing for that, if you take the averages on a ten-year basis, you will find that great progress has been made.

I would say that since taking over this office just a few months ago and visiting the various chief rangers' offices under the fire protection section of the department, I am greatly impressed with the personnel and the equipment. Even in the winter months you get a chance to see the equipment all stored there and you realize just how efficient it can be.

For example, up in Quetico Park just a few days ago, I saw for the first time the latest type, very small equipment in one sense and yet very important, whereby in a pack-sack type of thing there can be carried on the back of a man a certain amount of water. He has in his hand a hose and nozzle and, by a little pumping effect, he can spread the water that he is carrying on his back, travelling quickly through the bush in making close-up attacks on fires before they get under way.

At the other end I saw that very splendid new method we are using, of fighting fire from the air with water, the equipment for which was demonstrated to me in Sault Ste. Marie a few days ago. If carried out with precision drill it is possible, in a matter of a couple of minutes, by the use of several planes, one following the other on their circuit, to drop as much as a tenth of an inch of water in a fairly good sized area in a matter of minutes. As you know, a rainfall of a tenth of an inch dropping in an area is a very considerable amount; and if that is repeated it is even more so.

That is a great holding method until they get the ground forces in. We use helicopters, we use aircraft dropping equipment with parachutes, and we have, as I mentioned yesterday, very special types of equipment and specially trained crews to go through very difficult country and terrain to reach fires.

We are very proud of it, as a matter of fact. I was in New York the other day and had the opportunity and honour of addressing the firefighter chiefs of all the international groups there—we are members of that, as is the fire marshal's department and The Department of the Attorney-General—and was able to tell them something. The chief of the New York fire department, who has something like 13,000 firefighters, was sitting there, and the chief commissioner was sitting there, and it was too much for the chief commissioner when I stretched the point a little bit about our hose and said that we could perhaps wrap up a fair section of the city of New York and not leave much more than the top of the Empire State Building showing.

In reply he said that perhaps they could bring their hose up here and wrap up our Christmas trees. But after I went around the north, I realized that the whole production of hose in the United States would not be enough to do that.

In a little more serious vein I am going to give you these figures. The following table provides some interesting detail in connection with forest fire occurrence. I am going back quite a period and my hon. friend has asked for this. The article he refers to, the author of it ought to take note of it, I go back first, 1920 to 1960, a period of 41 years. In that period the average fires per year were 1,323. The average acres burned over per year—296,639. Man-caused fires—82 per cent; lightning-caused fires—18 per cent. In the period 1920 to 1929, ten years, number of fires per year—1,104; acreage burned averaged 476,042; and again a percentage, this time higher—92 per cent, and 8 per cent lightning caused.

The period 1930 to 1939, ten years—1,609 average fires; 398,489 average of acres; 80 per cent and 20 per cent.

1940 to 1949, ten years—1,323 average fires; 241,035 acres; and again the same percentage, 80 and 20.

1950 to 1959, ten-year period—average of fires—1,291; average of acres—97,516; percentages, man—77, lightning—23.

1960—956 fires; 31,386 acres burned; 68 per cent man caused, 32 per cent lightning.

1961—1,305 fires; 1,184,998, that was the terrifically bad year; 66 per cent man-caused, 34 per cent lightning.

And last year, 1,521 fires; 13,797 acres; the lowest I think I can say in 40 years as far as acreage goes; 80 per cent man-caused, 20 per cent lightning-caused.

The period of highest fire occurrence, of course, is usually in the summer months, particularly from June 30—last year, June 30 to July 19. In this 20-day period 404 fires were reported, 42 occurring on July 19 alone. Most of these fires occurred in the central and southern parts of the province. North-western Ontario experienced a below-normal season, both from the standpoint of fire occurrence and area burned.

We have in the department, in the office of Mr. Mackey who is in charge of this work, a very up-to-the-minute switchboard, an electrically operated board; and by means of teletype and radio all through this fire period, starting at the very first fire, we are able to keep a running account of where the fires are in each district, what state they are in, and exactly the disposition of aircraft, of men and of equipment. At any given time I could walk from my office, a matter of about 50 yards, go in there and at a glance—as my hon. friend could do and perhaps he would like to go in some time next summer and look at it—see exactly what the picture is as of June 20 or July 30 as to fires, and what is going on at that very moment across the north country, and where all our fire fighting forces are distributed.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, some time last summer, I believe it was in the early part of the summer, I received one of the weekly reports that the department issues from the district offices. I believe this one was in the Cochrane district. I understand that the district forester in that area had sponsored, on his own initiative a contest, a fire fighting contest, in which participants were invited from the various cutting camps and mills in the area.

I subsequently talked to the forester in question who advised me that this particular contest was quite a success. The people involved, who took part in it, were all very enthusiastic and enjoyed themselves in the process of learning.

I wonder if the department has given any consideration to sponsoring such a programme on a province-wide scale.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I think we can generally say we certainly would encourage

any wise and good move towards helping to keep fires down or to put them out. I think perhaps there are various ways in which that sort of end object is being attained or sought, but I think that is perhaps an idea that might go beyond the particular district in which it was tried out, if it has been as successful as has been suggested.

I might say that we do have new ideas throughout the whole department. We do have a system for getting new ideas from our people throughout the department, and there is a select committee constantly looking over these. On occasion we get some extremely good ideas, very valuable ideas. This is something to which I will draw attention, and do what the hon. member has said.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, if I might, with your permission and that of the hon. Minister, I will read into the record and give him for his information an idea that I have here, which I think might be of some help under the forest protection branch, especially in helping to fight fires and also the saving of human life. This is a letter I received a few days ago. It says, and I quote:

Having travelled all of northern Ontario and a lot of the rest of Canada, including the Yukon, Alaska and Labrador, I think it would be a great idea to cut identification lines through the north country. Ever since Mr. Barilko, the hockey player, was lost on his return trip from Hudson's Bay about eight years ago, I have thought about how such tragedies could be prevented, and decided to explain my suggestions to you as you seem most interested.

The first thing that enters the minds of most people, including myself, when leaving an airport or water base, is to wonder just where they are. Usually they have to wait until an altitude of 1,500 feet is reached before they can place themselves by comparing the terrain, such as lakes and rivers, with the map. That is, providing the weather is clear. Invariably, the general course when flying is either north or south, it seems. With an average aircraft travelling at 150 miles an hour, on a 200-mile trip, you may hit foul weather about half-way, or near your destination.

Not knowing the size of the storm you are undecided as to whether to go through it or return to base. However, if there were definite lines cut out east or west of you, in about 15 or 20 minutes the line could be reached and your flight continued

and your location more easily confirmed or a landing place found quicker if necessary.

Often during heavy smoke or fog a pilot has to come down to about 500 feet and the line would be a great help in determining their location. Especially for the tourists flying in for the first time, this would be a great thing as they could follow these lines to the nearest spot of their destination. My opinion is that these lines would be used 90 per cent of the time by all pilots flying in the north to induce more flights to areas where the vastness of the country is more clearly laid out.

The lines, to my way of thinking, could be tried out here in northern Ontario, say from a place like Red Lake, Pickle Crow or Nakina, or for that matter any place that is most suitable. I would suggest that a line about 30 feet wide be cleaned out, the logs laid on the side and the limbs and brush of the trees all burned, leaving the line open for good walking, and when they come to rivers or lakes cross and resume work on the far side again.

I also suggest that only Indians be hired as labourers to do this work. This would certainly create a great deal of work for the Indians if it was decided to be done, but I realize that it would have to be probably a provincial-Dominion operation. This could be tried as a winter works programme without too much cost, and if it proves beneficial more of this type of work would be beneficial. It would also alleviate the problem of procuring work for Indians in the winter months.

If these lines were put in north and south about 150 miles apart across our province, a line could be cut on the Manitoba-Ontario boundary starting at the middle of Lake Winnipeg on the east side, which would connect the 45-degree angle which exists in that boundary, and then a line north from each of the following bases—Red Lake, Pickle Crow, Nakina, Hearst and the Quebec-Ontario border.

He says Cochrane in between would be omitted, because the railroad could be followed there.

Once the purpose of the lines was known to the public, I am sure many people would be interested in flying north, knowing that if an emergency landing were made the search parties would locate them quickly and with much less cost. Forest fire work would be benefited, as

would prospectors, surveyors, and trappers as well as many others. Several pilots I have already spoken to about this, heartily agreed that it would give them and their passengers a much stronger sense of security.

Now, I am going to leave that for the hon. Minister, and in closing I might say that I have the greatest admiration for the staff and the equipment he mentioned just before that makes up The Department of Lands and Forests. I have flown over areas when they were on fire. I have seen these men work with the equipment, which unfortunately is not as plentiful or up to date as we should like it to be. The summer of 1961 was a tremendously bad fire season, but I want to make it clear that my admiration for these department men is very great. The staff of this department generally, I have known for a great many years, and worked very closely with them. They are a dedicated group of servants.

I would suggest that any man who says otherwise, will find that more than 50 per cent of the fault lies with him. I have found throughout the civil service generally and this department especially that when you go in a co-operative way to ask them to do something, you get more than your share of co-operation back. That has been my opinion all along and I just want to pass it on to the men you have with you today, because so many of the department heads I have known for a great many years are here in the Legislature this afternoon. I wanted to make these public remarks about them, and commend them for the great service they have been to me through the years.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I was appalled to read in the Brantford *Expositor* about three weeks ago that within five years there would be no more elm trees in that county and within 12 probably no more elm trees in Ontario. I wonder if there is any plan to be undertaken by the department, even if it is a plan consisting only of advice to the municipalities to avert this tragedy.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That, unfortunately, is a very serious situation in parts of this province, and a very serious situation in the metropolitan area here. But The Department of Lands and Forests has a contract with the federal government for tree disease research and this includes both insect and fungus diseases. There has been a fair amount of work done on that, and what follows is mainly based on reports and discussions with

the federal pathological laboratory at Maple which was established under this contract.

The Dutch elm disease, insofar as North America is concerned, reached the United States from Europe about 1930. A European outbreak preceding its arrival in North America was presumed to have resulted from the importation of affected elm material.

A quarantine on both wood products and living material was imposed by the federal government in Canada as early as 1928. Prior to the original discovery of the disease in the United States, Dutch elm was found in 1944 in Richlieu county, Quebec. It is generally assumed that the initial infection came direct from Europe and not from the United States. From this point, infection spread eastward.

It is justly presumed that this particular infection is not responsible for the occurrence of the disease in Ontario. The first occurrence in Ontario was in Prescott county in 1944, and spread westward through southeastern Ontario in subsequent years. The second infection is believed to have occurred in the Niagara and Windsor areas about 1950. This infection is believed to be of United States origin. At the present time the disease covers all of southern Ontario and has advanced north to approximately the French River-Lake Nipissing line.

Mr. Sopha: Couldn't you leave this until after April 8?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well if you do not, I have been asked what I think was quite an intelligent question, and I anticipate that the person who asked it expected an intelligent answer. There is no reason to believe that the disease will not shortly cover the whole range of the species in the province, and the Great Lakes watershed, and I would think the member for one of the metropolitan ridings would be particularly interested in this, because it is a real problem as far as this metropolitan area is concerned.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): What are you doing about it?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, what is being done? Can't you read the papers? There has been a university committee set up here two or three weeks ago, and it has been acting and taking evidence and getting statements from the best authorities in the province, in the whole country. That is what has been going on.

We do not talk all over the place without knowing what we are talking about in this department. I would like to tell you that this is a technical department, that has to learn something about things before it starts to tell people over there. You tell us things without knowing anything about it half the time. You cannot listen—just wait until I get through. Well, it is wonderful to listen. I am trying to give you fellows some information. You do not want this.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: This study is being taken on by people who know something about the subject, and who are engaged to do it, and it will not be solved by a lot of hooting around in this legislative assembly. Tree breeding and selection might be the final answer to the Dutch elm disease. Almost certainly it will be the best answer for the species, as a timber producer, and as a contribution to the southern Ontario landscape.

At best, however, this development cannot be expected to come about quickly. It is generally believed by those best qualified to assess the situation that the general population of native elms will be severely reduced in numbers during the next few years, but elm will not entirely disappear. Subsequent build-up will depend on the natural or scientific development of resistant elms, or the discovery of practical low-cost treatment which will cure or prevent the occurrence of the disease on existing elms.

Municipalities and other local agencies concerned with the protection of a limited number of shade trees can reduce losses to a tolerable amount at practical cost by sanitation, eradication and proper spraying. Individual or ornamental trees will probably be preservable by chemical treatment in the very near future. Now, that is the position at this moment, the best that I can give to you.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister mentioned a moment ago that the difficulty was being looked after, is he referring to this committee that was set up two weeks ago? Surely not?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am referring to the committee that Dr. Cyford headed and got together for the purpose of starting a thorough inquiry into the picture, at the level of the university and with people who ought to know all about this subject.

Mr. Nixon: Just in very recent weeks, and the fact is that the problem has risen to this

proportion without anybody who knows anything about it taking some action, isn't that so?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would not say that. There was a lot of action taken. But the fact of the matter is that if you had some elms on your property, you would be inclined to take the action if you wanted to save them.

Mr. Nixon: The only action, Mr. Chairman, is to cut them down, because we read in the paper that this spray may be completely useless. We read it just about a month ago in a Toronto paper that the spray control was a waste of money. All you can do is cut the tree down when it appears to be diseased. When you drive down the highways of this province you are usually within sight of at least five dead elm trees. I would think that control would be practically impossible under these circumstances.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think that the treatment the hon. Minister has given to this question is once again a demonstration of his irresponsibility with regard to almost any serious problem that comes before him. He was asked, as he said, an intelligent question—

Mr. Sopha: Then he becomes abusive.

Mr. Bryden: —he was asked an intelligent question on this problem of the Dutch elm disease, which as far as a layman can determine is threatening the elm tree throughout this province, a tree that has given character and beauty to the landscape of Ontario. Its loss will be a very serious matter to anyone who is interested at all in the surroundings in which he lives.

The hon. Minister was asked this question, and he read us a dissertation on the history of the disease. He read us an answer that told us that the disease exists in the province and it is serious. That frivolous attitude, I suggest, is not proper for the Minister in the appropriate department faced with this sort of problem. I quite agree with him that there must be research done but I do not think his department has had anything whatever to do with encouraging any research. The problem is one that is not very well understood and there has been no satisfactory solution discovered as yet. But the parks commissioner in Toronto, for example—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The very crux of the thing is just what you said.

Mr. Bryden: But the parks commissioner, for example, for the city of Toronto and the

authorities at the university have been trying to do something against overwhelming odds. As my hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald) said while the hon. Minister was reading his statement, we have in the Minister a modern Nero fiddling while Rome burns!

The city and university just do not have the resources to handle the problem even under the techniques that are now known; furthermore, they do not have the powers to do so. As I understand it from reading the reports of experts and listening to them, the only known answer at the present time is to cut down an infected tree and destroy it so that it will not infect other trees. This is quite an expensive proposition to begin with. The city of Toronto now has a programme afoot to do that, but they are not beginning to keep up with the problem and they suffer from very severe limitation in that they can do nothing about trees on private property.

The hon. Minister says that if a private individual wants to keep his elm trees he will have to do something about them himself. Well, all he can do is cut them down; that is not going to keep them. The point is, though, that the private individual probably does not consider it worth the money that would be required to cut down these huge trees.

So his trees stand on his property and they are not, as the hon. Minister implied, a matter that is purely his own concern but as a source of infection for trees nearby on other private property or on public property—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): Shame.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, well the liquor commissioner thinks this is a question of no concern, apparently. But I would think that this department could very well give some leadership and assistance to municipalities and to the university authorities, in trying at least to use the methods now available to keep the problem under control. The very park in which this building is situated is certainly going to be radically altered in appearance and for the worst, if the ravages of the disease continue at the present rate. I would like to say again, Mr. Chairman, that it is regrettable that the hon. Minister apparently is quite unwilling to view this matter in any serious manner at all, or to consider that his department has any responsibility of any kind or might be able to exercise any sort of leadership.

Mr. Sopha: Well, just by way—

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford): I think, Mr. Chairman, that anything that is done now is just like locking the door after the horse has gone. I know that at my cottage at Port Dover this summer we lost three trees that are over 50 years of age, and as you look around the lakeshore and around the horizon, there is nothing but bare trees here and there, or trees that are turning yellow. They turn yellow and come down and you can see it all around the lake. I do not know what can be done but I think it is just as I said, just like locking the door after the horse has gone. I do not think you can do anything about it.

Mr. Sopha: By way of addendum I recall very well that it was in the session of 1960 that this matter was first raised by the official Opposition and, if I am not mistaken, I think it was the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Belanger) who raised it.

Mr. Newman: Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Sopha: Windsor-Walkerville, pardon me. Then the hon. Minister tells us that a bare two weeks ago a committee was set up to advise the people who are knowledgeable in the arboreal science to look into it.

Now I just want to put it in this context that we have asked you people time and again to stop politicking and get down to the business of the province, and we wish you would do that.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1104 carried?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I am not going to repeat unduly what has been said here but I am just going to add my support to this plea that the government give some leadership and treat this thing seriously. One of the people who has been involved in a very constructive way, in efforts to come to some conclusions that might result in leadership in the absence of action on the part of this government, happens to be one of the top municipal officials in York township, and I have had many opportunities to discuss the problem with him. I will just underline the need for leadership by two points.

The hon. Minister rises here and says, for example, that one of the answers is spraying. And then he says: If you have an infected tree, you should cut it down. Well, no more than two or three days ago we read in the papers from the parks commissioner in the city of Toronto that you cannot spray be-

cause, if you do, you will kill all the robins in the city! It would seem to me that this would be a matter of some concern to the hon. Minister. Either he is wrong or the parks commissioner is wrong. If they have come to the wrong conclusion I submit it is this government's responsibility to face up to this issue and find out what is the right answer. But it is rather ludicrous for the hon. Minister to come in here and say one of the answers is spraying—and this, he says, is on the basis of the best information, technical information, and his is a technical department—when within the same week we have the parks commissioner for the city of Toronto, or for Metro, saying that to spray will kill all the robins and, by implication, that spraying cannot be indulged in.

Secondly, the proposition of cutting down. Quite apart from the legal problem, the expense involved in cutting down a tree in the city is not like that involved in cutting down a tree in the country. When I grew up in the country, if you wanted to cut down a tree you cut down the tree, but you cannot do it in the city. You have to get somebody who is capable of cutting it down branch by branch and handling it in this built-up area. And I happen to recall a year or so ago when I thought, well, I will have a few branches cut down on the trees in my back yard because the owner of the apartment nearby was complaining about the odd one that fell on his property. So I inquired and I discovered that to have a few branches cut off was going to cost about \$80—just a few branches, not the tree; to cut the tree down was going to cost a few hundreds of dollars. So you have the problem of literally—I have forgotten what the figure was in the paper in the same story with regard to the parks commissioner, but it was some astronomical figure in terms of millions of what it would cost to cut down the trees which are infested in the Metro area at the present time.

So I submit that this matter is a serious matter and that somebody should be giving some leadership. All praise and commendation to the group that apparently came together voluntarily at the university level, involving people in various municipalities.

But I would think in a matter like this that this government should have been giving some leadership and I would hope that the hon. member for Brantford is not completely right. That it is not a case completely of locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. I would hope that at least one element

in the hon. Minister's speech was correct that there may be a few of them salvaged and a generation or two from now we will have found the means of killing the disease and can re-create and re-stock this province with what I think is the most beautiful tree in existence.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We all agree that this is a terrible thing—

Mr. MacDonald: Where is your leadership?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: —that has hit this part of the country, hit the United States and hit southern Ontario; of course it is. But you might as well get up here and suddenly decide that this government is to blame because we have not cured cancer. This is one terrible disease that is sweeping by; and all that can be done, I think, is being done so far as this department is concerned. At any rate, it is doing all that it can to get technical answers and to give the value of that information to all the areas, and the people in charge in those areas who want to have it and who could make use of it.

Mr. MacDonald: Who decides—the hon. Minister or the parks commission, as to who could make use of it?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I am not going to get into that. The parks commission here—as a matter of fact I have seen this Metro outfit get out of step with the rest of the province quite regularly, and they could be out of step right now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: As a matter of fact, their experts may differ from ours and may differ from the university ones, but I do not think they are so dogmatic that they will not sit down and try to find what is the best solution and what is the best type of treatment. It is obvious that we are bound to lose a great many trees. We have lost a lot already as the hon. member for Brant has just said. As I say, it is pretty nearly as serious in the field of tree study as cancer is in the field of human disease study.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in my first address in the House back in 1960 I brought this problem to the attention of the Minister involved. I repeated that in 1961, again in 1962, and it is only now in 1963

that we finally have a committee set up to study the problem. Surely we should not wait three years simply to study the problem?

The city of Windsor has gone right ahead in an attempt to overcome the problem, but they are sort of hitting their heads against a stone wall. They are spraying trees in the community but find that they cannot keep up with it at all. The disease is spreading a lot faster than the treatment that is given to the tree.

The city of Detroit has undertaken a study and have actually attempted a spraying for over ten years, yet they find that the incidence of Dutch elm disease is not diminishing; it keeps ravaging the community. Surely it is about time that this department got off to a little better start and did something rather than simply set up committees now, three or four years after the problem had been brought to their attention.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I think that is what you would call short thinking too, because actually this work of study had been going on for several years before the hon. member came into this House, and it will be going on for several years after he goes out at the next election. The forest pathology lab. at Maple, with Dr. White in charge, has been working hard on this, doing its best to get solutions and pass out information and advice just like a doctor would pass out to patients. They are doing their best and they will continue to do their best.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister said just a moment or two ago that Metro was out of step with the rest of Ontario. I think he should elaborate.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I did not say any such thing.

Mr. Singer: Well, what did the hon. Minister say?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: What I said was that Metro often gets out of step with the rest of the province, and if you want to put it the other way perhaps the people in Metro might think the province is out of step with them. But the fact of the matter is this does not surprise me at all, in the course of this study, what the hon. member for York South just said.

Mr. Singer: No, but if the hon. Minister is saying that certain Metro officials have not done their job properly—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I did not say so at all; I did not say any such thing.

Mr. Singer: I think the hon. Minister should elaborate on that.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think it could at least be said that the hon. Minister is not out of step with anybody, because he is not moving at all. I would like to put two questions to him.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I know enough to stand still long enough to think.

Mr. Bryden: Well, the hon. Minister will never suffer from that disability, I can tell him that. The hon. Minister may some day realize that there is a difference between thinking and atrophying.

If I may, I would like to ask him two questions, which he may or may not see fit to answer. I would like to ask him, first, if the government would be prepared to consider giving financial assistance to municipalities that undertake approved campaigns to try to combat this disease. As I understand it the only method now is, probably, to cut down the trees. I would like to ask him that.

I would also like to ask him if the government would consider some change in the law whereby a municipality could, with the consent of a private owner, remove diseased trees from the private owner's property. Right now they cannot do it even if the owner wants it, because they have no authority to use public funds on private property. I think it would be desirable to enable them to make arrangements with private owners to have diseased elm trees removed from those properties.

I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would indicate if the province is ready to do anything in either or both of the areas mentioned in my questions.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, the hon. member has put forth certain suggestions and this whole matter is certainly something that is of vital importance to everybody. We will take a look at it and see if there is anything that can be done that would be feasible, because actually this might be—if you were to make the eradication by removing all trees—an impossible cost proposition. But we are certainly anxious to see these trees preserved if possible.

The street on which I live is practically entirely made up of elms, very beautiful elms. I have done my best from time to time to watch the area there and get sprays

and that sort of thing. They took one out the other day but I do not know whether, even with all the best efforts in the world, they—I know in fact, from what the people tell me, that we cannot save anything more than a fine proportion of them.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1104 agreed to.

On vote 1105:

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. Minister some questions with respect to the lands division of his department. I would like to deal particularly with the policy of the disposal of lands. Is this the proper place to raise it? I presume that it is.

What is the policy in the disposal of Crown lands?

1. Do we always dispose by tender?

2. If we do not dispose by tender what is the method, and are proper appraisals obtained before the lands are sold?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, just a moment. I have an answer to that one in some detail. I take it from the question that the hon. member for Wentworth is asking the general policy in relation to land disposal, speaking in a general way. I would be glad to outline that under certain headings.

Summer resort lands, private and commercial, are usually disposed of by sale on the terms and conditions and at the prices fixed by the regulations. Where there is a heavy demand, summer resort locations are made available by tender, auction, or by public notice that the locations will be available on a first-come-first-served basis at a stated time and place. Private summer resort locations are sold at the rate of \$2.50 per foot frontage plus a fee of \$150 to cover survey costs. The average private summer resort location sells at from \$500 to \$800. Commercial summer resort locations are sold at the rate of \$4 per foot frontage plus a fee of \$300 to cover survey costs. The commercial summer resort locations sell from \$1,500 up.

The policy of the department is to sell private summer resort locations on pre-survey plans of subdivision.

Commercial Crown lands on new highways: where new highways are opened up and there is a heavy demand for commercial sites, lands are made available for lease with option to purchase by tender or auction. The lessee can purchase his leased site after the fifth year of the lease if he has erected improvements and he is operating an establishment. When the heavy demand stage

has passed, the remaining sites are disposed of on a first-come-first-served basis, on a lease with option to purchase the same as on older highways.

Rental of Crown lands for commercial, industrial or private uses other than summer resort use: Leases, licences or occupation or land use permits are issued for various uses at rates established by the regulations or by department policy.

Agricultural lands: An amendment to The Public Land Act a couple of years ago provided for the establishment of a public agricultural lands committee. This committee is composed of members of The Department of Lands and Forests and The Department of Agriculture. The applications for agricultural lands are reviewed in the field by the district forester and the agricultural representative. And these are referred through the committee, which makes recommendations for the approval of the Minister. Land capability, type of farm operation, local economic and social factors are taken into consideration in dealing with an application.

Isolated Crown land surplus to the requirements of The Department of Lands and Forests: In some parts of the province, and particularly eastern Ontario, there is a pattern of isolated Crown lots. These are generally sold to the adjoining resident land owner at the going price for the land and the forest products. If the adjoining resident land owner is not interested and there is a demand for the land, isolated Crown lots are sold by tender or auction.

The Department of Highways land surplus to highways requirements: When Crown lands vested by The Department of Lands and Forests in Highways, become surplus to the requirements of Highways, they are normally re-vested in Lands and Forests. Where lands acquired by The Department of Highways from private interests, become surplus, they are disposed of in accordance with the policies and procedures of that department. They may be resold to the owner from whom they were acquired, or disposed of by tender or auction to a successful bidder. Or they may be vested in Lands and Forests, and managed or disposed of in accordance with the policies and procedures of the department.

Water lots: Disposition of water lots along the Great Lakes is by lease pursuant to policies established in 1955 on the recommendation of the Treasury Board. Rentals are established on the basis of land appraisals carried out by The Department of Public

Works. Charges for water lots on inland lakes are fixed by regulation. Licences of occupation are issued and charges vary from \$30 to \$60 an acre for commercial use and \$15 for private use.

Dispositions for lands for use not otherwise provided by regulations or departmental policy: Section 18 of The Public Lands Act provides for the sale or lease for such purposes at prices and under terms and conditions as are approved by the Minister. Under that section not more than 10 acres can be sold or leased without an order-in-council, nor can a sale at less than \$10 an acre or a lease of less than \$5 an acre per annum be made without an order-in-council. Applications for land under this section are dealt with on their merits. For example, the owner of a commercial summer resort location can establish his need for a larger area. This application for purchase or lease could be dealt with under this section.

Now that is the method. I think that gives the hon. member quite a detailed answer of the policy and the regulations. Some of it, of course, is spelled out by statute, under which public land is disposed of.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I thank the hon. Minister for the detailed answer. What I am particularly concerned with is in three positions where the hon. Minister stated that they were sold at "going rates". What I would particularly like to know is how they establish the going rate. I can understand that as you get up in the isolated parts of the province, perhaps where you are trying to open up the area, you could establish a price at so much a foot and the regulations which the hon. Minister stated would be appropriate. What I would like to know is how is the value of the land established when you get into a perhaps more built-up area. The hon. Minister mentioned heavy demand. It seems to me this demand would be directly related to the publicity that was given to the fact that the lands were for sale. How does the hon. Minister establish the value when there is heavy demand? How are the going rates determined?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is established internally through the department by appraisal, or it may be that the department requests Public Works to come in and give an appraisal. Having got a figure in that way, it moves from that position.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Then is this appraisal determined in all cases where there is a

heavy demand? What I am trying to say is this: that the hon. Minister is probably aware of the fact that usually in the sale of municipal land The Department of Municipal Affairs takes a very positive position in most cases. They say that it must either be by public tender or in any event there must be qualified appraisers to give an opinion. These appraisers are fully within the jurisdiction of The Department of Lands and Forests, and if the policy of establishing a fair going rate for the land is not publicly known, I suggest to you, sir, that the door is open for mistakes. It would seem to me that a government which insists on certain precautions in the sale of municipal land, should likewise be responsible for insisting on the same precautions in the sale of Crown lands.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, in the experience of my senior officials, many different methods have been tried, but on balance these methods that I have outlined, considering the volume of business that there is in a year in connection with sale of lots and sale of land and this sort of thing—and the fact that much of it is to encourage people to settle on the land or to develop the land—that this type of procedure is in their view good. Now I imagine that there could be exceptions. I imagine that there could be cases—in any system as far as that goes—there can be cases to which we can point as weaknesses, and certainly our minds are not closed to improving our system at any time in this department.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few brief remarks. I do not think the system is satisfactory. I think the hon. Minister is well aware of the situation which was brought to his attention and I do not wish to discuss it here. As I went into that situation, I understood that a piece of land was for sale; it was known that a piece of property was for sale. Two people were interested in purchasing that piece of land, known to the department, and subsequently the one individual purchased the land unbeknown to the second party who was interested and who was not even given the opportunity to submit a bid.

Now I do not like to make charges and I am not going to make charges this afternoon. I would hope that we could get at the business of the House without having to continually make charges. There have been pleas for responsibility and that is what I have been trying to do in this case. I suggest that unless there is a predetermined method of establishing value, and in determining who shall purchase the land, by this predetermined

method, that the door is left open to patronage—to put it “plain and simple”. If there is not a predetermined method and if, in fact, the lands are sold at what the department feels to be a fair price and to whomever the department feels should be permitted to purchase the land, then I suggest that the government is leaving itself open to serious criticism.

I am suggesting that the answer which the hon. Minister gave me this afternoon still leaves the impression that these lands are not being sold in perhaps the best method. Certainly a government should, in my opinion, put itself above criticism and one of the methods of doing that would be to do it by public tender. I would think in built-up areas where, as the hon. Minister says there is a heavy demand, that the department has a responsibility to obtain for the taxpayers of Ontario the highest and best price they can get for those lands. I suggest that the method is entirely different in the built-up areas, or for instance in the case of lands which The Department of Highways have as surplus, the situation is completely different in this instance to that in isolated areas where we are trying to develop tourist areas and places of recreation for the people of this province.

I think the hon. Minister knows what I am speaking of and I suggest that it is the responsibility of the government to change the situation with respect to these areas where there is a heavy demand. I do not think that the government leaves itself blameless when your department establishes what would be a fair price. I suggest that The Department of Lands and Forests is no different from a municipality which must not only shun evil practices, but must be beyond and above that; it must shun the appearance of evil practices, and I suggest that the way it is being done now leaves the door wide open for friends of the government to buy the land at a lesser price.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I appreciate that my hon. friend has presented that particular side in a way that certainly should be looked at. There are various angles and that is why I said that on balance the procedures as carried out are considered to be, by these senior officials, perhaps as good as anything we know of at the present time.

Let me just illustrate—and I am not depending entirely on this because I think myself that there are certain areas where perhaps the rules could be laid down a little more clearly so there could not be any danger of what you call by a certain term, and I

might call it something else, but somebody has to get it and some people have to go without, and that is the end result if there is real competition.

Now, we have found on occasion that type of thing has happened and we have had calls for the highest bidder or tried to put a high price. Later on it turned out we sold them a lemon, and they paid too high a price. We get a lot of grief from that angle, and that has happened several times. Now that is on the other side of the picture. If the department can get a fair price, and let a whole lot of people go after it at that price, on a first-come-first-served basis, that might turn out to be as good as any other, and perhaps even better.

Now, occasionally we do, on that first-come-first-served basis, come across a situation where people will line up perhaps a day or two when they know that a certain subdivi-

sion in some area is up for sale and they would like to get a lot. The people who are showing the greatest stability with respect to weather and so on in the line-up, get the first choice, and the others have to go without, but the prices are the same, no matter what, on that type of thing.

Now, again, those are all matters that perhaps some other group would handle differently, but I am saying now, on the advice I receive, we feel that this generally speaking is satisfactory. As to what my hon. friend said a few moments ago in regard to what he called "built-up areas", we shall take a good look at them.

Mr. Chairman: Is the vote carried? It is now 6 o'clock. I will now leave the chair and resume at eight o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 21, 1963

Estimates, Department of the Attorney-General, Mr. Cass, continued	955
Resolutions re amounts to defray the expenses of government departments, concurred in	993
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	993

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1963

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 211:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): I would like to raise some questions in connection with the probation services. I appreciate, as the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Singer) said, that we have a new hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) and I congratulate him on his new post and look forward, indeed, to making suggestions as I think they will be given consideration by him. I have been making suggestions before, to the previous hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts), and I feel now more of a glimmer of hope that perhaps some of these suggestions will be given more consideration.

I would like to say, sir, that I have been interested in the pre-sentence reports that probation officers make. I have noticed that the previous hon. Attorney-General had suggested that these were an excellent method of assessing intelligently what kind of rehabilitation treatment should be given to an offender, not just on a sort of blind basis because he has committed a crime, fitting the sentence on the basis of the crime, but rather fitting the sentence on the basis of the offender to rehabilitate him.

The previous Attorney-General had said that they had pre-sentence reports for almost all young offenders. And I have been asking the question, whether or not, as suggested in the Fauteux commission report, that these pre-sentence reports should be mandatory. The hon. Attorney-General might give consideration to having the pre-sentence report made mandatory.

My second question is that I have wondered about pre-sentence reports. I should say that I myself was a probation officer for a period. It was pointed out to me—I was not working in this province—but there was a fairly advanced approach, I think, in the province of British Columbia at that time to proba-

tion services. I always had a certain feeling of uneasiness, in some respects, with what I was doing.

As a probation officer I would go and talk with young offenders and tell them that they should have some confidence in me, that I was trying to help them. I would learn a great deal about their private lives and about their home lives. We talked to their doctors and their school teachers and so on, and then compiled this information. Then I might appear before the magistrate privately, and I would really have made a judgment about the treatment that should be given. I would give this judgment to the magistrate privately; I would also give him the report, and he would look through this. This conference never came before the courts.

It seems to me there is a question in this of pre-sentence reports; whether we are not somehow sidestepping the procedure of British justice in not having all evidence appear before the court and open to both the defence lawyer as well as the prosecutor. I understand that here the pre-sentence report is available to both prosecutor and the defence lawyer, but I still think that, in many cases, the probation officer goes to the magistrate. I wonder if that procedure has been clarified in Ontario, whether some people, when they are giving these personal facts to a probation officer, whether they really know this is going to go to the magistrate and is going to be weighed in connection with the sentence meted out.

One thing I feel with probation services, from my own experience—and I noticed that the previous Attorney-General mentioned it a number of times—is that the family background certainly has a great influence on the cause of appearance of the offender before the court. I found myself in frustration at times, when someone was put on probation and was sent back into a home situation where, to me, the parents were delinquent and disinterested in the responsibility of parenthood.

I remember, during my period as a probation officer, that I would often suggest that we should do something with the parents

rather than with the child. I know in The Juvenile Delinquency Act there is a qualification that we can do something. But it seems to be very rare occasion, when we have a young offender before the courts, that the parents are brought into the picture and punished. I wonder, from the point of view of the hon. Attorney-General's department, whether there could be some encouragement to magistrates to look into this situation, where it is quite obvious that the parents have been delinquent, to encourage magistrates to give sentences to the parents, rather than to the child.

This brings up the point that it is all very well to increase probation services, I think that this is highly commendable that we should, but it seems to me that if the probation services are not backed up with other community resources then really the probation officer is doing almost a futile task. I mean by this that in many cases, where the young offender comes before the courts, where we realize it is the unfortunate environment in which he lives, if we could remove him from that environment to a more controlled environment, perhaps he would have a chance to mend his ways. If we had foster or probation hostels for these young people, I think we would be going a long way in helping to correct a number of them, rather than just letting them go back into the same environment which caused them in many cases to get into trouble.

I remember asking the previous Attorney-General—I was just looking prior to our session tonight—I was going through the 1960 discussion of estimates. I asked the previous Attorney-General, in connection with the community services, whether they had foster homes or whether they would consider having probation hostels. He answered—and I do not want to quote it directly here—that he is not interested in that area. I am sure that this hon. Attorney-General is interested in that, because unless we get these kinds of services there is not much point in going through all the elaborate procedure of a probation officer making reports and trying to supervise young offenders.

I feel as well, sir, that there should be more encouragement in connection with psychiatric clinics. I noticed the question had been asked previously about the young offender who might need examination by a psychiatrist.

They have in Metropolitan Toronto such a clinic, and the previous Attorney-General said that they were going to have clinics which could travel all around in areas other

than Port Arthur and Sudbury and other areas that already have clinics. He said that they were going to have travelling clinics in order to cut down on the delay. I wonder whether this has been done, or whether it is your intention, sir, to proceed with the travelling psychiatric clinics?

The last point that I would like to make is in connection with research. I have the feeling that we are blind, in our attitude to probation, indeed about the whole aspect of crime. For example, in the pre-sentence reports there is an enormous wealth which could be analyzed in studying the offender and what causes him to commit the crime.

I would hope that the hon. Attorney-General would be thinking of having some research people look into the pre-sentence reports, treating them as confidential but examining factors about the offenders—their background and all the other factors causing the young offender to come before the court. We have a whole compilation of facts over a number of years. I would hope that we might study the effectiveness of probation.

Sometimes we give a very glib answer, saying that 80 per cent of those who are on probation did not get into trouble again. They might not have got into trouble even if they had not been on probation, and had rather been given a suspended sentence. I think this whole thing should be given a good hard look. I asked the previous Attorney-General if perhaps he could start looking at research in these pre-sentence reports and I would like again to make this plea to the hon. Attorney-General today.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I am—and I am equally sure that the officials of my department who have under their responsibility the probation services, and who are present here this evening also—I am very pleased to hear the comments of the hon. member for Dovercourt who has experience in these matters, as he has said, and as we all know. I can certainly assure him that the Ontario probation services, both in pre-sentence investigations and all subsequent proceedings, is in the vanguard as far as these matters in Canada are concerned—or perhaps even on this continent.

I would say that the latest figures which I have are for 1961, and they indicate that there were 11,000 pre-sentence reports, and I am advised, and I believe it is so, Mr. Chairman, that these particular matters are matters for federal jurisdiction and the use

to be made of them, and how they are to be dealt with. The officers and workers in probation services, have done their best to co-operate and give such guidance and assistance as they could to those responsible, for not only hearing the cases, but imposing sentences when there is a conviction.

I am also advised that in 1961 there were 300 cases against parents of children preferred under the section of the Act, another Act mentioned by the hon. member. The matter of the care of these children is one that concerns us all, and I am sure I do not have to remind the hon. member and other hon. members that great steps have been taken in that respect over a period of time, but it has been done rather through the Children's Aid Society than through the probation services which I think quite proper. I can assure the hon. members that we will continue to research and to take action in regard to all these matters. I am advised by my colleague the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) that there are some 23 psychiatric units which serve by travelling, 19 others throughout the province—most of them operating out of Ontario hospitals. These are available for the purpose mentioned by the hon. member in that about 40 per cent in almost all the cases treated, are children.

So, I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. members of this House can rest assured that everything possible is being done. We are not standing still; each year we do see some improvement.

Mr. Thompson: I just have a couple of supplementary questions. I have this question about federal responsibility, provincial responsibility, and also voluntary responsibility, and I can appreciate in connection with the criminal code that there are complexities concerning their various responsibilities. I have some concern, and I think I will express it in the area of parole, because I understand probation officers do parole work to some extent. I noticed the question was asked, I think, by the hon. member for Kent East (Mr. Spence) about parole services in Guelph.

The hon. Attorney-General mentioned at that time that it is done there by a voluntary agency, the John Howard Society. I should—and I am speaking personally, and not from the point of view of the party—feel that parole in many ways should not be the responsibility of the voluntary agency. I listened and I appreciated your answer, and I thought it was ably given—that rather than government help to the people who come out of prisons, the more relaxed and informal

approach of the voluntary agency would be better.

But I am somewhat critical of the fact that voluntary agencies themselves can often be the dead hand of progress. There should be more responsibility taken by the government. I always felt that one of the roles of voluntary agencies is to experiment, to show the need for services on a universal basis, which should be taken over by government. I remember pointing this out to the hon. Minister of Health, and he was kind enough to commend me for thinking on those lines. I think the John Howard Society, for example, has a great tradition; that they have done many fine things, and one of the fine things they have done is to show up weaknesses in penal reform across the country and in every province.

But I do not think, for example, that the John Howard Society as a voluntary agency, can or should cover the parole services for the whole of Ontario, and I would question whether, again, that they even had an office in Guelph. Perhaps the hon. Minister could correct me. You are suggesting that these men can go to Guelph and see the John Howard office. I do not think they have one, and if they do have one, it seems to me that through the United Fund and private individual donations, we are paying for the support of something that should be taken over rightfully by the government.

The parole service to me is a most confused picture. I do not understand what the parole board, set up by the reform department—not in your department; however, there must be a connection between the parole board and the probation officers. But I would feel that this whole area of parole is so vitally important, that this is a real test of whether rehabilitation has been effective for an offender. There is confusion, and I would suggest, sir, that when you were saying that the research is a responsibility for federal people, your probation officers do the pre-sentence reports—perhaps therefore that should be taken over from the federal people. I would think that in many other areas the Ontario government moved in in order to show the federal people what to do. I think this might be an area you might move into. I understand the Children's Aid Society is helping with foster homes, and I appreciate your concern with the young offender.

Just taking, for example, my own riding, they have the Dovercourt Boys' Club, and also we have a home for emotionally disturbed children. They get a grant—and I am

sure that organization appreciates it—from The Department of Public Welfare. These are ideal projects to keep the institutions from being crowded and they are a great help to probation officers. Could we not hunt around for foster homes that would look after young probationees?

I think that you have suggested or inferred in your answer to me, sir, although the previous Attorney-General said he was not interested, that you are interested in this. I hope that your staff would be hunting for more foster homes where young probationees could stay. The other question that I have is: Why is the probation service under your department? Perhaps you could clarify this for me, sir? I could see a correction department, and I say this for the reason that I see parole and probation being interwoven together.

I think this whole approach of correction should have a closer association. I think it would do two things.

(1) That if probation services were associated with the other correction institutions, they would have an appreciation of what happens to young people who go into institutions. The probation officers would, if they were also acting on parole work, have a closer association with the people in institutions, prior to them coming out into the community.

You want to get young men and young women to go into this correction field. And if it is just a narrow field of probation—I do not say this in the sense of being a narrow work, I know it is a field of imagination and ability and I admire the men who have gone into it, but I mean with respect to government services; this small department can be a cul-de-sac for promotion and so on.

If they were allied with the department of corrections, I could see an outstanding probation officer being moved to take charge of an institution, being the warden of an institution. I can see some outstanding custodian person moving up to being a senior parole officer. In other words, I see you setting up a comprehensive correction department, providing a field for young men and women to enter knowing that they are working in a comprehensive correction department. Therefore I ask: Have you considered this, and why particularly keep this in the Attorney-General's department?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say again that I am very grateful for the views of the hon. member. Either I was not

as explicit as I should have been or else the hon. member did not read out of my words what I should have put in them.

The other day in this House I mentioned the John Howard Society and the Elizabeth Fry Society as being very important and useful voluntary services. But, of course, in addition to that, there is the parole staff which the hon. member has mentioned which operates under The Department of Reform Institutions; I suspect there are some three score officers employed on parole work there.

It has been brought to my attention, and I think I mentioned it, Mr. Chairman, in the House the other day that we in Ontario, through our probation service, have been looking after—or servicing I think is the technical word—some 300 parolees from federal institutions at the request of the National Parole Board. It seems to work very satisfactorily and I presume that will continue.

The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, has asked me a question which could be answered in several ways with respect to why this particular branch is in the Attorney-General's department. Of course one of the main answers is because, at the present time, it is there and, as the policy of the government, it should be there. I think we can go deeper than that and say that the probation officers who work in this department are officers of the court and have a responsibility both to the magistrate or judge hearing the case, as well as to the other court officials and the public. Therefore I think it is quite appropriate that those forming part of the administration of justice government in this province should be officers of the court, and this branch should be under the Attorney-General's department.

On the other hand, I think there could be a very great distinction drawn between the position of those who are parole officers under The Department of Reform Institutions, whose duties take up after the sentences imposed by the court have been served as far as a parole board deems necessary. I think that is a reasonable solution and a reasonable reply, to that question, Mr. Chairman.

I think that we have shown, in Ontario, that in the Attorney-General's department the probation service has advanced by leaps and bounds and that it is the leading probation service in this country. At least I personally, Mr. Chairman, would be very adverse to changing the present set-up which

has been so good and has produced such tremendous results, unless I were shown much better reasons than those advanced by the hon. member tonight. I do admit there is some merit in his thoughts, and certainly I am sure that my hon. colleague in Reform Institutions (Mr. Cecile) and I would be glad to discuss the matter.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, before you leave that I wanted to underline one of the earlier comments of the hon. member for Dovercourt related to something that I was discussing the last time the estimates were before the House—two days ago that is. The hon. member for Dovercourt has drawn attention to the fact that we are not certain as to the value of many aspects of this work—that there has not been adequate research on the role of pre-sentence reports or on the claim that 75 per cent or 80 per cent of those placed on probation do not become offenders again. As the hon. member pointed out they might not have become repeaters if they had been given suspended sentences because there would not even be the cost of having them on probation.

I want to tie this in with something else we discussed earlier with regard to research and bursaries. As you recall, Mr. Chairman, an earlier estimate indicated that there was only \$3,000 for two people now on staff, \$1,500 for each of two officers; that there was \$7,000 for in-service training. I think that the hon. Attorney-General agreed with me when I suggested that now that we have fairly well exhausted the potential group of people from whom we might draw probationary officers, we may well have reached the stage when we will have to subsidize the training of these people. I would just throw out for his consideration the idea, as part of that broader field of subsidizing those who come into the field, that if you had somebody who was obviously interested and already experienced in this field, that post-graduate work in tackling some of the unanswered or some of the uncertain areas that were outlined by the hon. member for Dovercourt would be a very useful expenditure of a few thousand dollars. It would ultimately pay off. I just throw that out as an elaboration of my earlier comments in that connection.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman I was wondering if the hon. Minister could tell me what the case load of each probation officer is. How many cases do they have to look after?

Hon. Mr. Cass: The average case load is about 60, I believe. I stand corrected—65.

Mr. Trotter: Sixty-five—my information is that it is much higher. Could be that you have obtained—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, in the days gone by, and not so very far gone by, there were case loads of 110 to 120, but due to the expansion of the department and staff that we discussed the other day in the estimates, we have been able to reduce that to 65 as I am advised now. I presume that with the additional staff which we hope to obtain this year there will be some slight reduction also for next year.

Mr. Trotter: I do not have the exact figures before me but I understand that there are as many people in jail in Ontario as there are in all of England, which has about ten times the population. Many credit this in large part to the fact that the English probation services are much further advanced than ours. We are improving, no doubt, but it has certainly taken some time and we have some way to go.

There were two aspects of probation which the two previous speakers did not mention and which I would like to emphasize. One is that men who are suspected of being drug addicts are put on probation from time to time and if no facilities are available where they can obtain drugs legally they are most certainly bound to get into trouble with the law once again.

Now there was an article in one of the Toronto papers either last night or the night before, where one of the inspectors of the Toronto force was putting up the argument that it was impossible to cure drug addicts. Policemen are no doubt good in tracking down criminals but I have often found that policemen are sometimes like top army officers and army colonels—they are not very interested in reform, they are sort of hard-boiled and they take things as they are.

There would be very few improvements made in our status of living or in our welfare measures if we had the viewpoint of these authorities who are in charge of tracking down these criminals because, good as they might be in their field, I think they have a very narrow approach and I hope that the hon. Attorney-General will listen more to the advice of men like Mr. Kirkpatrick of the John Howard Society. Mr. Kirkpatrick has from time to time put out pamphlets—and I imagine each hon. member here in this

House has received those pamphlets—emphasizing the necessity of giving assistance to those who are drug addicts or suspected of being drug addicts. If drug addicts know that they can obtain help and obtain it legally, I believe there are many who will seek help, despite what the Toronto police inspector said about the English system; the English system seems to be working. And certainly it is far better to start a pilot project and try to do something than just sit back and say it can't be done, it's all lost.

Unfortunately, this has been the view of the government on this subject. I know when drugs are brought into question the federal jurisdiction must also be thought of; but certainly, at the same time, the provincial government here could take some initiative to bring about the use of drugs legally for those who need them. I would press this upon the administration here once again.

There is one other thing I wanted to mention and that is the importance of finding work for those people who are on probation. This is often the same situation for those who need after-care once they have been released from jail. So often these fellows, who have been in difficulty because of debt, have been caught stealing for the first time. In many cases it is because they are desperate, they are out of work; in many cases they have families and they do not know how they are going to keep them. The government has great resources, where it can use its influence with the different business firms in trying to obtain employment for these people.

You only need to look through the public accounts to see the various contracts which the government has with large firms—it no doubt has a great deal of influence with many business firms and I think that through the discretion of probation officers much could be done to find proper work. I have had two or three cases where we have managed to get the individual released on probation but the big problem was to find that person work.

The probation officers in both cases were unable to do much and did not seem to know how to go about finding them work. They would advise the young fellow not to do this or that, and make sure that he was at home at a certain hour, and not to drink, and all this type of thing, but they had no facilities at all for finding work.

If these people, who get into difficulties with the law and are released on probation, can find some decent type of employment or, if they are not equipped to have a decent job, can have some arrangements for their

training, their retraining would be of tremendous assistance. After all, this is not just what the police inspector in Toronto said, "A lot of do-gooders trying to help people," but it comes down to dollars and cents. If you can stop one of these people on the road to crime early enough you will have a person working and paying taxes rather than somebody being in and out of jail for the rest of his life. To me, it is dollars and cents, and I do wish the government was more aggressive in this field than it has been in the past.

Finally, I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be wiser to have such facilities as probation under The Department of Reform Institutions because, despite the fact that one is a parolee once they have been released, and the other is on probation—they have not been in jail—it is still very much the same work; the facilities should be very much the same; the experience of your trained men should also be the very same. In other words, it is getting individuals to walk the straight line, to stay out of trouble and to try to become citizens who are of use to the province, so there is a tremendous similarity.

Perhaps behind the scenes they work together. Perhaps there is some type of organization where the two departments talk over their problems—I do not know. The two departments are very similar and I would not be too surprised if there is not a great deal of overlapping between The Department of Reform Institutions and the probation department of the Attorney-General's office. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 211 agreed to.

On vote 212:

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, since we now have a new hon. Attorney-General I should like to again bring up the matter of the hours of work of firemen which I think is regulated by this department.

The last time I brought this matter up I understood that the maximum work week for fire departments was 56 hours a week. I presume that there has been no change in that; is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

An hon. member: Are we going to have the debates or are we going to have the Whip?

Another hon. member: A very important fellow, too.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well until this very moment, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member

was still holding the floor. He merely sat down now, and the rules of this House require that the man who has the floor has to be there.

An hon. member: Where? On the floor?

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): It is nice to have the hon. Minister listening.

Hon. Mr. Cass: The Minister is listening. You would be surprised how much the Minister listens, has to listen to, in fact how much we all have to listen to here.

Several hon. members: All of us.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, in answer to the question posed to me by the hon. member I will say that I had the officers of the firefighters association in to see me about two weeks ago and they presented a brief. Many things were in this brief, some of them the responsibility of the fire marshal's office in my department and some which were not; those which were not were taken to other Ministers.

One of the matters in the brief, and one of the matters given a very great deal of discussion at that time, was the maximum work week for firemen in the province of Ontario. Presently, as the hon. member has said, the maximum work week is 56 hours. The brief contained figures which, of course, were known to us, indicating that a few fire departments with a small number of firemen—I am sorry I have not those figures at the moment but they are substantially less even than those quoted in last year's *Hansard*, when this matter was debated—were still using the maximum work week.

I did say to the delegation and I say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members here that that is a matter which we would consider when bringing in our legislation this year. I could not say whether it would be part of the legislation but I felt that good progress had been made and perhaps the time was rapidly approaching, or even here, when, without disturbing the operations and arrangements of many small communities, who find it rather difficult financially and otherwise to foot the firefighting bill, it could be done without too much difficulty and upset of their budgets. We would study, in the meantime, whether I could consider such an amendment. I say that in answer to the hon. member's question and that is where the matter stands.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I submit to you, sir, and through you to the hon.

Minister, that one of the purposes of this government is to lead instead of follow.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: It seems to me somewhat annoying. We brought this matter up before; it has been brought to the attention of the former hon. Attorney-General; it is not something that just came to the attention of the government with this brief. It has been a continuing thing through the years.

Surely the time has come in this province where a 56-hour maximum week is outdated? We sat in this House, I think it was two years ago when the unemployment situation was at its peak, and Minister after Minister over on the other side rose and made long political speeches about what was being done to overcome the unemployment situation. Here is one place that something could be done.

We have a law in this province which says the maximum work week, in most cases, is 48 hours. Many people now feel that that should be reduced to 40 hours in the interests of all the people of the country. For the hon. Minister to stand up tonight and say that he is going to give this consideration, and that after everybody has quit working 56 hours he is going to reduce the hours in this particular regulation—is to be ridiculous. I think that the government has a responsibility here to lead. I think the time has come when this can be shortened. I think the time has come when the government should take the lead.

If, in fact, they want to bring it forward in an orderly manner, why on earth does the hon. Minister not stand up and say they are going to issue something that will bring this down progressively so that it will not be an undue hardship? For surely the time has come when there has to be a determination of what we are going to do. In my opinion, with great respect, I think the answer we have had from the hon. Minister tonight reflects the somewhat anti-labour policies that are reflected in nearly every department of this government.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Who does the hon. member think he is kidding?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to kid anybody.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I think the time has come for us to say what we mean and mean what we say and quit giving lip-service to a principle that we are not going to enforce. I think here is a place where we could show some leadership. It certainly would not inconvenience anybody to cut that week down from 56 hours; it could come down at the very minimum to 48 to be at least comparable with other regulations which are in force in the government. I am disappointed in the attitude of the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that one day the hon. members of the Opposition stand up and tell me that we must not do things which raise the tax rate on the poor people who have to pay—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Hogwash.

Hon. Mr. Cass: And then the next day they say, "Lower the work week, employ more people, make the taxpayer pay more money".

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would say this in reply to the hon. Minister: I am prepared to take the responsibility down where I live for raising the taxes if it is necessary to reduce the work week below 56 hours. I am prepared to stand up and say that I will take full responsibility for it because I think that is what the public wants.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on this same estimate 212, a few years ago, perhaps it was 1958, in Metropolitan Toronto, the council set up a special committee to investigate the possible amalgamation of fire forces. At that time the fire marshal of the day came before that committee and ventured certain opinions. There is presently in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and in the daily press certain talk about possible unification of services or perhaps other things. I was wondering if the hon. Attorney-General would care to express an opinion, as being the Minister responsible for the fire marshal, as to whether there is any wisdom or lack of wisdom in the possible amalgamation of metropolitan fire forces.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a matter which I am sure will be discussed at the proper time when the meeting of the officials charged with this duty of amalgamating or not amalgamating the fire departments in Metropolitan Toronto are held. I have no comment at the moment.

Mr. Singer: But, Mr. Chairman, this is the point that my hon. colleague from Went-

worth was making. Is it not reasonable to expect that the people of Ontario are going to get some leadership from this government—not that we are going to get answers that we are getting from the hon. Attorney-General on almost every question that was asked. When the proper time comes, our officials will have an opinion. If this government is leading, if this government is supposed to govern, surely it is not unreasonable to expect that in this Legislature, where they are called to account as they bring their estimates forward, that this government will have an opinion on at least some of these.

I had hoped, and I said this at the beginning of these estimates, I had hoped that with the new hon. Attorney-General we would perhaps have a new broom sweeping clean, but this man is no better than his predecessor, he has no opinions on anything.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, under vote 212 I would like to ask the hon. Minister in regard to a report from the fire marshal's office. I have an article here by the top official of a county stating that 35 per cent of the rural schools in one county are not complying with the fire marshal's regulations. It does make me think, Mr. Chairman, if this exists in one county it must exist in other counties. I would like to know if there is a report from the fire marshal's office, which the hon. members of this House can secure and read to see if these conditions exist in all parts of the province.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to get the answer in a moment from the fire marshal because I have a summary, not a report but a summary, of circumstances in one county in Ontario and I am not sure to which county the hon. member is referring.

Mr. Spence: The county of Kent, my own county.

Hon. Mr. Cass: The county of Kent. Mr. Chairman, if you will just allow me a moment. That is not the county I have. Mr. Chairman, I must say that one of the things which concerns the office of the fire marshal as well as this government is the safety factor, as far as fires are concerned, in many of the schools, not just the large city schools but the small rural schools where there is no fire fighting apparatus within easy reach. I can say this, Mr. Chairman, not from personal knowledge but from knowing what goes on in the office that there are a great many inspections made and there are a great many requests for inspections of schools and a great many complaints and that, as a result, an inspection of

schools is constantly going on in various parts of Ontario.

I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the schools in Kent county have not been inspected by the fire marshal's office. The report which I have is on Peterborough county.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, in the public accounts for the year ending March 31, 1962, there is an item under the fire marshal's office, the Drolet Catering Service, \$15,437. What would that be for?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am not sure but I will get an answer. I presume it is the fire college—for catering service there. Yes, that is the catering, Mr. Chairman, at the fire college at Gravenhurst.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, on this particular item. As you know, a few days ago we had a very tragic fire out in my riding of High Park on Miller Avenue; eight youngsters were burned there.

An hon. member: In a school?

Mr. Cowling: No, it was a house. And we were all greatly concerned at the time and we still are. I was there the morning following the fire. It was a very disastrous affair. I was just wondering, for the information of the House and the hon. members, if the hon. Attorney-General had some report on that from the fire marshal.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, that was the question which the hon. member was asking me when the hon. member for Wentworth was holding the floor over there. I do have a report and I think that it would be the best if I should read this report which is from the fire marshal and is dated February 21, 1963, and I am now reading the report:

Re Fire, 26 Miller Avenue, Toronto, February 8, 1963.

The Metro Toronto Arson Squad investigated a fire which occurred at the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Roy French at 12.49 a.m., on February 8, 1963, at 26 Miller Avenue in the city of Toronto in which eight children, ages 4 to 16 years, died.

The results of the investigation indicated that early in the evening some of the children made french fries on the stove and then went to bed. Later the same evening the father, as usual, filled the kettle with water and put it on the gas stove so that he could make tea when his wife arrived home from work. The father apparently went to sleep. Because of the

complete destruction of the stove we are unable to determine whether or not the father turned on the wrong burner. However, we do know that the fat from the french fryer spilled over on to the stove and ignited the combustible walls, resulting in an exceedingly fast-spreading fire.

A review of the circumstances surrounding the fire would indicate that the fire hazard involved in leaving fats on the stove, and operating the stove by heating a kettle, was not apparent, even though the fire marshal's office and many fire departments within the province conduct substantial public information programmes to warn the public of the common hazards from fire.

The fire marshal's office engages in public information programmes by producing fire prevention material which is made available to fire departments, and conducts three annual displays to help "sell" large audiences on the increasing need for fire protection and fire prevention training. Each year the office exhibits at the Canadian National Exhibition, the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair and the International Plowing Match where all exhibits stress fire safety, and fire prevention literature is distributed.

In addition, the office operates one of the largest fire safety film libraries on the continent with over 300 titles which are shown about 4,000 times to over 200,000 people each year, excluding TV audiences. The library has up to 12 copies of each title with a total of some 800 prints of films.

Also, in co-operation with The Department of Education and the Ontario Emergency Measures Organization, the booklet "Fire Prevention Education—An Education Guide for Teachers" is distributed free of charge by the office to the teachers of all elementary, secondary and private inspected schools in Ontario on request. Over 14,000 copies of the booklet, which has been developed to assist school teachers to make the home, school and the community safe places in which to live, were distributed last year in Ontario.

Also, municipal fire departments engage in fire prevention inspection and public information programmes. Fifty-nine municipal fire departments have regular programmes of carrying out home inspections. In 1962 a total of 170 municipal fire departments reported making 335,414 inspections from municipalities representing a total population of 4,440,236, which included all of the 65 full-time departments in Ontario.

That, Mr. Chairman, I think, is a very full report.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us how many inspections were carried out last year by the fire marshal and the result of such inspections, and particularly in schools, for the last year.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman. I would ask the hon. member if he would elaborate on what he means by the result of such inspections. Does he mean—

Mr. Thomas: Where they would regard it, after an inspection, as being hazardous. From a safety standpoint.

Hon. Mr. Cass: If I am correct in my interpretation of the advice given to me, last year the inspections by the fire marshal's office in schools took in the county of Peterborough, and the following is an analysis of the report. I may say first of all, there were five schools in the township school area and the inspection disclosed defects ranging from exit doors opening against egress, to bracket chimneys. Reports on the inspected schools were filed with the secretary of the township school area and copies were sent to The Ontario Department of Education. For the information of the hon. member and all hon. members I would like to give the House the analysis of the work required to be done and which has been completed now on these schools.

In the first school, there has been a new chimney erected. A new exit door with panic hardware was provided and the door hung to open outwards. Fire extinguishers had to be provided and the interior painted with fire-resistant paint, and this has been done.

The next school: There had to be a new exit door with panic hardware to be installed, wiring inspected, new extinguishers provided and again the interior painted with fire-resistant paint, and the existing exit door was hung to open outwards. These have been done.

The next school: There had to be a new chimney, new exit door provided, fire extinguishers provided, and the existing exit door was re-hung to open outward, and again the interior was painted with fire-resistant paint.

And the next one: There had to be a new chimney, new exit doors with panic hardware put on, fire extinguishers provided, and again the interior painted with fire-resistant paint.

And the last school in this inspection area: The work included provision of exits from the two classrooms, and the doors re-hung

to be opening out, with panic hardware, and a bracket chimney was taken down and the proper chimney put up.

And then I would say to the hon. member that inspection of schools within municipally organized areas are, of course, the responsibility of the local fire department and the inspections are carried out by them with assistance from the office of the fire marshal. Each year there are 1,400, more or less, appointed from the various fire departments in Ontario, to be assistants to the fire marshal in carrying out this local inspection work in the schools and other public buildings in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 212 agreed to.

On vote 213:

Hon. Mr. Cass: Before proceeding to discuss the estimates of the Ontario Securities Commission, which is vote 213, I should like to make a few observations with reference to The Ontario Securities Act and to the commission itself. Hon. members will recall my preliminary remarks prior to considering my departmental estimates on Friday last.

The government and citizens of Ontario have lost a most experienced and valued public servant in the untimely death of Mr. Oswald E. Lennox, QC, chairman of the commission. Mr. Lennox discharged his difficult position in a most dignified, efficient and dedicated manner and commanded the respect of all those with whom, in his official capacity, it was his duty to deal. Indeed, the government is faced with a very difficult task in replacing such a devoted public servant.

The consideration now being given to the appointment of a new chairman has caused me to review not only the organization of the commission itself but to review the practices and policies heretofore followed pursuant to the legislation.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that it is my intention after further study of these matters, to introduce as much legislation as is necessary and possible during this session, to improve the present legislation. At that time, all hon. members will have an opportunity to study and debate the proposed amendments.

At the present time, I emphasize, it is not possible for me to be more explicit. However, there are certain specific matters which have given me concern and which will be the subject of legislation at this session.

1. The present legislation authorizes the chairman, acting by himself, to investigate complaints and to suspend or cancel registrations as a result of such investigations. An appeal from the decision of the chairman lies to the full commission of which he is the presiding chairman. While this procedure may not in practice have resulted in any injustice in the past, it is my firm opinion and that of my advisors, that this procedure has not the appearance of a fair and impartial hearing which should exist in a proceeding of this character. It is my intention to amend the Act to resolve this situation.

2. It is, in my opinion, desirable that the administrative functions of the commission, and those which might be termed quasi-judicial, be definitely separated. This question will be fully explored and appropriate action taken.

3. With regard to the provisions of the Act providing for investigations, these will be carefully reviewed and where necessary, in the opinion of the government, appropriate amendments will be made.

4. It was the frequent practice of the late chairman and his predecessors to act under the statute *ex parte* in some proceedings resulting in cancellation and suspension of licences. While this practice may have been justified in certain instances, it is my opinion, supported by my advisors, that this procedure should not be continued and if an amendment to the legislation is indicated, such will be made.

5. The organization of the commission itself is under review at the present time with the object of providing more efficient and speedier methods of processing matters coming before the commission, such as new registrations, renewals, hearings and investigations.

As mentioned before, it is my intention to introduce as much amending legislation to improve the Act as is possible during the current session. At that time, hon. members will have every opportunity to examine and debate these issues. At this time, it is not possible for me to say anything further.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, there were two or three questions that I wanted to ask the hon. Minister. Perhaps I should probe no further, but I am awfully curious to know whether in addition to these five points, there is going to be some reconsideration of the rather unique relationship of this commission to the Toronto Stock Exchange. We have discussed this many times

in the committee on legal bills where the Ontario Securities Commission, in effect delegates its authority to a body, and has very little authority over what that body may do. Now I do not need to go any further than to say to the hon. Minister that this is an area in which there has been a great deal of public discussion. He said nothing as to whether or not this was one area to which he was giving further thought. If he is, perhaps he can just say yes or no and satisfy our curiosity.

The second point, while he is considering the yes or no, Mr. Chairman—

An hon. member: He did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, he heard me, he has two ears. One is for his advisors and one is for us. I have learned that from watching him in operation.

The second one, to pick up on a point that the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) raised earlier—is with regard to our regulations concerning directors of a company and the possibility that they can use inside information for their own benefit before a decision has been made public. Perhaps I can set my questions in context through a quotation from a front page editorial of the *Financial Post*, February 9, 1962. They called for clear rules that provide guide lines of conduct for all companies and their directors. I quote:

As things stand now, Canadian law gives insiders virtually no guide on this matter and condones a situation where there may be two kinds of shareholders each with quite different profits—the insider and the outsider. In the US, directors must report changes in the shareholdings in their companies once a month, and must turn over to the company any profits on shares held less than six months. In Britain, directors must give their boards notice of any dealings in company shares, and details including the price paid or received must be included in the register of the directors' shareholdings, whether the trade is made in their name or through a nominee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, whether or not consideration has been given to laying down what the *Financial Post* refers to as "guide lines of conduct" to meet this situation, particularly in light of some recent developments.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the first question, I must say that perhaps

I am at some disadvantage because I have very little knowledge of the operation of the Toronto Stock Exchange, although I have now some considerable knowledge of the operation of the securities commission, and I am not yet satisfied in my own mind, that there is, or should appear to be, the type of connection to which the hon. member refers between the exchange and the securities commission. I will say though that this question is not new to me, and the subject matter of that question is not new to me. In the discussions I am having now with my officials and those in the industry who have some knowledge of these matters, I hope that it will be possible to produce procedures that will not only disallow the type of thing which I think the hon. member has in mind, but not seem to allow it.

The other matter concerning which the hon. member quoted from the *Financial Post* is also one of great interest to us in the department. I myself, have that clipping here, because it was very interesting, in what it tells us, and in the suggestions that it gives of what is being done in other jurisdictions.

I say this, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. member, that this is one of the other facets of investigation which is being carried on and if it is possible and necessary at the present time to introduce legislation before the end of this session it certainly will be done. I would draw to his attention the fact that at the present time there is an inquiry going on under the commission in connection with certain shares of a company, where there was a suspicion of the matter which the hon. member has raised having taken place.

The report of the inquiry has not yet reached me, and when it does, I will have some better way of perhaps judging the operations of the so-called "insiders" and of deciding what actions are possible to prevent this from continuing. I share the hon. member's alarm with respect to this particular phase of operations in our corporate entities in Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: There are questions that I wanted to ask the hon. Minister, with regard to a couple of cases that have been in the courts, against the Ontario Securities Commission during the past year. One of them has reference to the very point in which the hon. Minister says he is going to bring in an amendment to the Act. That was the case against the securities commission because the chairman could sit on a ruling in which he had been involved earlier.

Now, I am curious. The hon. Minister has

clarified this to some extent by saying he is going to bring in an amendment. Was a decision made in the court case? In effect, is the government going to implement the decision of the court, or are you anticipating a court decision? I am referring to the case involving Luccis and Company.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I will get the information in a minute, but to the best of my knowledge we neither have a decision on it, nor any indication of it. At least I have not.

I am advised that the case, Mr. Chairman, has not yet been heard.

Mr. MacDonald: The second one is even more interesting. I do not know how the hon. Minister is going to frame the legislation to cope with this: An action against the Ontario Securities Commission seeking damages of \$175,000 in connection with the Pantan Mining Company, claiming that the operations of this mining company were held up unnecessarily, and losses suffered by both the mining company and its precedents. Has that case been concluded? If so, what was the result?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, that case is still very much under way.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The statement by the hon. Attorney-General, if I may be permitted to say so was—I was going to say uninformative—but I move to say it was arid, because it hinted at a number of things. I have come to realize that is within the agility of the hon. Attorney-General—although he did not actually define the areas in which we might expect to have some legislation with any degree of precision.

I never can understand with the government such as we have, that dedicates itself so thoroughly with getting on with the legislation of the province—dedicated to its good and welfare while other people play politics, that they are unable with any degree of despatch at all, to make appointments to vital government organizations of the Crown.

It has been some time now since the commissioner of the provincial police retired, and we have not had an appointment to that position. And unhappily, with great regret, it is now a couple of months since the chairman of the securities commission died, and we have not had an appointment to that position. I do the gentleman in question no great disservice. I do not do him any disservice at all when I say that when they

appoint a master of the Supreme Court to act as chairman of the securities commission *pro tem.*, one wonders which is suffering most, the mastership of the Supreme Court or the securities commission.

Certainly it imposes an intolerable burden on him to have to carry on the two onerous duties at the same time. Some members of the House may recall that at one time I advocated the name of Joe Ryan for chairman of the securities commission—and I did that for a purpose.

Some people may not know who Joe Ryan is; others may. But you will recall in the public print that at one time, Mr. Joe Ryan got very loquacious and articulate and said he was going to do certain things to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer), if the leader of the Opposition did not desist from doing certain things that the leader of the Opposition was doing.

Mr. MacDonald: He made pretty wild statements.

Mr. Sopha: No, he did not make pretty wild statements. Apart from the very manly activity of football, nobody had quite heard of Mr. Ryan except very dogged and determined reporters who keep files—in the morgue, I believe it is—of such things. They saw that he had some connection with the security business and they went to the securities commission, and said: "What can you tell us about Joe Ryan?"

The securities commission said: "We have never heard of him, we have never heard of anybody named Joe Ryan". Then in the following edition of the paper it was published that Joe Ryan, Joseph Ryan perhaps I had better call him, had been barred from dealing in three stock exchanges in the country. He was barred by the Toronto Stock Exchange, the Montreal Stock Exchange and the Canadian Stock Exchange.

I was moved to comment that obviously Joe Ryan knows more about the securities commission than the securities commission. So, it follows that he should be chairman of the securities commission. I just leave it at that, and perhaps the government might consider him.

Now my hon. friend from York South raised the question of the control of the Toronto Stock Exchange by the securities commission and I would beg leave to say a word about that but I want to put it in its context. That the Toronto Stock Exchange, performing the service as it does in providing liquidity—that being its main function pro-

viding liquidity in the sale of shares—is a very fine and a very integral part of the economic organization of our country. The Toronto Stock Exchange furthermore brought the trading in securities into a very high degree of respectability and has done a great deal, it follows as a corollary to that statement, to take a good many fly-by-night and marginal—marginal in their conduct—people out of the realm of dealing in securities. However, so far as the Toronto Stock Exchange is concerned it has been the policy of this government, acting through the Ontario Securities Commission, to leave the Toronto Stock Exchange as a purely self-regulatory body.

Now the late chairman in a letter—which I could table but I will not—written to me approximately three days before his unfortunate and untimely passing, said he was a great proponent of self-regulation and he preferred to leave these matters in the hands of the people to discipline themselves and to control the activities of all those that were concerned in the business of trading in securities. I am not so sure on an analysis—and I must say if you put it in this parenthesis that the chairman of the securities commission knew a great deal more about it and had a far longer vista of looking over a good many more decades of this type of thing than I have. But against that background I would beg leave to make a couple of comments.

I said during the estimates of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) that I felt that his department should do something about being the watch-dog of the public interest in respect of dealing in securities, and the same comment is apropos of the Ontario Securities Commission.

I use this example and I beg leave to repeat it, Mr. Chairman. In the case of Gunnar mines, when the directors of that company wanted to amalgamate their affairs with McNamara Construction Company, I believe it was in more than a very allegorical sense a marriage or an intertwining—that is the word my hon. friend the member for Dovercourt was using—an intertwining of families because both the companies are owned by two separate families who are to some extent intermarried or interdependent or interrelated—

Several hon. members: Or intertwined; togetherness.

Mr. Sopha: —or intertwined. They are in a spirit of togetherness, says the hon. member for Parkdale.

The directors of Gunnar wanted to join the McNamara firm and they wanted to do it without holding a meeting of the shareholders of their company. The Toronto Stock Exchange requested that they hold a meeting of shareholders in order to put the issue to the shareholders, whether this would be not only a feasible but an official move for the affairs of the Gunnar company to sort of get married to the McNamara Company and set up a joint enterprise of mining and construction. That was put, as I understand it, in the form of a request and the directors of Gunnar complied with the request and they held a public meeting and I do not have to go into the details of what occurred there and besides the results of that meeting are now crystallizing in a case that is before the Supreme Court of Ontario.

However, my complaint is this, that whether the joining or the interlocking of these two giants in industry is a thing beneficial for the economic good of our province, is, in my humble submission, not a matter pre-eminently of the business of the Toronto Stock Exchange. That is not their business. They provide a floor down on Bay Street—the first block above Wellington—and everyone would be well advised to visit it and see just what goes on, for the trading in securities. They provide the opportunity, the contact, the bookkeeping and everything else for people to meet together and trade their securities.

It is not up to the governors of the Toronto Stock Exchange *per se* for them to determine whether two companies joining is for the economic welfare of Canada. That is a matter, if it is anybody's concern at all, it is the concern of us in this Legislature, and it is the concern of the government, pre-eminently the concern of the men on the Treasury benches who advise His Honour, and the concern of the emanation of the Treasury benches in the Ontario Securities Commission. That is their business.

Now I venture to say that within the confines of The Securities Act, the securities commission, had it been interested, could have launched itself into the middle of the controversy and said to those people: "Here is what we expect you to do." It didn't, it didn't. So point one—I say that the Ontario Securities Commission reneges on its responsibilities in this area of public importance and often crucial public importance because the lives and welfare of a good many thousands of working people in the province who have no control over the directors are directly related to the decisions they make.

The second thing I draw to the attention of the House is this. That The Securities Act, which the hon. Minister now talks of re-organizing and redrafting and amending, The Securities Act makes no real provision in it for the control of the securities commission of the Toronto Stock Exchange at all.

It may be that the hon. Minister has in mind some amendments to those portions of The Securities Act; if he has them he did not tell us about them in his five points. It may be—and here I speak with the deepest humility and circumspection—it may be that if I have said a word that the hon. Minister may incorporate some further amendments into this statute that he is going to bring forward.

Now that moves me to go into another little line of thought. This is another reason, of course, that these estimates should have been delayed—these estimates should have been delayed until we saw this legislation dealing with what we take to be major revisions of The Securities Act. But I say to my hon. friends, because the hon. gentleman over there will be deaf to the entreaties, that if there was not such precipitous haste on the part of this government to get these estimates done before the Roach report is tabled, we would be able to approach these things with care and consideration and with circumspection and an opportunity to look at the thing from the point of view of its wholeness and its impact upon the public good.

The hon. Minister does not need to snarl, does not need to snarl because everyone in the House who has taken the interest to inform himself on such things knows very well that he has the report, he has the report on the northern Ontario natural gas business in his office or in his desk down there but he is playing politics and waiting for some appropriate moment to release it. And he has had it probably for two or three weeks and has not revealed its contents; whether he will or not remains to be seen.

Now The Securities Act, sir, as I was saying, only has three or four sections which deal in any degree with the Toronto Stock Exchange at all, and two of the sections—just to show you how tenuous and innocuous is the control of the commission over the Toronto Stock Exchange—two of the sections, 33 and 34, deal with the requirements if the exchange is to keep an audit. Then three more of the sections, around section 67: "No person or company", says 67, "shall carry on business as a stock exchange without the consent in writing of the commission". No

person shall carry on business without the consent in writing of the commission.

Every stock exchange in Ontario shall keep a record of every transaction that took place in it. And that is about the extent of the control.

In other words, just to sum it up, this government, in power for 20 years, has preferred and in fact has reneged on any move toward asserting any control whatsoever over the operations of the Toronto Stock Exchange. Now it crystallizes or reveals itself in this manifestation within our economy.

The exchange, the Toronto Stock Exchange somewhat prides itself, somewhat prides itself on the fact that whereas some time back in the history of the exchange they used to trade mining securities on one floor and they traded industrial securities on another of the exchange, they now trade both types of security together on the same floor. And they put that down, I take it from the literature they publish, they put that down as rather an item of pride, an item of progress. I do not see it quite that way. I would not presume to go into a discussion or an analysis, because I am not equipped or educated enough to do so, of the way in which mining promotion is financed in this province. But I know this, I know that we have, in the speculative realm of promotion of mining shares, the unlisted securities that are traded by brokers who specialize in that type of thing—over-the-counter trades they are called—and then we have securities that have the respectability about them that they are listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange and traded on the floor of the exchange.

Now, one should never forget this, that our mining promotion in Canada is, always has been and always will be, a reflection of the geology of our country, and that geology is such as divine providence placed it there that the incidence of precious metals or base metals is of very scattered and erratic nature. I mean by that, that a person will set up a diamond drill and he will drill a hole and he will run across a certain result in the core of the diamond drill, but that in itself, no matter how splendid the result, does not mean that that property will by any means make a mine. He may have run across a very small incidence of metal or in the case of a Quemont—I see the hon. Minister of Mines looking at me—or a Manitouwadge or the Sudbury Basin, he may have run across a large body of ore or a section of the country that is rich in mineral resources. It is a gamble. It is a gamble. To put it another way a person can

go along and pick up what they call a grab sample of gold. It will run as high as three ounces to the ton, returning something over \$100 to the ton, and no matter how much he searches in that area he will probably not find another trace of the precious metal.

Our geology makes the whole thing a gamble; we start from that.

I said that the shares, the mining speculative issues, sometimes called the penny stocks, the trade on the Toronto Stock Exchange, are given to some extent an aura of respectability by the fact that they are listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange. They get an air of prestige about them by reason of their listing. They pay a sum of money to list those shares on the exchange, sometimes as high as many thousands of dollars.

But then again, to show you whether the mere listing of them on the exchange means that they are manifested in a contribution to the economic development of our country all you have to do to get the answer to that question is to look at the financial page of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. If you look at the listing of mining shares, which are usually on the right, then glance down them and pick out the ones that are paying a dividend—no, I am not looking at the ones you own, Mr. Chairman, many of those have disappeared—you see some 400 different companies listed.

Then, if you count the ones that are paying a dividend, just let me take the time to count them, you have 32—32 out of over 400 listed that are paying a dividend. That means that 32 out of those 400—and I think there are actually more than 400 listed—that have taken people's money by way of investment in this gamble in the geology of our country, have come to the point where they have developed to the extent that they are returning something to their shareholders.

If, on the other hand, you look at the left-hand side of the page at the industrial stocks, then you see that almost every one in this very buoyant economy in which we live is paying a dividend—I might say through no fault of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan).

No one knows it better—no one, I suggest, I will put that a little different than I was going to put it—no one is entitled to know it better than I who was raised in Cobalt. I was raised in Cobalt; and I first remember Cobalt when it was a ghost town after the price of silver had dropped. Cobalt was on the decline.

Then came the war and the whole of the economy got a little boost forward. But it was after the war that I recall most. After the war a succession of mining promoters came into Cobalt. There were various developments here and there of a spotty nature, and a little money was invested. You would hear about some activity at the Agnico or you would hear of something at the Cross Lake or the Silver Miller, Glen Lake, Brady Lake, Keeley Frontier and so on.

But notwithstanding all the developments and all the rumours and the limited activity, I can say this: In the revitalizing of the Cobalt economy I know of no company to this day that has ever paid a dividend. Not one has ever paid a dividend, for the thousands of dollars that have been put into search for minerals and search for an ore body in that community.

I remember. I have said before in this House that I remember seeing the people that came there in order to promote these speculative prospects; how well I remember them. You could always tell they were from Toronto. You could also tell they were from Toronto because they wore their new canvas coat and the breeks and the high leather boots that were new; and I noted that they always drank a little better grade of whiskey than my father did.

I use that as an illustration to point out that because a stock is listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange it does not mean that it is any the less a speculative security; that the risk, that the amount of risk inherent in it, is any the less, because of the fact that it has been listed. Thousands and thousands of dollars—I am too conservative—millions of dollars have been lost by reason of false hopes of investors, usually amateurs who have seen a get-rich-quick scheme and have put their savings and often money they have borrowed into the investment and speculative securities in that exchange, in the hope that at the end of the rainbow, to mix a couple of metaphors, they would find the promised land.

It is not too long ago, in my own community, where the man investing in the exchange began to sell a stock named Lake Dufault short on the exchange. I do not know the prices and I did not know the man; I do not know the prices at which he began to sell it short, but I know that in selling it short the stock continued to go up day after day. He borrowed every cent, grasped and clutched at every cent that he could lay his hands on, to pay for the

demands of the broker to keep the margin up to the requirements of the exchange. Then, finally, when he was beyond all resources in getting assets in order to cover his liabilities, and the stock kept going up and up, one day just about noon the man went down into the basement of his place of business; and when his wife came down a little while later there was the man hanging from the rafters in the basement. This is the type of thing; this is the desire within the human spirit to get rich; this is the length to which it can take the individual.

To put it in the context of these estimates I say once again to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Ontario Securities Commission has not manifested any interest whatsoever in the activities of our exchanges, not at all. They have not really looked at the way in which they are carrying on business. They leave it to the self-regulatory devices of the people who own the exchange, that is to say those who have seats on it and elect a board of directors. Like all other methods of self-regulation it overlooks the opportunity for daily temptation, daily temptation to do wrong.

When a person is involved in a matter himself, and is expected to regulate himself then it is within the human element, the nature of man, at least since Adam, to be subject to daily temptations to do wrong. But I say again that important body in the future of our country, actually the economic development of our country, depends to a large extent on what goes on on the floor of the Toronto Stock Exchange.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): It does not have anything to do with it.

Mr. Sopha: Indeed it does. Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Woodbine achieves heights of arrogance and stupidity, but tonight he has reached the unparalleled heights of a veritable Everest of stupidity. Well, I do not presume to stop to argue with you, but let me say this: people who invest their money in stock are investing in the equity of our country, and investing in its economic development. The money that—never mind, write a brief on it and send it to the *Steel Workers Gazette*. No indeed it is not. Now what the securities commission has been busying itself in was adverted to, in some extent, by the remarks of the hon. Minister when he read of his proposed reforms and was adverted to by the remarks of the hon. member for York South when he referred to these cases that are before the court. I rather prefer to believe

—and it is a great tribute to that very able lawyer, and we are lucky that this community has a lawyer like him; I will give you his name in a moment, but we will always need lawyers like this—it is a great tribute to Glen Howe, QC, that the hon. Attorney-General has, as I guess, anticipated the decision of the court in bringing in these reports, because it was Glen Howe who drew attention to the vices of the Ontario Securities Commission in being both prosecutor and judge in the case. That was the reason he took it to court.

One of the sections—I am going to put it in the record; that comes out of The Securities Act, and then I am going to leave that statute alone. Section 24 says that no person, without the consent of the commission—will you harken, Mr. Chairman to it, I hope all hon. members will harken to this short section. No person without the consent of the commission shall disclose any information or evidence obtained or the name of any witness examined or sought to be examined under section 21 or 23.

In other words, if you are called down before the Ontario Securities Commission—this is unique in law, this is absolutely unique; I have heard of this in no other avenue of the law. You are called down before the securities commission, and you are asked questions about something, then you must not, when you go away from there, disclose to any person, to your wife, your lawyer, your clergyman, your friend, no one presumably, not even your God, must you tell what went on before that commission. What they asked you, who you saw there in the corridor, or anything else about the matter. Now it goes so far as to break the solicitor and client relationship; you cannot, having been questioned by that commission, go and tell your lawyer about what was asked you. At least there is no exception in it. If you do, you are subject under section 64 to a fine of not more than \$2,000, or to imprisonment for a term of not more than one year, or both.

I make two comments; this is the Star Chamber in operation. The Star Chamber were pikers compared to this piece of pernicious and anti-democratic legislation. I note with interest that the hon. justice of the High Court, Chief Justice McClure speaking to a lawyers' group in the city of Toronto here, said it is the duty of the profession. He reminded them—sometimes the profession needs reminding—he reminded them that it is the duty of the profession to seek out sections like that, which do away with our liberty,

which encroach upon our fundamental historic freedom, to have them eradicated from the statute book. I have no idea, I have not the faintest idea how that section got in there or what government put it in, or why it was put in, but I suspect that a section like that was put in by a hungry bureaucracy. A word I seldom use, is the word bureaucracy, but I suspect that that section gets in there because of a bureaucracy that is hungry for power. I have tried to convince you of a simple proposition and you heard me not. I am not going to pay any attention to you.

Mr. Bryden: Our ears have been battered down.

Mr. Sopha: Then, of course, another thing that the securities commission has never interested itself in—and this is quite a sum of money that we spend for protection of the public to invest in the equity of ownership and in the economic development of our country. By reason of the investment of that capital, their savings, they expect protection—and it is a funny thing—they tell me, those that are engaged in the securities business, that the amateurs come forward and invest some of their savings in stock. They have the unarticulated presumption in their mind; they think they are protected by government. They think they are protected by the state. They think, in other words, that the state is ever watchful and wary on their behalf. If they run up against sharpers, people of moral turpitude, people who are bent on milking them out of their money, they think that the state is there as a watchdog to protect them and defend them. It is not so. It is not the watchdog; it never has been the watchdog and it never will be the watchdog until the provisions of The Securities Act relating to the stock exchanges are that much more embracing.

Now, the other day I made some reference to another matter in which the securities commission takes no interest, and that is the matter of disclosures, of dealings by directors in shares of the company of which they are directors. But I want to cite an editorial of the Toronto *Daily Star*, which I hope makes sufficient reference to the Canadian Oil Company deal. I do not have to go into too many details. I shall be corrected if I am wrong. Shell Oil Company of Canada made one offer to Canadian Oil Companies for the acquisition of Canadian Oil Companies' assets. That offer was rejected out of hand. Then, subsequently, further negotiations took place and another subsidiary of

Royal Dutch Shell, the parent company, made a further offer for the acquisition of Canadian Oil, and a good many people in this country regretted and deplored the fact that an outside company—that is, Royal Dutch Shell—had come in and taken over what was a totally Canadian owned and operated company. We lost it to foreign interests, but I say that in parenthesis.

Subsequently the Royal Dutch Shell Company, through another of its subsidiaries, made an offer for the acquisition of the assets of Canadian Oil at a certain price per share and that offer was accepted. Between the two offers—the one that was rejected and the one that was accepted—it was noted that there was quite a stir of activity in the trading of Canadian Oil shares on the exchange.

The price advanced rather dramatically to something in terms of several dollars a share. Knowing that there were negotiations for this sell-out—I should say, the sale; I have reversed that word, the sale of the assets—knowing that considerable curiosity and speculation were stimulated, it became apparent that between the two offers the directors of Canadian Oil Companies, with the inside information of the pending acceptance of the second offer by the Shell Company, had been trading in the shares of their company and in fact had reached quite substantial profits.

The *Toronto Star* had this to say, and I am not going to read the whole editorial, but I am going to put it in the record.

The suspicion and controversy arising from the proposed sale of Canadian Oil Companies have called attention to the special responsibilities of corporation officers and directors, and the need for more adequate laws to enforce them.

Someone made a killing in the shares of Canadian Oils Limited, and suspicion has arisen that directors or officers of the various concerns involved, made profitable use of their advance information that the company was being taken over by the Shell interests.

Directors, presidents, general managers and other high executives have an obligation to their company very similar to that of a mayor or councillor to his municipality. Each of them is, in fact, in the position of a trustee. What this means was spelled out by the Supreme Court of Canada in a 1953 case:

A trustee is bound not to do anything which can place him in a position in-

consistent with the interests of his trust, or which can have a tendency to interfere with his duty in discharging it. Neither the trustee nor his representative can be allowed to retain an advantage acquired in violation of this rule.

Applied to corporations, this means that officers and directors must use their ability and experience for the benefit of the company, and must not get into a position where their private interests conflict with their obligation to give disinterested advice. An example would be a director advising shareholders to accept an offer where he stands to profit if the offer is accepted, and to lose if it is rejected.

Similarly, an officer or director cannot use for his own purpose property entrusted to him by the company, and this includes confidential information he receives by virtue of his position. An executive who uses such information to speculate in the company's shares commits a breach of trust for which he may be accountable to the company, or in some cases to the shareholders.

It is instructive to compare this state of affairs with the situation in the United States. After the 1929 crash—which revealed a great deal of skulduggery in Wall Street—legislation was passed to provide greater protection to investors. Under these laws, strict obligations were imposed on what are called “insiders”—which includes officers, directors and also shareholders with 10 per cent or more of a company's stock. (It is assumed that a large shareholder will have access to information normally denied to small stockholders.)

Every “insider” is obliged to disclose his stock holdings in the company to the Securities and Exchange Commission, the federal regulating agency, as soon as the corporation is listed on a stock exchange. After this first report, he must keep the SEC informed whenever he buys or sells shares in the corporation. The SEC makes this information public, so that any stockholder can easily find out what the executives are up to.

One of Canada's greatest needs today is for more capital, and especially for Canadians to invest more in Canadian industry. The passage of full disclosure laws would help to promote this by creating an atmosphere of greater confidence in the investment market.

Now that is as much of the editorial that I am going to read.

The Ontario Securities Commission, to my knowledge, has never interested itself in such matters. In fact, I suppose the securities commission could pass the necessary regulations under the statute in order to enable it to secure information. It moves me to make two comments in that regard. In this country we hear a great deal, from time to time—not so much recently but it will increase again—we hear a great deal about demands that the trade unions open their books and show what they do with the funds in account to the rank and file membership, but in this country we never hear a corresponding cry from the management side for disclosure of such things as are referred to in the editorial that I have referred to myself in the Canadian Oil/Shell transaction. It is a one-sided cry. The second thing is that the securities commission, under the aegis, or with the consent, or with the privity of the former Attorney-General—who went downtown to a meeting of some broker-dealer association and like a veritable Saint George, smoking the dragon out of his den, he said, “We are going to get into that natural gas business, there are going to be some startling disclosures about it. We are carrying on an investigation and we shall see”, said he, “what we shall see”.

Well, they tell me, and I will not say who they are, they tell me that when the Premier picked up the paper—or should I say the Prime Minister—and he read about that, he turned several different shades of the spectrum. Once the securities commission had been brought into that position by the former hon. Attorney-General then I am guessing, but it is an educated guess, that the government has been caught up in embarrassment ever since, because the implications of that move are so terrifying to the government that, having got the report—

An hon. member: They have got some Liberals in the net.

Mr. Sopha: They have got no Liberals in the net—

Mr. Bryden: They had one in the first net, I don't know if they have got any now.

Mr. Sopha: Having got the report—

An hon. member: Do you have access to it, too?

Mr. Sopha: Having got the report they are in a very embarrassed fashion; they are keeping it tucked away in the drawer somewhere in the hon. Attorney-General's depart-

ment. But you see they had time to get into that type of thing—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I will stop that, because it is not nice. For myself it would be a blessing if they never release that report, because if they ever do, the hon. member for York South—you will never hear the last of him. He will be in full throat. If they smoke out even the most insignificant little fish out of the thing, we will never hear the last of it from him.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member would just as soon have it repressed, would he not? I would not wonder.

Mr. Sopha: No, I do not want it repressed. I am telling you and I am challenging the hon. Attorney-General. He has had that report for several weeks and no doubt he is going to keep it.

Mr. Singer: This is typical of the thinking that comes from that group of mumbling, bumbling—

Mr. Sopha: And I cited that, Mr. Chairman, only for the purpose of demonstrating what the securities commission will do. You see, they will go off on a great tangent pursuing some of the broker-dealers; they will get into a great spirit of self-righteousness about a matter such as I have cited. But when something important comes along like the non-disclosure of the dealing in the Canadian Oil Companies shares, then there is a great resounding silence. The great pall of inactivity weighs down on 145 Queen Street West, and you never see or hear them do a thing. And yet every week the *Financial Post*, a publication for which I have the highest admiration, has an editorial on its front page, or on one of the inside pages, about the necessity for some action in this area of non-disclosure.

It boils down simply to this: If we are to develop this great land of ours it requires the people to take their savings out of the bank, or from under the mattress, or out of the sock, or wherever they have got them, and put them into equity ownership in the development of our country. And they will not do it. They will not do it and they will never do it as long as they have a suspicion of the speculative, promoting, nefarious activities that go on in the sale of stocks, and as long as they do not have trust in the people who are responsible for the corporate management of our large financial and developmental organizations.

It is as simple as that; and the arm of this Legislature to which we have entrusted the responsibility of policing the securities market is the Ontario Securities Commission, for which we are asked to vote the meagre sum of \$278,000 this night. It is not enough, our geology being what it is, and our history being what it is in the realm of the promotion of speculative mining securities. For as I have said before this Legislature, and I beg leave to repeat once again, no group in our country has given the fair name of our country a dirtier aspect abroad than have those fly-by-nighters from downtown here who have peddled the phoney mining stocks in the moose pasture of the northern part of our country. No group have given us a worse name abroad.

We are not, in spending \$278,000, spending anywhere near the requirements for policing, for keeping those people on the straight and narrow. That organization—I have had a question on the order paper since the opening of the session, asking how many people actually work for the securities commission. I have waited day by day for an answer; but you know, Mr. Chairman, when you put a question on the order paper, no doubt it goes to about 16 different people and they look at it and they say, "Now what has Sopha got in mind here? What is he up to? What is he up to?" The question says only, "How many people work for the securities commission? What are their respective duties and responsibilities?"

Instead of waiting for an answer, the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) says I could get on that radio programme and ask the hon. Prime Minister. That programme, Mr. Chairman, has never reached its potentialities. He could be, on that programme, an Ann Landers with a moustache. Now I could call him up and say: "My 16-year-old will not help Mother with the dishes, what am I going to do?"

Mr. Chairman: Will the member stick to the estimates.

Mr. Sopha: Well, these are just some friendly suggestions. You see, I could go down—besides that, I say to my hon. friend from Essex North that I know some people in the securities commission who are very nice people—I could go down there I suppose some afternoon and count them all. I could go down and look in all the offices, and count them and see how many work there. Then I would know.

But my reason for asking the question, and now I will disclose it to show you what

kind of a fellow I am, is that I know how many people work for the Securities and Exchange Commission in Washington; and do not ask me, because I am not telling you. I am not telling you, so do not ask me. I know how many people work for them, and I want to know how many people work for our Ontario Securities Commission so I can make some comparison in their effectiveness. It is as simple as that.

One other area to which I want to draw attention is that which has to do with mutual funds, another area in which the Ontario Securities Commission to my knowledge has ever interested itself. Mutual funds have shown an astounding growth in our country since their development, which started some generations ago; the development of mutual funds got a great impetus following the Second World War. In the United States they are referred to as open-end companies because the number of certificate holders or shareholders is limited in no way; presumably, mathematically, the number of shareholders in mutual funds could be infinite.

These companies have become very large owners of shares in the United States, shares trading on the New York Stock Exchanges and the other major exchanges, and have become a source of concern to the American Congress, to the extent that back in 1959 or 1960 the American Congress commissioned the Securities and Exchange Commission to make a report on the development in activities of the mutual funds, and their impact upon trading in securities and the prices of securities, and every other manifestation of the exchange market.

To that end the Securities and Exchange Commission in turn commissioned the Wharton School of Finance of the University of Pennsylvania to make the report on it. That report of the activities of the mutual fund was submitted last year, I believe, to a committee of the American Congress.

The best way to put on record our concern on this side of the House about the activities of these funds and their possible impact upon the economic development of our nation, is to read into the record the observation of a person who made a study of that report, and I beg leave to do so, Mr. Chairman.

Mutual funds have shown an astounding growth since the end of the Second World War and particularly during the last ten years. In Canada today there are approximately 135 investment funds of all kinds. By the end of 1961 it reported total assets of \$1,685,000.

Why do people buy mutual funds? No one has ever made a detailed analysis of the reasons but the selling techniques stress these characteristics: The availability of expert investment advice, differentiation of portfolio risks, convenience of security management, economy of bookkeeping activities as well as capital gains, stability and liquidity or growth.

In other words, the funds will take your money, invest it for you at no bother to you and you will reap the rewards of their expert investment knowledge as effortlessly as can be. But for this you must pay a price and it is here that the first faint suggestion that mutual funds may not be all that their advocates say they are, begins to appear.

For the past few years there have been suggestions that the services charged by the funds, often called the front-end load, have been onerous and unjustified. Beyond that some people have suggested that the management advice given by mutual funds is not all that good. Some have even suggested that the employment of investment advisors is nothing more than a device to siphon off funds from the mutual fund itself.

It was criticism of this sort which prompted the United States Securities and Exchange Commission to authorize a study of mutual funds by the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, which had scarcely a good word to say for mutual funds. This study showed that on performance records funds don't appear to offer much advantage.

The report states that during the period under study, 1953 to 1958, performance records on the average conformed rather closely to the behaviour of the security market as a whole. Again while the fund showed no better performance than the market as a whole, they did show a great deal of portfolio turnover. Indeed, portfolio turnover rates varied widely within the mutual fund industry itself. A high rate resulting in superior performance would cause little concern to shareholders, but a high rate which results in a mediocre or inferior performance is certainly another matter.

The brokerage commissions generated by high turnovers are expenses to the fund. The Wharton school of analysis revealed no strong relationship between turnover rates and performances, nor incidentally

did the study discover any relationship between fund performance and either management fees or sales charges.

Perhaps the most significant portion of the report, however, deals with the relationship of investment companies with their advisers. In the main, of course, this is the strongest selling point for mutual fund salesmen. The expert investment advice which XYZ fund commands means that for only a few dollars Joe Doakes can buy some of the best brains in the country. Unfortunately, it does not seem to work out quite that way. There are three principal and interrelated sources of income and other benefits for investment advisers and those who maintain effective control over mutual funds.

The first, of course, is advisory and management fees. The second is payment for selling activities, wholesale and retail distribution of fund shares, and the third is brokerage commission for the purchase and sale of portfolio securities for the investment company.

What is really significant here is that in four out of five cases the fees charged open-end companies by their investment advisers were fixed and did not vary with changes in the size of the fund. Furthermore, fees charged mutual funds tended to be substantially higher than fees charged by the same advisers to their clients other than investment companies. Clearly a conflict of interest appears between mutual fund shareholders and their investment advisers. Benefits to the adviser for more or less indefinite growth by intensive selling are obvious, but without a scale management fee, the advantages of such growth to shareholders by cost reduction is sharply restricted.

The study, of course, confined itself to mutual funds in the United States, but there is no reason to think that the funds in Canada behave with any significant differences. In fact, it may be that with our fragmented securities jurisdictions, selling and other practices in Canada are somewhat less ethical than those in the single tightly controlled federal U.S. jurisdiction.

It is interesting to note that the mutual fund industry in Canada has just recently formed its own association for the avowed purpose of self policing. We may wish them luck. But it has certainly been our experience in the past that self policing groups in the securities industry have had little success. If,

however, the mutual fund industry in Canada would undertake to examine itself on the basis of the Wharton report, it would take a giant step towards establishing itself as the reputable financial intermediary it holds itself out to be.

Now, that is that set of observations. I want to make it perfectly clear to you, Mr. Chairman, that the only reason that I raise these matters and bring them to the attention of the hon. Attorney-General, is that in the words of, and in agreement with, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, when he said in this House last year—and I found a place that I could agree with—he said that Canadians prefer to invest in debt securities; they do not like to invest in equity securities, and that is true. That is true.

Or looked at another way, I have been watching the Toronto Stock Exchange for some 18 years, I remember back in 1946 the number of shares traded daily on the stock exchange was around three million. Look almost every day of the week nowadays and you see that the same amount of shares is traded—around three million. So you know that with the growth of our population, the number of people that are coming forward to put their savings into equity securities is not increasing; it is not even remaining constant.

Canadians simply have distrust for investment in equity securities. They prefer to buy school bonds and Dominion of Canada bonds and various other types of secured investments, but they do not like to invest in speculative issues. One of the reasons, of course, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman—the prime reason that they do not like to invest in speculative securities—is that they distrust the manipulation of the markets.

One of the places I beg leave to put the fault, and I will be glad to be corrected if I am wrong, is with the hon. Attorney-General; not necessarily the Attorney-General of today, but with past Attorneys-General, and with their emanation and their agent, the Ontario Securities Commission, which I say has reneged from its responsibilities in supervising and policing these vital sectors of our economy, so that our citizens could put their faith in the investment in equity stocks, knowing that the government and an arm of the government is there as the watch-dog and their protector. Such has not been the case.

And now I can say that O. E. Lennox lies in peace and at rest. I remember back in the year 1951 when I was attending the Univer-

sity of Toronto law school over yonder, that Mr. Lennox came to lecture to us. I remember. I never said this as long as he was alive, but he came to lecture to us about the operation of the securities legislation, the activities of the securities commission, and he said to us in that classroom—and I never forgot it—that the government of this province will not provide the money to enable us to have the staff to sufficiently police the securities market.

He told us that day about the size and the scope of the operation of the Securities Exchange Commission in the United States, and he compared his operation most unfavourably with the operation of that commission. I took the time of the House and I only repeat it in order to show an example of what I am talking about.

I took the time of the House during the estimates of The Department of the Provincial Secretary to show the requirements of disclosure; of dealing in the companies' shares by the directors; of showing the requirements of showing how much the principal officers of a company are paid—those requirements of the New York Stock Exchange and the Securities Exchange Commission of the United States, and compared it with the paucity—the absence of similar provisions required by our Ontario Securities Commission.

Mr. MacDonald: Paucity.

Mr. Sopha: The what?

Mr. MacDonald: Paucity.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you. Thank you. Now a new word has crept into my vocabulary. I have discovered tonight that after all there is something I can learn from those people. I had not suspected it.

Mr. Bryden: It is almost infinite what he could learn.

Mr. Sopha: I had not suspected it. It makes my view of human nature to be all the more sanguine.

Mr. MacDonald: They tell the story about the minister who preached the same sermon ten times.

Mr. Sopha: Well, the hon. member should be absolutely the last person to say that, and I always believe that people who lived in glass houses should do those things they do not want the public to see them doing in the basement. That comment particularly is apt for my hon. friend from York South.

Those are my observations. I hope they have some effect. I want to make it clear to you, Mr. Chairman, that as far as the observations on the mutual funds are concerned they do not come as a bolt out of the blue to the hon. Attorney-General. I studied the Wharton report. I made a summary of it and I sent it to the hon. Attorney-General, and I sent a copy to the hon. Prime Minister. I sent it to the late chairman of the Ontario Securities Commission, my summary, and the chairman wrote a very kind letter back to me in which he expressed some of the concern I had expressed.

It would not advance the cause any to put that letter in as a matter of record, but once again for the health and the development of our country I feel it is incumbent upon this government and its arm, the securities commission, to show some initiative, some rebellion and some activity along the line that I have taken the time of the House to point out.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I should hope that in far less time, with many fewer words and with much less eloquence I could give the House much more information with respect to those matters than we have had in the last hour.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the hon. member and all hon. members that the Toronto Stock Exchange does, so far as certain operations are concerned, come under the securities commission; and under certain other sections of The Securities Act, the operations of that exchange and any other exchange in Ontario are exempted. But, all the members of the stock exchange are subject to audit of their accounts.

All issues, before being filed in the first place and offered to the public, must pass the scrutiny of the commission, but there is no known way, Mr. Chairman, of preventing people of stupidity or inexperience, or who have a desire to get rich quick, from investing in the peculiar things, which they will invest in. By The Ontario Securities Act, and the procedures under it, the government has made it possible for a full disclosure to be made and from then on our people have to use ordinary common sense.

Now, I would say to the hon. member that the complement of the Ontario Securities Commission at the present time is 44 persons. I would also say, that either he is not a continuous subscriber to the newspaper from which he quotes, or else he does not read it

every day, because some time ago there was a very great deal of publicity over a certain inquiry authorized by the Attorney-General into the dealings with respect to the takeover by Shell Oil of the Canadian Oil Companies.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, for the information of the hon. member there is an inquiry under way—I do not yet have the report but the commission is certainly on top of these matters.

With respect to another matter, and it was a challenge thrown at me by the hon. member re the northern Ontario natural gas investigation, I say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member that I do not have that report in my desk, in my office, or in my possession. So far as I know that report has not been presented anywhere. I do know that certain portions of it, and rightly so, have been handed to my officials—who are looking after it and making investigations. In due course that report will be forthcoming, and all the action that is necessary will be taken.

So far as mutual funds are concerned, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member that this is a difficult and a new problem. I would like to tell him that the mutual funds are subject to the commission and the Act, that the issues must all be filed, and all salesmen must be registered, and that service charges in connection with this and all other charges must be set out in the prospectus before the company is registered by the commission.

I would also say, that the commission has encouraged the formation of a regulatory body or association of the mutual fund companies, called the Mutual Fund Association. We do hope that there will be some self-regulation coming out of that because I subscribe to the view that as far as possible, within limits laid down by the government for the protection of the investors and for the advancement of the development of our province, we must encourage people to regulate their own activities. So, Mr. Chairman, I say to the hon. members of the House: Many of the things that the hon. member has drawn to the attention of the House are very important matters. I am very grateful to him for stating his views on many of them.

On the memo that the hon. member for Sudbury sent to me with respect to mutual funds, my officials and I have read it. It is one of the many things we are interested in at the present time, and was mentioned in my opening statement.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, may I please draw attention to the editorial in the *Financial Post*; I just want the record to be complete.

LET THERE BE LIFE

Canada's bankers are wholly content with the laws of this country regarding securities regulations and corporate disclosure. Before the Porter Commission, one leading banker went so far as to say that the investor gets a pretty good break in this regard. We disagree.

The investor, it is true, may get a better break than his counterpart in Europe or South America, but this is shortsighted. If Canadian industry is to grow and prosper, if the Canadian economy is to meet the immense challenges of the fiercely competitive world more Canadian investors have to be willing and enthusiastic about putting their money to work. The more they know about the companies they own, the more likely they are to invest. If shareholdership is to be broadened, our security laws and regulations need strengthening to protect the investor. He should not have to stake his money in the dark.

Perhaps all the investing public should not be overly surprised at the bankers' viewpoint. Their own reports, according to the accountants and investment dealers and advertising experts who are judging for the *Financial Post* annual report, get the most criticism of any corporate group in Canada as far as full and complete disclosure is concerned.

It does me a service to corroborate and substantiate what I have said by an editorial from a leading and respected journal, a journal even quoted by the hon. member for York South, so it must be all right.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General whether or not the Securities Commission has any control over trading on the Toronto Stock Exchange other than the requirements, the various requirements, that are set out to precede the listing of the stock?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, there is no such control in the commission, because by section 41 of the Act the stocks that are listed and posted for trading on any recognized stock exchange—after they have been disclosed to and cleared by the commission—are exempt from the operation of the Securities

Commission. The Act requires the various things that the hon. member for Sudbury has been talking about.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Attorney-General, do the members of the stock exchange have exclusive determination whether or not a stock will, in fact, be listed?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am so advised, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Has the hon. Attorney-General ever given any consideration to the advisability of segregating or making two exchanges, that is a speculative exchange, and what might be termed a blue-chip exchange?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I certainly have not had the opportunity yet to consider that particular question.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, earlier in these estimates I raised the matter of securities that are being offered for sale in this province at 10 per cent interest rates—short term notes. I think I ought to be given the opportunity to discuss this type of security at this time. There has been considerable consideration given to this problem by many of the newspapers, and the leading financial periodicals in our country, and I have particularly noticed the advertisements of some of the outfits which are seeking money at an interest rate which is well beyond that a normal risk would carry today. I think it is because they are re-investing this money in a type of risk security; and I think eventually many people are going to be hurt unless legislation is brought forward immediately to control this situation.

I understand it is a problem which goes beyond the borders of Ontario, but at the same time I am given to understand that there is legislation which can be brought forward in Ontario which will control this situation.

The hon. Attorney-General said the other day that he was concerned about this problem. I wonder if he would give us assurance that the necessary action which is needed will be taken now before somebody gets seriously hurt, because I do not think it takes any imagination at all to realize that any organization, which is going around offering interest rates of 10 per cent today, must be re-investing that money in a very hazardous manner to be able to pay that type of a return to a short-term investor. I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would comment.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have forgotten my comment of the other day, but I will say this: No one is more concerned than the government and the securities commission. There has already been action taken in connection with one of these companies. From what we have learned there we hope to be in a position to produce the necessary legislation.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Will we be able to do something this session?

Hon. Mr. Cass: The hon. member can expect whatever he wishes.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that is the right of the hon. Minister to answer in such an offhand manner if he chooses. I would say this to him: Unless he is prepared to take action immediately then his is the responsibility for the people who get hurt; and I do not think his present attitude is what the public are expecting.

I am again disappointed in the attitude of the hon. Minister. You would think that a Minister of the Crown would be more anxious to assure the hon. members that something is being done to protect the public rather than sit there and snarl, as one of the hon. members said, in such an offhand manner. I do not think it is becoming of a Minister of the Crown.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will read *Hansard*, he will find out what my answer was and he will know that I gave a proper answer.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I will remind the hon. Minister, since he seems to have forgotten, that he told me this should be discussed within The Department of Insurance and I do not think he knew what he was talking about, because I think it comes under this department. If he will read *Hansard*, he will find out that is what he told me. He did not answer me the other day.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks about the securities commission. I was very disappointed, frankly, in the explanation of the hon. Minister in reply to some of the criticism that has come forward. All we got were promises of something happy to come about in the sweet bye-and-bye.

It is very difficult really to direct intelligent criticism at any portion of these estimates because we are not getting any answers. Apparently we are getting some admissions or partial admissions that there is something

wrong. Reference has been made to Mr. Lennox and his unfortunate passing, but before Mr. Lennox died there was trouble in the securities commission; several senior officials left. There has been some doubt in the minds of many people, myself included, as to what arrangements are being made for senior staff on the commission.

Mr. Bray is still with the commission but there are very few people whom I can readily identify—it may be just my lack of knowledge on this subject—in the higher paid brackets as shown in the last public accounts. I think the hon. Minister has a duty to come to this House and tell us what arrangements are being made in his very important department of government. How long does a department, as important as this one is to the welfare of the people of Ontario, remain without a permanent head?

I asked the question under the estimates dealing with the Master's office as to whether or not the Master's office was suffering from the absence of Mr. Kimber. The answer that I got was that Mr. Kimber is apparently still doing some work in the Master's office and apparently is still doing some work in the office of the Ontario Securities Commission. Well now, this is not fair—either to the Master's office or to the Securities Commission or to Mr. Kimber.

Mr. Kimber is a good and valued civil servant and I do not think the hon. Attorney-General is being fair to him in not telling him which way his efforts should be directed. Nor, equally important, is he being fair to the people of the province of Ontario. This government has a responsibility to make up its mind, and in the shillyshallying it is doing—perhaps it is not in quite as bad a state as they got to in Ottawa, they never made up their mind about anything—this government is rapidly approaching its competitor and it is about to win the prize for that lack of ability to make up its mind.

Somewhere along the line, the hon. Minister said a little earlier on that he was not too happy with the thought that the Securities Commissioner should be sitting in on appeals on himself; with that I agree. But there was an incident involving the decisions being made by the governors of the Stock Exchange where, quite recently, those people were sitting in judgment upon themselves. I think this underlines some of the remarks made by my hon. colleague from Sudbury, that the Securities Commission must play a role in policing the sort of thing that goes on at the Stock Exchange, and that the people who set down the rules and regulations about how

trading is to be carried on, how listing is to be done, and that sort of thing, cannot at the same time be sitting in judgment upon themselves.

This is a principle that the hon. Minister recognized in an earlier part of his remarks, and it is a principle that I think has to be recognized in his new legislation if and when it comes forward. I would think there is a real responsibility, Mr. Chairman, on this government, to bring forward reasonably close to the time that we discuss the estimates, the sort of legislation at which the hon. Minister has hinted. If not, what is the point of suggesting that these things are under investigation?

Complaints come from this side of the House and have come, in the few years I have been here, much in the same tone. The hon. Minister's predecessor did not even indicate to us that he was thinking about them. This hon. Minister is an improvement; he is thinking about them and maybe we will see some legislation. But we are perhaps in the dying weeks of the life of this Legislature, and I suggest to you that if this government is going to see any action along these lines surely we, as responsible members of the Legislature, want to see it in reasonable proximity to the time that the estimates of particular departments are introduced.

I think those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, are all I want to say about the Securities Commission.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 213 agreed to.

On vote 214:

Mr. G. E. Gomme (Lanark): Mr. Chairman, I noticed a newspaper article in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, dated February 14, 1963, that a brief was presented to the hon. Attorney-General asking changes in existing legislation to allow a higher percentage of jurors to be women. I want to read a short part of that:

A group of women headed by Toronto lawyer Margaret Hyndman yesterday submitted a brief to Attorney-General Frederick M. Cass, asking that more women be used for jury duty. The brief pointed out that under the present Jurors Act women may be excused from duty simply because they are women. Litigants have the right to be heard by human beings of either sex, fairly representing the population, the brief said.

A report by the Attorney-General's office last summer emphasized that of the 5,850

persons available for jury duty in the county of York, only 96 were women. The Attorney-General received the delegation favourably and a reply is expected before the end of the present session of the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, my impression of the present legislation is that women may be excused from jury duty. I feel we should not make this mandatory, as often mothers of small children are not able to leave home at a call such as this. I do believe that women will do their duty and take their place on juries—I know some who have—and they should be free to accept or reject this call from jury service. I wonder what the views of the hon. Attorney-General are on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, I had anticipated some question with respect to this matter, but I had not anticipated it would come from where it did. I certainly did, because I had a very large delegation of ladies in to see me who suggested to me, Mr. Chairman, that they would have someone on the Opposition side of the House question me on it and perhaps introduce a bill.

Mr. Singer: Perhaps they are predicting something.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, in any event, Mr. Chairman, I would like to place my views, which are presently I believe the views of the government, with respect to this important matter in *Hansard* for the information of all of us, and for debate if debate is desired at this time.

The question of more women jurors has been under consideration for some time. At the present time there is no restriction on the number of women that can be placed on the selectors list from which jury panels are selected. The only difference between men and women in The Jurors Act is that a woman may, when served with a summons for jury duty, notify the sheriff that she wishes to exercise her exemption for a period of one year. Upon receipt of this request, the sheriff exempts the woman from jury duty for one year.

The wisdom of this procedure is patent. A mother in a home may have domestic problems which, if left unattended for several days or even nights, would be a great hardship not only to her but her family. The inconvenience and expense of arranging care for small children may be a factor which would preclude a mother from assuming the responsibility of jury duty.

The situation would in no way be enhanced by passing legislation which would impel the mother to attend in court to claim the exemption from a judge. The present legislation permits an elasticity to the situation which an amendment could not possibly permit.

The concept of women assuming responsibility and duties in this field has constantly grown in recent years. Their presence on juries deciding important questions denotes the new feeling, not only of the court officials but lawyers and litigants. The publicity such as the hon. member read, and indeed this statement, focuses attention on this matter and I hope will induce women to fulfil their duties in our engine of British justice.

In conclusion I am delighted to say that my officials and others who have spoken to me on this matter indicate the splendid job the women do when performing on juries.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, after the lofty heights at which we have been flying for the last couple of hours, I want to come down to a very mundane matter. The hon. Attorney-General, Mr. Chairman, has received a letter in the last few days with regard to a situation arising from advertisements in the paper in Port Hope in which a local packing company is advertising cat and dog food and they are doing so under the brand name of "Fame".

Now as the hon. Attorney-General is likely aware, this is a name which has been registered by one of the best known farmers' co-operatives in this province. I am wondering, under these circumstances, what action is taken. I assume that this might come under Crown attorneys.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure where it would come, but I have not seen such a letter and I have just checked with my officials here who would have access to my mails, and—

Mr. MacDonald: I have a copy of it, it was sent on February 16.

Hon. Mr. Cass: It has not reached my desk. If the hon. member will send it across to me, I will certainly take a look at it and see what we should do about it, because this is a new one.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 214 agreed to.

On vote 215:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of matters I would like to raise in connection with 215.

Hon. Mr. Cass: So would I.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. Minister want to lead off?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I will probably have something to say during this vote on public defender and legal aid, but I think I will wait until the hon. members have had their say.

Mr. MacDonald: There is one other point I would like to raise in connection with the public defender. I am not going to repeat all that has been said both by my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine and the hon. member for Parkdale and others on this question of the public defender.

Mr. Chairman, this has been part of the programme of the New Democratic Party, and the CCF before it, for years, and I am interested to see that the Liberals are now giving it a great deal of prominence. I am curious to know what is the view of the government.

In the hon. Attorney-General's reply, however, I would like him to address his comments to something which I suspect is pretty accurate. In one of her columns recently, dealing with justice for the indigent, Ruth Worth dealt with this in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, February 11 issue. Just let me read the first few paragraphs:

The Canadian Bar Association has been flirting with the public defender system for nearly 40 years but has always managed to bury the idea in committees. Only last week the Ontario section of the CBA referred a resolution on the question without discussion to the criminal justice subsection for a report. Back in 1924 the public defender issue came before the national body of the CBA. Then, too, it was referred for a report to a committee in whose hands the idea suffered a quiet burial.

Lurking behind the philosophical arguments for and against an employee of the state defending persons who have been arrested and are being prosecuted by other employees of the state, is one crass economic fact. A public defender would drastically reduce the work available here for criminal lawyers, thus crippling their incomes. Chicago, with a population of over 5 million has had a public defender system since 1930 and no more than a dozen lawyers in the city now practise criminal law on a full-time basis. Toronto, with fewer than 2 million people, has at least two dozen members of the criminal bar.

Then she goes on to spell out comments from top officials in the public defender's office as to the complete satisfaction which is now accorded to it in the city of Chicago.

There are other matters I wanted to raise, but perhaps the hon. Attorney-General would like to deal with the public defender first. I would appreciate it if he would speak to this question of whether or not this vested interest in the field, so to speak, by the profession of law is the reason why the issue has been buried in committees since the year 1924. If that be true, has the time not arrived for this government to give some leadership in terms of establishing a public defender and we would hope that even a few years from now the legal profession would accord it the kind of support that is has in Chicago?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, may I first return the letter from Kingston, RR 5, that was sent to me by the hon. member for York South?

May I tell him through you, sir, that when that letter reaches me I will be in a position only to advise Mr. Mills that it is completely a civil matter wherein those people whose rights are being affected must take the necessary action and that this department of government or no department of government is in a position to carry civil actions for persons, particularly the type mentioned in the letter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some time ago there was publicity in one of the local newspapers which has been referred to not only today but in a prior portion of the debate on these estimates and it quoted particularly the Chicago public defender system. Entirely without solicitation, because I have never spoken to the man and I would not know him if I saw him, but Mr. John Weisdorf, the assistant provincial director of legal aid in Ontario, has sent me a letter which is of great interest to all of us, particularly those who feel that the Chicago system is something much better than what we have in Ontario. I would like to read the letter, Mr. Chairman, so that we may realize that in Ontario we have equally as good a system, which produces equally good results. Certainly no one is in a better position to certify to that than Mr. Weisdorf. This is addressed to me and dated February 18, 1963:

DEAR MR. MINISTER:

I read with deep regret of the recent attacks on your department's estimates. Certain suggestions have been made, among them the establishment of a public defender office. I am entrusted by the law society of this province with the administration of

the plan providing for the defence of indigent accused, and as such, it is my duty to draw to your attention certain facts which I believe will go far in rebutting these unwarranted attacks.

An analysis of statistics comparing the functioning of legal aid in Toronto with the public defender in Chicago discloses the following:

1. The Chicago defender, out of a population of 5 million, acted for 2,400 accused. A ratio of 1 : 2,100. Voluntary legal aid counsel in Toronto acted for 700 accused. A ratio of 1 : 2,100. Proportionately there appears to be no difference between the two systems.

2. The Chicago defender pleaded 70 per cent—

Listen to this, Mr. Chairman:

The Chicago defender pleaded 70 per cent of his accused guilty and obtained dismissals in half the remaining cases.—

Or 17.5 per cent.

Toronto legal aid lawyers pleaded—

And I draw this figure to your attention, Mr. Chairman:

—50 per cent of accused guilty—

against 70 per cent in Chicago:

—and obtained dismissals and withdrawals in half the remaining cases. Result: out of every 100 accused defended in Chicago by the public defender, 15 are discharged. Out of every 100 accused defended in Toronto by counsel acting under legal aid, 25 are discharged.

3. Chicago now has fewer than 12 full-time private attorneys practising criminal law and practically none who practise part-time. In Toronto, at least 100 lawyers voluntarily undertake criminal defence of indigent accused.

From the foregoing several conclusions can be drawn:

1. Both the Chicago defender and the Toronto legal aid proportionately defend the same number of accused.

2. Proportionately fewer accused are discharged under the Chicago defender system than under the legal aid plan in Toronto.

3. The diminishing number of criminal law advocates in Chicago is inherently dangerous unless one is of the opinion that it is safe to constrict vigilance against the erosion of civil liberties to a tiny group of specialists.

4. When the state undertakes to provide criminal defence, injustices may result. Consider only one case, the famous Scottsboro case in which several negroes in Alabama were charged with the rape of a white woman and ultimately discharged. What would the result have been if the state of Alabama had provided these accused with the services of a public defender?

The legal profession of this province is not unanimous in the belief that a public defender is the best answer to the problem of the defence of indigent accused. Indeed, the question is still very much an open question, and, in this city at least, legal aid provides a better solution, for which recognition and credit should be given.

If this letter has been of some assistance, please feel free to use it as you see fit. If I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,
(signed)

JOHN WEISDORF

Mr. Chairman, I think that sets out much more succinctly and better than I could, the actual situation, so far as the successful operation of legal aid in Ontario is concerned. At the present time we have provided for the current year and are providing in these estimates for the ensuing year, a grant of \$20,000. With this money and the other money provided by the Law Society of Upper Canada, we have managed in other parts of Ontario to produce a record which is, I would say, equal to that in Toronto, quoted by Mr. Weisdorf.

At the present time, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question, I can see no need of a public defender. I can say this, that this matter has been under constant study by my predecessor, by my officials, and I will continue to give it my attention, because it is a very interesting problem inasmuch as it is the desire of all of us, I am quite sure, particularly those of us of the legal profession, and certainly those of us in this government, to see that our people in Ontario, our people in Canada, are given the very best service available when their rights and liberties are in jeopardy. And if they cannot afford it themselves, then certainly it must be provided for them.

And so I do not close the book, so far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, on the public defender system. I must confess that I have not been looking at it very long and have not

had the opportunity of looking at it very hard, but this letter from Mr. Weisdorf, which I have read, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members tonight, indicates to me that at least our people are not being prejudiced by the lack of a public defender system, so-called.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I just say that the hon. Minister seems to be quite impressed with the letter by Mr. Weisdorf. But he is the man identified with the legal aid agency set up by the profession as an alternative to the public defender. What else would you expect him to do but defend the system? I am glad to hear the hon. Minister has not closed his mind to it, but I do not think the hon. Minister can dismiss the comments from a very wide range of people, including many people in the legal profession, which certainly do not agree with what Mr. Weisdorf has said. After all, he has something of a vested interest in the organization for which he is speaking, and therefore just as sometimes the hon. Minister defends the indefensible—his predecessor, even more so—I think that is what Mr. Weisdorf is doing.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Will the hon. member permit a question? Does the hon. member dispute the figures which form the basis of Mr. Weisdorf's letter or has he other figures which are not covered by that?

Mr. MacDonald: I am not in a position at the moment to dispute the figures one way or the other. I do not happen to have an assessment right at my fingertips. But I do know that a lot of people who are very interested in this field and who have been studying it for years have serious reservations with regard to the adequacy, with regard to the availability, of legal aid, and the quality of service that is obtained when they get it. Now the figures that happen to be given here seem to deny this. I admit that, for the moment, I am from Missouri; I am not persuaded, because I have listened to a great deal of evidence and views on the opposite side of the question. However, I hope the hon. Minister will keep an open mind on it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to turn to another point which was raised in the House earlier by one or two hon. members on the Opposition side, and that is with regards to the courts in this area. I raise it because this statement deals with criminal justice accounts. I was interested in another point in the Ruth Worth article where she draws attention to the fact that 80 per cent of the criminal charges laid in the province

of Ontario are dealt with in the courthouses right here in the city of Toronto, so that this is a very large portion of the whole estimate that happens to be before us. Now there are a number of obstacles to a better provision of justice in the courts, that were raised in these articles, but there are two of them that I want to centre attention on for a moment.

One was the issue that conceivably has been resolved to some degree since we first discussed this in the House, and that is the question of the site of the new courthouse—the fact that there has been another alternative one confirmed for the Moss Park area in the last few days; and therefore there is within the foreseeable future some prospect of getting into at least the kind of accommodation that would make it possible to do an efficient job. However, even if that be the case, Miss Worth—and I will not go into the details of quoting lengthily from the article, points out that there is good reason to believe that it will be 1965, '66, '67, perhaps even beyond that, before these new courthouses will be ready.

And she draws attention to what seems to be a strange set of priorities in the present conditions, with which they shall have to live for a number of years, whereby funds are apparently available for refurbishing of Crown attorneys' offices, but they are not available even for installing adequate equipment in courtrooms for acoustic purposes—so that the accused will be able to hear the sentence that has been pronounced upon him. The article cites one instance of an accused who was led out and only after he had gotten out was he able to discover what had been the judgment rendered from the bench. Indeed there was even some question, she said, as to whether all of the evidence was actually heard.

Now, it would seem to me that if they are going to be in these buildings, even a year, if we are in a position to move some of the courts into buildings within the same area downtown, or if we are able to refurbish the offices of the Crown attorneys—the heart of the whole legal process—then in terms of the courts and the areas in which they are operating, something should be done about these inadequate facilities even if it is only for a temporary period. The long-term solution will be found in the new courthouse which is envisaged.

However, there is another and, to my mind, even more important issue, and this I want to draw to the attention of the hon.

Minister and to ask his comments. In her first article Miss Worth drew attention to the fact that part of the reason for the paralyzing lack of progress in modernizing the court system since the second world war, may be the archaic system of financing.

Metro is responsible, in theory, for the courts but the province pays for odd services scattered here and there as well as an unconditional \$1 per capita grant. Some accounting practices appear to date from Confederation.

In a later article in this series which is entitled "How Metro Profits from Justice"—just let me read the first paragraph or so, which I think, gives us the nub of the matter for our present purposes:

The most astounding aspect of the administration of justice in Metro Toronto is that it makes a profit. The profit is estimated to be more than \$2,300,000 in 1962. The total revenue received for court fines, fees, parking tags, etc., is estimated at \$7,655,054. Total expenditures, excluding judges' salaries but including the Don Jail, are \$5,341,247, leaving a surplus of \$2,313,807. Most revenue comes from fines paid in magistrates' courts and parking tags. Another big source of revenue is the unconditional \$1 per capita grant given by the province to the administration of justice. The province also gives an annual subsidy of \$100,000 for the jail. It is interesting to note an expenditure of more than \$18,000 for the redecoration of the office of the Crown attorney.

This is the part that I dealt with earlier.

Some of the accounting procedures in the courts date back to the 19th century and efforts to change them have so far been futile. For example, when the province began to employ lawyers to represent the Crown on a regular basis, a fee schedule was set up which has been revised through the years. A Crown attorney would receive so much to appear on a remand, so much to conduct a trial. In small Ontario communities where a full-time Crown attorney is not needed, this system still survives. Most cities, however, pay a Crown attorney a salary. Not Toronto. Toronto Crown attorneys' salaries are set and paid by the province and Metro still turns over to Queen's Park all the fees that they receive. Metro accountants must tabulate a fee for every trial and every remand where a Crown attorney appears. On an average morning eight or

nine Crown counsel will deal with at least 25 cases each. The province gains by this involved procedure. Last year the salaries paid to the 11 lawyers and three office workers in the Crown attorney's office were considerably less than the fee total of \$300,573.

And then I come, Mr. Chairman, to the final point—and this is the conclusion that I want to direct to the attention of the hon. Attorney-General in the hope that I can get his comment.

In 1957, legislation was adopted to eliminate the practice, but Metro finance officials report that no agreement has been reached during the last six years between Metro and provincial officials.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that this is obviously what Miss Worth describes it, as an archaic system that has grown up almost over a hundred years, a patchwork that would seem to me, on the surface of it, not an efficient way to go about it—a very complicated accounting procedure and everything else. Why is it that the matter has been under study now for six years and that we have heard nothing? Or am I right that perhaps we are on the eve of another production, another unveiling, with great changing of things?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the first comment of the hon. member concerning court accommodation: as I said earlier this evening, I read with interest Miss Worth's contributions to the local paper. There was a great deal of interesting information there. But with respect to the courtroom accommodation, one of the difficulties, of course, as the hon. member for York South has pointed out, has been the fact that for a number of years there has been under discussion a new court building, and only last week as I understand it from the newspapers, was the deal consummated whereby the lands were available from the federal government to the city of Toronto so that the new courthouse might be built.

Now courthouse accommodation in Metro, as in other places in southern Ontario, is the responsibility of the county or the city concerned and while my officials are quite as upset as the Metro officials with respect to the condition, I could say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, that I can see no real alleviation of the condition until the new courthouse is built. But I can also assure him that every effort is being made by my officials in co-operation with the officials of Metro to provide better accommodation and

more of it for our courts in the intervening period. What I have said about the control of the courthouses and the courtrooms is the only comment I could make with respect to those items of furnishing and other things mentioned in the article and quoted by the hon. member.

With respect to the other matter, I may say this: one of the first things that I saw, or had brought before me, last fall, when I assumed this particular department as my responsibility, was a draft of an agreement between Metro officials and my department. It was the latest of several drafts concerning the matter raised by the hon. member, that is, the payment of fees to the province and the payment by the province of the salaries to Crown attorneys and other officials in Metro court. I think that the comments made by the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, in this respect are quite valid under the circumstances. I will say this, that throughout the rest of Ontario over the years we have managed to update our procedures, and we have managed to get in accounting machines and various other things, so that we have a pretty good operation financially. But the one spot where up to now it has not been possible to do that, has been in Metro.

I do not say this is the fault of either Metro or the officials of my department. It has not been done. It is my hope that we can accomplish it and as the hon. member says I can pull it out of my sleeve or out of the hat before too long. I assure him that it is something that we do not wish to have continued for more reasons than those quoted by the hon. member. I can assure him that everything we can do will be done to do away with this procedure, which in its time, as has been pointed out, was the right and only proper procedure, but which now has outlived its time.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add just a few remarks to this matter of the public defender. I think that the hon. Attorney-General is making a mistake just to take the figures supplied by Mr. Weisdorf from the Legal Aid Society for this reason: I am not doubting at all that the lawyers in legal aid work do a fine job, that many of them give a great deal of their time and talent to helping people who are in need of help. But the assistance that is given by them is not nearly enough, especially in this area of the city we are now in. And there have been instances come to mind, been drawn to my attention—one of them as the result of the hon. Attorney-General's office

giving a person the wrong instructions on what to do.

I just want to cite briefly two cases how things can go very wrong. I think that anybody who has been in the legal profession should be aware of the fact that if you have money you get a better defence than the man who has not. It is all right to preach equality before the law and say we have equality before the law, but the bare fact is that we do not. If you do not have the knowledge of whom to see or have the money to retain somebody who knows how to go about to defend you, you do not get nearly the defence you should get, unless you are most fortunate in finding some lawyer to take up your case free. And true, the Legal Aid Society are in this group that take up these cases, but they certainly do not cover everything.

I want to give you an example of how serious this can be. This concerns an individual, a new Canadian, who has been in Canada only six years. He runs a small mixed farm of some three acres, just barely making a living for himself and his wife and his son who is 12 years of age. He was a man who was never in trouble with the police authorities. The only trouble in his life I believe was he had been in a German or a Russian D.P. camp. He had been having hunters come on his farm carrying guns, and of course he was always warning them to get off.

On one occasion three men, who were the worse for drink, and were carrying guns, came on his farm and he went out with his gun and fired two shots in the air and warned them to leave. The three men went and got the provincial police at Vandorf and a charge was laid against him for attempting to wound, with shooting with intent to wound. Well, he had some money and he hired a lawyer and the case was dismissed. This man, against whom the case was dismissed was so annoyed he went to the police and he thought something should be done about the three men who came on his farm.

But instead of the police going after the three men who came on his farm, they laid another charge against this man on the same facts. Only, instead of shooting with intent to wound, on which he was already found not guilty, they laid a charge of assault.

The fellow, by this time, could not afford a lawyer. He did not speak English too well, he was hard of hearing, and when he tried to explain he got too excited, the magistrate remanded him to have a mental examination. Mind you, this did not happen when he had

a lawyer. But this time the magistrate decided that mentally he was all right, and he was found guilty of assault. Now he has this record as long as he lives. But he was so annoyed about the trial that he immediately, within four days, wrote to the Attorney-General's department. Now he had lots of time on that occasion to appeal. This gentleman appealed to the department of the hon. Attorney-General on or about March 30, 1962, which was about four days after his case and was referred to a Mr. John Weisdorf, the assistant director of free legal aid at room 20, City Hall, Toronto. I have this letter from the hon. Attorney-General directing him to go to the free legal aid and reminding Mr. Weisdorf that this gentleman who was involved made less than \$1,800 a year.

You know, if you make more than \$1,800 a year you are not entitled to free legal aid. I would say that, in the Toronto area it is pretty difficult to live on \$1,800 a year, especially if you are raising a family. Mr. Weisdorf did not bring that out in his report that the means test that these people have to go through is so tight that it is very, very difficult to get help. But anyway, this man was referred to Mr. Weisdorf and he got a letter back from Mr. Weisdorf saying that the free legal aid looks after only those people who are in the city of Toronto. So this man living in Newmarket was just out of luck. I think we should keep in mind that the free legal aid, even though it is active, only covers a certain area.

So here is a man—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Trotter: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Cass: As a member of, I presume, the county law association of York, and a member of the profession, is the hon. member not aware of the fact that there is legal aid operating out of all of the county towns in the province of Ontario?

Mr. Trotter: Well, if that was the case, Mr. Weisdorf did not seem to know. He did not advise him, and the hon. Attorney-General's department did not even know. I am familiar with Toronto. I must admit I do not know about outside Toronto; I do not know how active the free legal aid is.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member—

Mr. Trotter: But it was the hon. Attorney-General's department which did not know. We have the letter here, where you sent him to Toronto; and then the free legal aid in Toronto, maybe hard-pressed as it was, did not tell the man what to do. As a result, a lawyer is now attempting to appeal this case to see if something can be done. Literally months have gone by and it is going to be most difficult to help this man.

Here is an instance, where this man will carry a record all his life. He was first tried on a set of facts; he had a lawyer, and he was found not guilty. Then the police come along on the same set of facts and lay another charge; he is accused of being mentally incompetent, he shows he is not mentally incompetent and he is convicted. True, it is for a small offence, but he must carry a record all his life.

In this case, this man was at a disadvantage, not only because of his poor hearing but because of his lack of English. I think if the hon. Attorney-General is going to have justice in this province, not only have justice but have the appearance of justice, I think much more should be done in cases such as this.

I will read one more case; I know the hour is late. I do not want to take up too much time, but this was more or less a test case which took place last year in our own courts in Ontario. The lawyer who took this case tried to appeal a conviction of an individual here in our courts in the city on the grounds that when the man pleaded guilty he did not have the benefit of counsel, did not know what he was doing, and therefore should be entitled to a new trial. The Court of Appeal held that just because a man did not have counsel, it does not mean to say he did not get a fair trial; therefore the appeal was not allowed and the man served a two-year sentence.

I just want to read to you the facts of this. This is from the affidavit that the accused made at the same time that they moved a motion for an appeal. This individual said:

I am 66 years of age, born in the city of Dublin, Ireland, in the year 1895. And I have worked steadily at my calling as a prospector for minerals from the year 1927 until 1959, and have only been able to find employment at my calling for three months in the year 1960. Since then, although having sought any work available, I have not been employed.

My benefits under The Unemployment Insurance Act expired quite some time ago and the only income I have received is

old age assistance of some \$55 per month, which is totally insufficient an amount to subsist upon.

I have become aware that no person cares whether another person lives or dies, eats or starves, and I took steps in an attempt to draw my plight to the public in the hope that someone would render me employment of any nature. When it was alleged that I had attempted to rob a bank on September 11, 1961, I had become so despondent, confused and depressed that I thought this was the only way that assistance could be provided. I only sought to borrow money and was prepared to repay it as soon as possible.

After I was arrested on September 11, 1961, I appeared in court the next day and pleaded guilty for I knew not what to do and no one had advised me that I had a right to retain and instruct counsel, nor did anyone inform me that I had a right to free legal aid. When I pleaded guilty I was still confused, despondent and depressed, not knowing or caring what happened to me.

I was not aware of the fact that the charge against me was a serious charge, nor was I aware of the fact that I could be sent to jail for a long period of time and was therefore incapable of appreciating the nature and quality of the alleged offence. I have never been charged with any criminal offence prior to this offence which is the subject matter of this, my affidavit.

Here is a man of 66 who has never been in trouble before. If a man had counsel in a case like that, many things could take place. A counsel could ask for a pre-sentence report. There is the possibility of probation, not necessarily on this type of offence, although the man actually did not use violence. But there are many possibilities. The man might get a much shorter sentence, even though he is found guilty.

The hon. Attorney-General was reading the letter from the Legal Aid Society about convictions and guilty pleas. Well, I say to the hon. Attorney-General, through you, Mr. Chairman, it is not always just the guilty plea; many times a person pleads guilty and goes on probation simply because somebody has known how to organize the defence and to bring in character witnesses, etc. This man had no opportunity for that type of hearing. I still say if we had a public defender, such a disgrace in our system of justice, like the Robert Roberts case, would not have taken place.

But this goes on, I say, in Toronto, every day. It will be going on tomorrow morning. The free legal aid people can talk all they like, but it is not sufficient here in this province. Just let us bear in mind that the legal profession, even though I belong to it, is like any other profession—just like the doctors who fight medical insurance—a vested interest. Those who are too far to the right may fear medical insurance, so the lawyers get scared if somebody mentions the word legal care.

But in a modern, industrial society it is up to the legal profession to see to it that these people get proper protection for their freedom. And if we, as a profession, do not do it, I say it is up to government, through the taxpayers' money, to see that this protection is supplied to individuals. It is up to us as a government, and it is up to the hon. Attorney-General.

I suppose to any man who comes to a new office as the hon. Attorney-General has, it is a wonderful opportunity for him. It gives him an opportunity to do something to be remembered. I realize the real reason why he was put in there is to help clean up the mess this province has got into in the Attorney-General's office the last few years. But assuming the present hon. Attorney-General might clean up the mess, this is a positive action he can take; it is a step forward in protecting the freedoms of the individual; it is something that can be added to what we like to call British justice.

I do plead with him, through you, Mr. Chairman, to see to it that we in this province make every effort to bring about a system of a public defender. I do not ask that he go into the whole thing holus-bolus, but certainly a pilot effort could be begun here in the city of Toronto in the near future. I would ask that the hon. Attorney-General's department give very serious thought to this.

Mr. Sopha: The very able and eloquent comments of my hon. friend from Parkdale, Mr. Chairman, besides demonstrating the inherent problem that he exposed, also demonstrate that we lawyers are capable of criticizing ourselves. We are not afraid; as long as we are able to criticize ourselves we need have no fear of any criticism the public might make of us. In that connection I do not know that we Liberal lawyers in the House—I do not presume to speak for the hon. leader of the Opposition in this regard, Mr. Chairman, but I speak for my hon. friend to the right and my hon. friend to the left (Mr. Singer and Mr. Trotter) are too

enthused, we Liberal lawyers, with the recent conversion of the treasurer of the Law Society to our cause as demonstrated by his latest epistle to the press. I leave it at that. He has not been known to be one of our foremost supporters in the past.

We, within the confines of this vote, were asked to vote the sum of \$669,000 for magistrates in juvenile courts. I am not sure that it is enough. Our magistrates again are a part of our society who do a very essential job, a very vital job, in the system of administration of justice and I am one of those who begs leave to borrow somebody else's phrase: The most important court that operates in our land is the magistrate's court, the court which deals with the greatest number of citizens, the court which deals with the great majority of citizens who find themselves enmeshed with the law, who pass through the magistrate's court and never again in their lives, the majority of them, will they ever again be embroiled with the tentacles of the law. It is usually only one brush and that is the end of it.

Most of our magistrates are good and able men who labour under very great difficulties at a very moderate rate of pay indeed in providing the excellent service that they do. Some of our magistrates, a very few, a very small minority, are terrible, have no right to sit on the bench. Some of them are abominable, in the practices that they carry on in the magistrate's court.

One of the things I do, and I make no apologies for it, is when I go about this province and I find myself in a strange city in the morning I inquire where the magistrate's court is being held and I go and as unobtrusively as possible I sit in the back of the courtroom to watch the administration of justice. I recall, to illustrate, to give substantiation for my previous statement that some of them are terrible, I recall being in the court of a man—I would not dare mention his name because he is so highly thought of in this province, a famous magistrate in one of our larger cities—I was in his court seeing him conduct his court and during the course of the proceedings here the man is trying a lad of 17 or 18 who is charged with stealing gasoline from a car in a parking lot and the lad was undefended by counsel.

I do not know if he had sought out legal aid or taken any steps to get counsel. At the end of the Crown's case there was a glaring deficiency in the Crown's case. They had simply failed to prove that it was not his

car. That is the absence of an essential. They caught him siphoning the gasoline out of it, it was two o'clock in the morning, but they had not been able to prove he did not own the car, you see. So at that point he should have gone free.

So what does the magistrate do? They thought there was one Crown attorney in that courtroom! Well there was not. There were two. There was one at the counsel table and there was one on the bench.

He said to the lad, he looked down at him and he gave him the most benign friendly beneficial trusting look and he said to him: "Now you are entitled to go in the witness box and give your story."

You note that: "Now you are entitled," he said, "to go in the witness box and give your story." The unwary lad—I said to myself at that point, shall I get up, shall I get up and cry out in the name of justice against this? Or shall I sit silent?

Well I sat silent, because I was from a long way off.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Shame!

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): Shame!

Mr. Sopha: Yes, the hon. member from St. George says "Shame". Maybe it will be to my shame that I did not get up.

The lad wended his way to the witness box and he took the book and he was sworn, and the magistrate could not wait for the Crown attorney to ask the fatal question, he could not wait, he had to ask it himself. He said to him, "Was it your car?"

And the lad who had taken the book and was sworn, he had to answer the truth, and he said "No", and they had him.

He had him, right then and there. He convicted him. That was the end of the case.

You see, the magistrate had trapped him into the witness box. Instead, this famous magistrate, had he carried out his duty as the impartial arbiter in this case, had he said to the lad: "Now, they failed to prove—"; or said to the Crown; "You failed to prove the case against him," the charges would have been dismissed.

No! The magistrate inveigled him into the box and had him. In the face of the bill of rights that has been taken across this country by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), where it says that no man is required to incriminate himself—one of our fundamental

freedoms. When we are in power and I catch a magistrate, if I catch a magistrate, who acts like that, who denies a person his fundamental rights, I will go to the Prime Minister and I will say: "Let's fire him! Let's get him off the bench and drive him into oblivion"; a pernicious person like that, who sits in judgment as a prosecutor when he should be a judge.

Now earlier in the estimates, before I was stopped by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), I used the phrase that I wanted to call attention to a very objectionable practice that persists in this province, and that is the practice of appointing magistrates to police commissions. It is a practice that has gone on for a goodly number of years.

I do not know how long but I suspect, I am told by people much more senior than I in the practice of law, that the practice originated out of the small pay that we gave our magistrates perhaps two generations ago, while they were stipendiary magistrates. They paid themselves from the fines that they levied against people who came before them. They did not make a very good living. You see, often the magistrate in those days was the town butcher, or the town haberdasher or a surveyor, perhaps, or a person untrained in the law. He paid himself out of the fines and in order to increase his emolument somebody thought up this idea of putting him on the police commission. It meant the municipality would add to his rewards of office and pay what, in effect, was a part of his salary.

Now it is interesting to note—they say in Great Britain that it takes about a generation for a report of a Royal commission to be translated into statutory reform. Well, it takes longer in Canada. It has taken longer in regard to this specific problem that I raise because I looked, in making research on this, I looked at a report made by a person by the name of Walter D. Gregory. I do not know who Walter D. Gregory was; maybe somebody who is senior to me in years afterwards will tell me who Walter D. Gregory was, I would like to know, but—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was a Bay Street lawyer.

Mr. Sopha: He was! Thanks. I would like to have a less colourable description of him than that.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps a more factual description.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Back in 1921 he made an interim report respecting sheriffs. It was a commission to inquire into, consider and report upon the best mode of selecting, appointing and remunerating sheriffs, etc.

Whatever the Gregory plan was of selecting sheriffs, it went into oblivion in this province, if he had any independent way of selecting them. You know we Canadians, we pride ourselves in not electing our sheriffs and our clerks and our garbage collectors, and so on. We condemn the Americans for electing theirs, but in Canada we do not elect ours, we defeat them. We defeat them. After they are defeated at the polls, if they are of the majority party they are appointed to the office.

Mr. Gregory in his report had this to say about the practice:

In cities and towns where boards of police commissioners constituted the police magistrate as a member of the boards, he takes a leading part in making the appointments and promotions. The policeman who testifies before the magistrate in court is often one of his appointees and the relationship between the magistrate and the police give the police an influence in the court that may be undesirable and prejudicial to persons brought to trial and against whom they testify. It tends to make the court, in substance as well as in name, a police court. In our opinion it would in the public interest to provide that the police magistrate shall not be a member of the board of police commissioners.

That report was one of 1921.

Along in 1933, Mr. Justice Kingstone was appointed to look into and report on the matter known as the Albert Dorland affair. Now once again, people older than myself will remember the Albert Dorland affair. It took place over on the corner of Wellesley and Church in this city where the police, having been tipped off of an incipient plan to rob a bank over there, that instead of going and arresting the culprits they lured them into a trap whereby they started to carry out their plan to rob the bank. The police were laying in wait for them and on the quiet of a weekday morning there was a great fusillade of shots on Wellesley Street and several of the—or some of the bandits, at least—lay dead and others were wounded. There was a public hue and cry about those police methods and Mr. Justice Kingstone was appointed to investigate. A lawyer, Mr. Bell, a very famous lawyer of yesteryear, not of my generation, was involved on behalf of

one of the parties and he was the Mr. Bell, you remember, who wrote the Broadway play "Parlour, Bedroom and Bath", perhaps one of the most famous lawyers in the history of jurisprudence in this province.

Mr. Justice Kingstone—because you see this matter involved the police commission insofar as the police commission were aware of the plan to rob the bank and it was with the privity and consent of the police commission that the plan went ahead to lure them into the trap and dispose of them and arrest them. In his report of 1933 he had this to say:

There is a matter I feel I might properly refer to as a result of what has been brought to my attention in this inquiry. It is the practice for a police magistrate to sit on the board of police commissioners in the cities and towns of the province. The board of police commissioners has to do with the manifold duties that are involved in the general supervision of the police, including the appointment and dismissal of all police officers and constables. The duties of the police magistrate are judicial. He is expected to bring to the discharge of his duties a completely impartial attitude of mind, wholly detached in every way from anything that pertains to police approach to the commission of a crime. It is the duty of the police on proper grounds to arrest persons charged with or suspected of crime and generally prevent and detect crime.

It would appear at times as if a magistrate must find it difficult to perform his duties impartially and judicially if he is closely associated and identified with the police, sitting as a member of the board. It is as important, it seems to me, that a man should believe and realize that he is getting a fair trial as that the trial should be fair and impartial.

The public and the accused person should have confidence and be assured that when a man is tried, no knowledge possessed by the police or police contact has in any way affected the mind of the court before which it appears. In order to put our courts in a position where no such allegation could be suggested it might be well to consider the advisability of prohibiting police magistrates from sitting on boards of police commission. I think the English system divorces in this sense the administration of the police body from the judicial functions discharged by magistrates.

About a month ago one of the judges of the high court was hearing a matter that was brought before him in which one of the counsel representing the Attorney-General appeared.

Mr. Chairman, one of the issues that came before the learned justice of the high court concerned a magistrate sitting on a board of police commissioners. However, although that connection of the magistrate with the board of police commissioners appeared in the record, counsel for the applicant did not raise it in making his application, he was silent about it. Counsel for the Attorney-General, when he rose to make argument, referred to that matter being in the record. The judge stopped him. He said, "This was not raised by the applicant. However, I have been waiting a long time," and here I paraphrase, "to say this in public. I think it is a terrible thing in this province," said the learned justice, "that magistrates are permitted to sit on police commissions and I hope you, when you go back to speak to your superiors at Queen's Park will tell your superiors that I have said this, because I have looked for the opportunity," said the learned justice, "to say that."

Well, there are three opinions. Neither Mr. Gregory, nor Mr. Justice Kingstone, nor the learned justice recently at Osgoode Hall, have had any impact on the matter. I recall that the matter was raised by my hon. colleague from Essex North, Mr. Chairman. In the city of Windsor, as he relates it, they had an even worse situation that existed for a long period of years. Not only did they have the magistrate on the police commission but they had the Crown attorney also. Their police commission, unlike any other in the province, consisted of a judge of the county of Essex, a magistrate for the county, and the Crown attorney, who incidentally was later promoted to judge and is now the chairman of the Ontario Police Commission.

Now, as Mr. Justice Kingstone and Mr. Gregory point out, the fallacy in it is this, that the policeman who is giving evidence in magistrate's court is an employee of the judge who is hearing the case. The judge cannot be impartial. When allegations are made about the behaviour or the conduct of the policeman, in a sense the person making those allegations is making an attack upon the judge himself. Indirectly he is making an attack upon the magistrate because the magistrate had a hand in selecting that policeman as his employee, and it is human for all of us when aspersions or serious allegations of misbehaviour or misconduct or police brutality are made against an employee, it is

natural for the employer to come to the defence of his employee. We would all do it and especially would we do it towards an employee who had been in our employ for quite a period of time. It is a natural reaction.

How many times have I been in magistrate's court myself—I could not count them—when I have seen people come in, unrepresented by counsel, and say to the magistrate, in one way or another, "I have been the victim of police brutality, I was assaulted when I was in the police station." And I have heard the magistrate, instead of launching an inquiry immediately as he should do in this the Queen's court, I have heard him say to that person, "Make a complaint to the police commission."

That is the way he handles it, "Make a complaint to the police commission." Well, if he goes to the police commission, is he in any better position? Then he faces the three employers, all three of them, the county judge, the magistrate and the mayor. And all of them are responsible in the sense that they have selected that policeman, have continued to employ him; in that sense they are all responsible for his conduct. Now that is one thing.

The second thing that I find to be wrong: The policeman who comes into magistrate's court and makes a great botch of the case. If he botches up the case—you see, in the presentation of his evidence, he leaves some essential ingredient out—then I have found that it is not long, it is not long until the chief of police has got the word from the magistrate and the chief of police has been directed to correct that officer.

Thirdly: Through this relationship of employer and employee, the policeman often is aware of the type of evidence, in a particular type of offence, that it is advantageous to collect and present in order to secure a conviction before that magistrate. Once again, the employer. Now, all of those things are contrary to our fundamental sense of British justice. The police magistrate, like the judge of the high court, or a county court judge, or the judge of the court of appeal, as a judicial officer, is one and the same as those in superior courts. He is to sit there as an independent arbiter, independent in his mind and in his thinking, independent of any relationship with anyone in the case, with any person in the case, and he shall hear the evidence, weigh it, and come to his decision. He cannot do it. He is precluded from doing that as long as this relationship of employer and employee is imposed upon him by the

legislation of this province. And that is how he comes to be there, by legislation, by statute; the statute requires that a magistrate be a member of the police commission.

It is a simple thing. Who is to say? Is the hon. Attorney-General's department to gain-say us, to contradict us, if we say, "Need it be a magistrate?" Who is to say that a police commission is made up of a county judge—I would never vote in favour of taking the county judge off—the mayor, an elected official, perhaps a dentist, a doctor, an architect, a successful business man, for that matter the president of the chamber of commerce or some other respectable and sophisticated organization; a police commission not limited to three but perhaps expanded to five? Can the hon. Attorney-General or anyone else—

Mr. MacDonald: How about the president of the local labour council?

Mr. Sopha: The president of the local labour council, indeed.

Mr. MacDonald: But not as an afterthought.

Mr. Sopha: Not as an afterthought. I would incorporate him in as being just as worthy as any other that I mentioned. I ask the hon. Attorney-General, can he argue that his police commission that this government fosters and perpetuates is better than the one that I have posited? I think not. I think the one I posited is more independent, is more designed to protect the public interest.

There is in short no justification for the continuation of this practice in this province. Let us get the magistrates away from their connection with the police department. Then you will see one corrective and prophylactic effect it will have on the administration of justice. If they are not connected with the magistrate, you will find that the policemen in their conduct will—those few, let me make it clear, those few who are guilty of misbehaviour, and perhaps guilty of brutality towards citizens—will indeed be more wary of having their conduct reviewed before a magistrate who occupies the independent position that I posit. I will leave it at that.

Having told the story about that one magistrate, and re-emphasizing once again, as I do, that the number of magistrates who do not measure up to high standards in this province are indeed few, the officials of The Department of the Attorney-General, if not the political head himself, are to be commended in their selection of good men to fill our magistrates' positions.

I myself make a confession. When my community selected a man who was not a lawyer I, being perhaps subject to some influence of people longer at the bar than myself, looked upon the selection of a layman as a magistrate as being perhaps a wrong thing. I thought that only a lawyer could fill that position. I have changed my mind. I have changed my mind.

The hon. Attorney-General's department, in my community, named a layman, a person with no legal training, to the bench. He has turned out to be an exceedingly fine magistrate. He is not only mature in his judgment, but I have observed of him that his hours off the bench are spent beneficially in the pursuit of learning the law. He is training himself. His deportment on the bench is unexceptionable. The hearing that he gives to the members of the public who come before him meet the highest standards of the practice and procedure of British justice. I am glad to have the opportunity to say that I welcome his continued occupation of the bench.

The other member of the bench who sits in Sudbury, Magistrate W. F. Woodliffe, is of course one of the finest magistrates in the province, one of the finest in the province.

An hon. member: The hon. member praises all those back home.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, I do not praise them, I do not praise them all. We have our days in magistrate's court, but I am paid to do my job and they are paid to do theirs. No, I am not always paid, either.

However, it might be of interest to note how Magistrate Woodliffe came among us. My community was suffering from a little dislocation and perhaps a little bit of leniency about 15 or 16 years ago—I think it is 16 years ago now. Magistrate Woodliffe at that time was holding court down on the lakeshore somewhere to the west of us here, and they decided something had to be done about Sudbury as far as I can understand it; things had got a bit loose up there. Of course, that is all forgotten now. They selected Magistrate Woodliffe and said, "Maybe you had better go to Sudbury and straighten things out up there".

Away he went to Sudbury, and he has been there ever since. Lawyers in the province would join with me in saying that Magistrate Woodliffe, in his occupation of the bench, has been stellar; and if our community needed a bit of tightening up from the administration of justice angle, then he brought the necessary qualities and instituted the neces-

sary procedures to do it. I am happy to take the time of this House to commend both of those magistrates for the fine service they have performed.

Mr. Cowling: Has the hon. member some others up there? Give us a rundown—

Mr. Sopha: No, we have only two.

But if you will treat it as a serial, then perhaps next week I will give you a rundown on some other aspect.

But let me end this way by going back to the major reason that I took up the time of the House. I hope the hon. Attorney-General will spring to his feet as soon as I sit down and say—

An hon. member: Thank God!

Mr. Sopha: —in our great zeal for reform—

An hon. member: I hope he says, "I move we adjourn".

Mr. Sopha: —our great zeal for reform, I hope he will say that we, who are interested in the welfare, and now I quote him directly:

We who are interested in the welfare of this province and who want to get the legislation on the books to promote the public good of this province in spite of the politicking on the other side, then I will accept from the member for Sudbury this very valuable suggestion and he may rest assured that this will be translated into legislation by way of repeal of that section of The Police Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, in the current issue of the *Financial Post* there is on the editorial page in the "quote, unquote" column the following wise words:

Democracy means government by discussion but it is only effective if you can stop people talking.

Those are words of Lord Attlee.

Mr. Chairman, seriously, I rise to ask the hon. Prime Minister, since it is obvious that he has not stopped the Opposition talking and there are ten more estimates, and one of the other requisites for an effective democracy is a little sleep, how long are we going to continue tonight?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I was waiting to complete this vote, Mr. Chairman; I do not like to cut anybody in this House who wants to talk—I do not mean discuss, but talk—so I

was just being polite and waiting for the hon. member to finish his remarks and then perhaps we could put the vote and I will make the motion.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 215 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply reports the following resolutions:

Resolved that supply in the following supplementary amounts and to defray the expenses of the government departments named be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963.

Department of Education, Dominion-provincial agreement, \$10 million.

Legislative grants, etc., \$20 million.

Special grant, \$1 million.

Department of Health, special grants, \$3,807,000.

Department of Lands and Forests, special grant, \$30,000.

Treasury Department, main office, \$1 million.

Resolutions concurred in.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning we will have the budget debate and will resume the estimates of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass), and we will not go to the order paper.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Excuse me, we start at what time, 10 or 10.30?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: 10.30.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.50 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Friday, February 22, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Friday, February 22, 1963

Statement re booklets in 13 languages re government services, Mr. Yaremko	997
Resumption of the debate on the budget, Mr. Sutton, Mr. Nixon	997
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to	1005
Estimates, Department of the Attorney-General, Mr. Cass, continued	1005
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1021

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1963

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, you will recall that a year ago, during the discussion on the estimates of the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship, I announced that the department would be publishing a series of illustrated booklets printed in 13 languages and I referred to them during this year's discussion. They have now been delivered and are ready for distribution.

The booklets provide details of Ontario government services available to the public in the fields of labour, health, welfare, education and workmen's compensation. They are summaries of five seminars which were organized by the Ontario citizenship division in co-operation with the departments concerned, and which were attended by many individuals, voluntary groups and organizations interested in immigrant integration.

This has been done in accordance with the department's aim of being helpful to individual newcomers directly and to the many persons concerned with newcomer integration. It is part of our general policy of being helpful to all people.

The booklets have been printed in English, French, Italian, German, Polish, Hungarian, Ukrainian, Dutch, Serbo-Croatian, Greek, Finnish, Portuguese and Slovak. I believe this is an unique undertaking and it is not likely that it could be achieved with a similar excellence of production anywhere else. I have had placed on the hon. members' desks for their knowledge the English booklet on "Labour" with the Portuguese version, there being 11 other versions.

This variety of languages should enable the more recent immigrants, who face many

problems, to learn about Ontario government services through the medium of their own language during that difficult period before they had learned enough English to read the government's regular publications and to make use of general sources of information.

Language classes, as I indicated to the House a few days ago, are one of the major efforts of the citizenship division. The English and French editions will make information available to immigrants who have been here for some time and have acquired a working knowledge of one of these languages, and also to those immigrants whose native language may be English or French.

All of these booklets should prove of value indeed, as a source of information and for ready reference for anyone. We are hopeful that in these booklets the newcomer or anyone else is likely to find in summary form the answers to most of his questions.

The series of five booklets, or any particular one in any one of the 13 languages, may be obtained free after March 1 from the citizenship division, room 167, main Parliament Building by writing, or telephoning 365-2285.

Clerk of the House: Fourth order.

Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. R. E. Sutton (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the budget debate I first wish to congratulate you, sir, on the fair and impartial manner in which you conduct the affairs of this House.

In debating the budget I realize that a great deal of latitude is given to the speaker and I expect to wander all over the lot today. My first words would be to reiterate and emphasize as strongly as I can the fact that the people of Ontario have enjoyed excellent government under the Progressive-Conservatives for the past 20 years. We have

witnessed Ontario's greatest growth and development in this period. Evidence of this development and expansion is all around us in new highways, new schools, new universities and new industries.

The power development policies of this government have tripled power generation, and this great and abundant and cheap electricity has been the main factor in our tremendous industrial development. We would not want to hear anything from the hon. members over there about Hydro because they were the people that cancelled the power contracts.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Oh, come on, fellows; it is Friday.

Mr. Sutton: Mr. Speaker, we have in Ontario developed nearly all of our water power sites, and we went on to pioneer in the development of nuclear power. We have already one nuclear plant of 20,000 watt capacity in operation, and another much larger plant of 200,000 watts well on the way.

I heard a scientist on television, last evening, predicting that a small portable nuclear power plant would soon be produced. He even said that mountain climbers would carry their own portable power plants to the peak of Mount Everest. Ontario's know-how in the nuclear power development field should put us in the forefront of such future business in exporting package deals of nuclear power plants.

While on the subject of power, I would think that the federal people should co-operate with some of our provinces who still have undeveloped waterfalls and power sites, and develop this hydro-electric power for export to the United States. At the present time these waters are simply wasted, flowing under the bridge, when they could be developed and, in the development, make many needed new jobs; and when the power is sold to the United States to generate the precious foreign exchange that our economy so badly needs.

Over the past 15 years Ontario's population has increased by 2.5 million new Canadians. Half of the people, and half of the industries coming to Canada, locate in Ontario. At the present time we need many more new Canadians, in my opinion.

The dynamic creed of our party by which we lived under Hon. Leslie M. Frost, remains the heart and centre of our policy under

the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). It is: More people, more industry, more jobs, more wages, more opportunity, and from these more productivity and revenue to do the job of supplying government services.

The new Robarts team has vim, vigour, vitality and, above all, new initiative. They are determined to make Ontario's economy grow.

Present proposals of an Economic Development Agency, a Portable Pensions Bill, Minimum Wage Bill, a Draft Medical Care Insurance Bill, are all measures to inspire confidence and support.

As I say, this government shows a fresh view of the problems we face and a determination to meet any challenge. We have in the Cabinet a group of clear-thinking men whose policies and programmes the people of Ontario will be proud to support whenever a general election is called.

In the hon. Prime Minister we have a young man proceeding cautiously, deliberately and surely to take over the tremendous responsibilities of the office of Prime Minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would point out to all the members that it is a little early in the morning, and everyone seems to be over-enthusiastic. I have noted just as many words coming from this side as words from the side of the member speaking. This is not fair to the speaker, and I would ask for the co-operation of the members.

Mr. Sutton: He now has his feet solidly under his desk, and is making new marks for himself and his team of Cabinet Ministers, each and every new day of the present session—I do not mind that yakkety-yak over there, Mr. Speaker, they can go on as long as they like. He has, as I have said, a tremendous team of able assistants. To mention one, I would say the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) is doing a magnificent job with his trade crusade. He is going to find 60,000 new job opportunities each year for the next ten years.

An hon. member: Bully for him!

Mr. Sutton: In the last 15 years the Canadian economy succeeded without half trying. These were our lush years when western Europe and Japan were broken and bankrupt. There was little competition in world markets. We in Canada could make and sell almost anything and consequently

we experienced a terrific boom. Things are different now. World trade patterns have completely changed. Western Europe and Japan have made an outstanding recovery. We in Canada have now found that we must be efficient and our prices must be competitive; the quality of the article must be high to get business. We find ourselves in trouble with excess productive capacity; we have a chronic unemployment problem, very serious adverse balances in our international accounts, continuing huge deficit in our national budget and slow rates of economic growth.

We have had one run on our gold and U.S. dollar reserves. We have foreign debts of \$18 billion. To pay interest and/or dividends on this foreign investment requires almost \$1 billion. In other words, January 1 of each and every year sees us behind the eight ball for \$1 billion in foreign payments. During the course of the year our exports must be greater than our imports by \$1 billion, just to break even. This we have been unable to do for many years. We had deficit payments as large as \$1.5 billion in both the years 1956 and 1957. We have gained on this problem since those years but even last year, 1962, although our merchandise trading accounts almost evened out, our overall position was approximately \$1 billion against us. We do have a surplus trade position with most foreign countries, but with the United States our best customer, we have a deficit position of about \$700 million.

This is what is meant, Mr. Speaker, by a structural weakness in our economy. This adverse problem is built into our economy to the point where some people are thinking in terms of closer economic union with the United States of America. The Americans now own 97 per cent of our automobile industry, 90 per cent of our oil and gas industry, and almost 60 per cent of our general manufacturing industry.

Fortunately there are two things working for our prosperity today. One is the devalued Canadian dollar, now pegged at 92.5 cents U.S. and the other is the trend to cheaper money. The cheaper Canadian dollar abroad encourages exports, while at the same time it discourages imports. The cheaper interest rates will encourage an increase in production all along the line for both internal and foreign consumption.

We have to increase our exports and decrease our imports. We must develop new secondary industries. We must use our precious raw materials for manufacture here in Canada of many of the items we now import. We have an adverse tourism account

of some \$200 million brought about by Canadians travelling abroad more than foreigners travel in Canada. This situation must be rectified and those responsible for tourism must do some touring themselves to see where and how travel in Canada can be made more popular.

Another matter I wish to suggest is that we carry out the recommendations of Professor Bladen in his report on our automobile industry. We have a \$500 million deficit with the United States in this one industry. We have a \$200 million deficit, as I just said, in tourism and we have a \$500 million deficit in the automobile industry, our total deficit with the United States is \$700 million. Correct these two items and we have gone a long way toward correcting our problems.

We import a great many U.S.-made cars with very little Canadian content in them, and we have been importing nearly all the automatic transmissions and many of the engines that go into the cars assembled in Canada. Surely Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. automobile manufacturers can build in Canada all the engines and transmission systems, etc. that go into Canadian-built cars and can at the same time manufacture here in Canada and export to the United States sufficient of these same products to offset completely the monies necessary to bring in the luxury automobiles now made in the United States.

An hon. member: What kind of a car does the hon. member drive?

Mr. Sutton: I drive a Riviera, and I bought a Sabre the other day for my wife. Is that all right?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sutton: I probably make more jobs than a good many of you fellows over there, I have built six cottages up at the lake and I have used all-Canadian labour and all-Canadian material.

Since writing this paragraph I see in the press reports that American Motors Canada Ltd. has completed a \$4 million deal to export Canadian-made automobile parts to its parent company's plant in Kenosha, Wisconsin. The new programme is expected to create 400 additional jobs at Ontario supplier companies. The deal will cover the export credit required by the company under the Nowlan plan. Ford Motor Company of Canada, Studebaker of Canada and Chrysler of Canada have all announced exports of parts to their parent companies in the United

States to fit in with the Nowlan export credit plan. General Motors of Canada announced that it would make automatic transmissions in its former engine plant in Windsor instead of importing them from the United States. So you see, we are correcting our problems.

No one should be pessimistic about the future of Canada. We have here the cheapest natural gas of any industrialized nation. We have lots of oil. We have some of the world's cheapest hydro-electric and nuclear power. We have large supplies of every known metal, including the largest known deposits of uranium and we have a fair share of the world's brainpower. So what do we lack? Our greatest surge forward economically must come in the fields of exports. We must have determination to bring this about. By close co-operation of government, industrial management, and labour, harmoniously working together for the best interests of all of us, we certainly can do this.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, in planning my remarks for this morning, I had hoped that I would be able to open them by offering my congratulations to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) whose riding, Haldimand-Norfolk, and mine are adjoining. But, such as I could, I find the best I can do is to congratulate him on his stamina, in presenting such a long and rather boring address, and along these lines I would like to say that I was interested to read in the press report for that particular afternoon that one of the observant hon. gentlemen off to my right noticed that in the House only the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and the former Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) were paying much attention to the address, and they had copies of the budget in their hands. I would with great respect, suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer and to the Liberal man in our midst who will be the Provincial Treasurer next year, that when the next budget is offered, surely it would be of great service to all the members of the House if a copy of it could be placed in the hands of the hon. members, before or just as it begins to be presented, so that all hon. members can follow it with some reasonable ease, and makes notes as they go along. This even occurred to me yesterday during the hon. Prime Minister's statement on the new grant system that will be instituted for education in this province next year. It would have been a great convenience, if we could have followed along as he read this important statement.

Now, I would say sir, that this is only the second budget address that I have heard, the second budget to date, that I have had the honour to take part in. But, it seems to me that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has taken upon himself a job that is unnecessarily large, when he feels that he must speak the piece of each individual Minister as he goes through the budget itself. He treated us to quite an extensive lecture on the good work that was being done in The Department of Education, good work that was being done in The Department of Reform Institutions; and so it went, department by department.

Now this would have been very much in order in the days when my good hon. friend from Grey South (Mr. Oliver) tells me the estimates were presented without a long speech to begin with by the appropriate Minister. Now we, who are sometimes accused of extending the estimates, are in a position where we have to listen to a double blurb of the work of each department. First from the hon. Provincial Treasurer himself and then, of course, by the individual Ministers themselves.

Certainly it would be of great service in the future if the budget could be presented in a much briefer and more concise form, probably on a page or two of paper so that every person has it before him. The hon. Provincial Treasurer can go over the figures outlining the proposed expenditure for each department without any detail, showing how the money is going to be raised, where they expect, in the coming year, the money to come from, and outlining any tax changes that there would be.

I would think that such a concise outline could be presented in a much shorter time and with much greater interest in this House, and it would be followed much more closely.

Mr. Speaker, there are about four items that have importance in my mind, as a representative from the riding of Brant, that do not fit conveniently into any of the estimates that I expect will be presented or have been presented. I would like to draw them to the attention of the House at this time.

The first has to do with Indian affairs. This has already been expressed in some of the estimates, very notably by my hon. friend, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), with whom I most heartily agreed. We have read in the press in recent days that some of our very well thought of legislators—in the case I am referring to, Senator Croll himself, an hon. member from my party

and a very well respected citizen—had some comments to make about the future of the Indians in this province.

Now I, of course, can speak only for my friends from the Six Nations reserve in Brant riding. I would like to remind the hon. members of this House that they occupy a very special position in this country. They are not wards of the Crown, they are allies of the Crown. As one of their members pointed out in the press just a day or two ago, there is a very serious question as to whether this country would exist as a separate nation if it were not for their help in the troublesome days of 1812 and shortly thereafter. They deserve our great respect and co-operation and certainly as their member in this House, I would never be a part of any plan that would tend to "lead them by the hand" to do anything, because this attitude of paternalism is certainly out of date now, if it ever had any real application at all.

These are our friends and allies, and in no sense second-rate citizens. They do not, really, regard themselves as citizens at all. They live on the Six Nations Indian Reserve, and they are very proud of their accomplishments there.

So certainly it is our responsibility in this Legislature, and I feel also that it is the responsibility of the Parliament of Canada, not to dictate to these people but to find out what they wish themselves and to co-operate in every way with the elected councils, where they exist on the reserves, and to give them the most help and co-operation that is possible.

As far as Indian affairs themselves are concerned, there are two specific problems that probably have more to do with this government in Ontario than anywhere else. I would like to bring them to the attention of the House at this time.

The city of Brantford has at its heart a very valuable piece of real estate called the market square and the old, historic city hall is situated on this land. It, like all the rest of the land in Brant county, originally belonged to the Indians. But as the city developed it was obvious that they needed land for a market and the Indians, in their generosity, wanted to give land for this purpose.

The regulations at that time, and I believe they still exist, prohibited the Indians from selling their land or even giving it away directly. It was the method, in those days

before Confederation, for the Indians, if they wished to dispose of their land, and they disposed of a great deal of it, to first sell it to the Crown or deed it to the Crown, which then disposed of it to the final owner.

I understand—and I would appreciate if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) could give me his attention for a moment in this regard—that years ago the land that is presently in use as the market square in the city of Brantford was deeded by the Indians to the province of Upper Canada and it was then conveyed by the Attorney-General as was the legal practice, to the city of Brantford with a proviso that it be used as a market.

The citizens of Brantford now propose to dispose of this land in a private sale, at least this is under consideration. The Indians feel it was given only for use as a market and if it were to be sold they should certainly have something to say, perhaps about the sale or certainly to share in the monies that come from the sale.

I would ask the hon. Attorney-General if he would examine any responsibilities that the province may have in this regard as actually being part of the original transaction. I believe the deed contains the proviso, put on it by the then Attorney-General of Upper Canada, having to do with the land to be used only as a market.

There is another problem having to do with the Indians in my riding which I feel comes under the hon. Attorney-General's department. I am sure he has some knowledge of this and is no doubt having it investigated.

It has come to my attention, as the representative for the area, that the solemnization of marriage on the reserve is running into some legal difficulties.

Now this has cropped up before in that I believe this Legislature granted the right to certain representatives of the long house religion to perform legal marriages on the Indian reserve. Of course ordained ministers of the Christian missions on the reserves can also perform this ceremony legally and do so. But apparently, and unfortunately, there are quite a large number of the citizens on the reserve who are not members of the long house religion, nor are they Christians and it is necessary for them to be married in some sort of a civil ceremony that would be available only in Brantford.

Unfortunately, the magistrate there is not familiar with the customs and procedures that sometimes prevail on the reserve. The local Christian ministers have brought to

my attention, as the member for the area, that many of the marriages are not properly performed and not properly registered and in this the offspring of the marriage are not properly registered and there are obvious difficulties. They are appealing to the government to set some method whereby the local justice of the peace, who himself is an Indian and a respected citizen of the area and knows the people concerned, would be given the authority to perform this ceremony.

I certainly hope that the government and the hon. Attorney-General are looking into the matter carefully and anything I can do to assist in the investigation I would be most pleased to do.

Mr. Speaker, the next item that I wish to deal with does not fit in very smoothly, but as in the case of the previous speaker (Mr. Sutton) I will take this opportunity to wander a bit.

As a new member I have had the opportunity to take part in the business of this House for a year and to receive the emoluments that have to do with the business here for somewhat over a year, although of course my indemnity is not payable until March 31. Naturally, we receive our expenses at the rate of \$150 a month if we request it. It is a sort of status symbol, I suppose, not to have to request it, but I have had to do this.

More than that, it seems to me that when our indemnity is paid in a lump sum at the end of the year this works an undue hardship on the small number of us who are members in this House who really depend on this money to carry on the expenses of our family, and for us to have to request special permission to receive some of this money in advance is in a sense an insult.

It is not that we feel there is anything wrong with the procedure but it would be a great convenience if our indemnity and expenses were paid monthly. I would strongly urge the appropriate Minister, or I suppose the hon. Prime Minister himself, to give this some consideration. We are not starving, but only because our bankers at home are very trusting men—and I hope that they will continue to be so.

I have two or three comments to make, Mr. Speaker, regarding The Election Act and the procedures in the election. There is some indication that before June of 1964 we will be going through this mill again, and I would appreciate it if I could hear some comment from the people concerned in this—they are not very far-reaching suggestions but, I think, suggestions that might be of some use.

We, of course, are delighted with the introduction of The Redistribution Act, but speaking as a member for a constituency that is half rural and half urban with well over 30,000 electors—it is not in any way a pocket borough, it is smaller than the York constituencies but considerably larger than some other Toronto constituencies, I feel that it is very unfortunate that the redistribution was not a complete redistribution, extending over the whole province. Certainly, with the seats that are being added here in Toronto, it is going to upset the historic balance of representation in this House.

I am certainly not going to say that the historic balance must be maintained indefinitely, but it should not be upset in such a haphazard way whereby the seats are added in an urban area only because there does not seem to be time to do it elsewhere. I am all in favour of The Redistribution Act as it is presently presented and that these seats should be set up for the coming election, but I say it is most unfortunate that the redistribution could not have been carried out over the whole province before the election that is perhaps in the offing.

As far as the election procedure itself is concerned, it has struck me that in my own riding of Brant there are, on every election day, a growing number of electors who unfortunately find themselves in hospitals and are therefore unable to vote and take part in the election. It seems to me that a procedure might be set up, perhaps during the time of the advance poll, where a vote may be taken of the people who are in the hospitals on some sort of a very convenient basis.

I can picture the poll mounted on wheels and being taken from ward to ward. I do not know whether this would be practical or not but perhaps the sanctity that surrounds the polling booth itself is maybe a little archaic in this day and age. Our job is to determine the will of the people, and if we can enfranchise these unfortunate people who are in the hospitals at the time of the election I feel that we should do so.

I can see that here in Toronto, where a large hospital would have people in it from 10 or 12 or 14 different ridings, this would be difficult to do; but in Brantford there would be one or, at most, two ridings represented and probably 800 to 1,000 people concerned. I think we should examine this very carefully.

I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that the custom that is growing up once again in this province,

to have a confrontation on a public platform among or between the candidates themselves, is an excellent trend. I do regret, however, that sometimes this is under the auspices of an organization which might possibly be thought to have some political bias.

In my own riding of Brant, this confrontation, if I can call it that, has in the past been arranged by the local labour council. They have done this very ably and I would not for a moment suggest that they do have a political bias. As a matter of fact I believe they would have a Liberal bias, if anything, in that area, from the way they vote.

I do feel that if the returning officer in each riding were instructed to receive the formal nominations of each candidate, perhaps from the candidate himself, in a public hall that would be hired for this purpose and well advertised, and the candidates would be expected to present themselves on nomination day and subject themselves to questions perhaps through an impartial chairman, that this would have a very important effect in raising the interest in the local area and giving every elector an opportunity to question the candidates concerned.

This might not be popular with all candidates, but I do feel that if this facility were made available there would be no thought that the meeting whereby all candidates, three or four or however many there might be, would have any bias as to its arrangements.

Lastly, I would like to suggest, sir, that, when the officials who are charged with actually taking the vote on election day are appointed, there might be some consultation, not only with the representative of the party in power in that particular area, but with the bona-fide candidates of all parties. Certainly the deputies would be appointed by the returning officer of the riding and perhaps on the recommendation of the representative of the government party. But surely it would be an addition to the fair play of the procedure if the returning officer would accept a recommendation of the Opposition parties when he comes to appoint the poll clerk and the constable in the case of a third party being represented in the riding.

In this way it would be assured that all candidates would be properly represented in the poll, not that these election officials would be there primarily as party representatives, but certainly they would be there to

see that fair play was accomplished at all times.

It has come to my attention that in some of the polling subdivisions in some of the ridings not all of the candidates are able to find people who are loyal enough to the party to take a full day to represent the party and be present at the count. I feel that fairness could be assured if the returning officer were instructed to appoint the officials in the poll on this basis. Certainly their duties are carefully outlined in The Election Act; they would certainly be able to co-operate in the performance of these duties, and in so doing ensure fair play as I have already suggested.

Lastly, I would like to echo the sentiments that have been already stated in this House, that the government should appoint permanent returning officers for the provincial elections in this province for a number of reasons; certainly so that the ridings can be kept up to date as far as the polling divisions themselves are concerned, but more important than that, so that when the three-month waiting period has elapsed following a riding becoming vacant, the writ would be issued automatically and a by-election held.

Certainly I, as the representative for Brant, have no complaints specifically in this regard, because when the riding became vacant following the death of my father, about three months elapsed, the campaign was all over, and a new representative had been elected. But when we look at the examples that are presently before us, particularly in Sault Ste. Marie, almost six months has elapsed and there is no call yet; there is every indication that there will not be a call for a by-election because there is a feeling that sometime within the next 18 months, there will be a general election.

This is particularly unfortunate in the case of Sault Ste. Marie, because there are problems in that constituency that are pressing at this time, and there is no one in this Legislature to speak for the constituency. I am going to be brash enough to take on this responsibility myself. I lived and worked in the riding for two years as a teacher in the collegiate; I was married in that community and I have many friends still there. Some of the problems have been very forcibly brought to my attention, and I would like, sir, at this time, to bring them to the attention of this House.

There are six of them. I will not dwell on them, but simply itemize them at this time.

Those of you who know the city realize that the Canadian Pacific Railway has quite an extensive marshalling yard and track which run right into the centre; they actually bisect the city, making it very inconvenient for the many highway crossings. One of the urgent needs there is either that the track be re-located, or that money be found to build underpasses, so that this growing city will be freed from this inconvenience, and this provincial government must certainly have a part in this. It has also become apparent that the waterfront along the St. Mary's River is urgently in need of re-development, and much of the real estate and docking facilities presently there, are actually owned by this government and they once again would be directly involved in this problem. The city of Sault Ste. Marie, like every other city through the province, has expanded and extended up into the surrounding townships, and amalgamation is becoming a very pressing problem, and something that must be dealt with in the very near future if the city is going to expand with any order at all.

I think also of the court facilities there, particularly for the juvenile and family courts; Judge Carter has found these facilities to be inadequate. Something should certainly be done about improving them in the near future. I was surprised to learn that this important city is not served by a health unit and this is certainly something to be desired; there is no member here to urge it on the government, and speak for those people. The same is true of the fact that this important area does not have a conservation authority, and this, too, is an urgent requirement that should be discussed in this House, and acted upon in the very near future.

Well, sir, I must admit that my knowledge of these difficulties is not firsthand, but from talking to my friends from the area, and more directly from reading a column in the *Sault Daily Star* of February 4, 1963, by Mr. Joe O'Hara, who wrote the column entitled, "Member at Queen's Park urgently needed", in which he itemized many of these difficulties in that area. So, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to bring to your attention, a letter that was written to the *Sault Ste. Marie Daily Star*, four days after the column was put in the paper, and it was signed by Mr. Patrick S. Fitzgerald, secretary of the Northern Ontario Progressive-Conservative Association. Now, this letter was written in answer to the column of Mr. O'Hara and I would like to bring to your attention certain parts of the letter that I feel are of concern to all hon. members in

the Legislature. This is to the editor, *Sault Daily Star*:

In the issue of the *Sault Daily Star* for Monday last, I found an article by Joe O'Hara, entitled "Member for Queen's Park urgently needed". Mr. O'Hara states that Sault Ste. Marie urgently needs an authoritative voice in the provincial Legislature, drawing attention to the fact that there has been no by-election since the death of the late Harry Lyons. It is also stated in that article that Premier John Robarts could be too busy with other things to call a by-election here.

Mr. O'Hara goes on to say that the Sault has had no representation at Queen's Park since the death of Mr. Lyons, and concluded his article by saying that the city finds itself an orphan.

Now I am quoting from the letter of Mr. Fitzgerald, the secretary of the Conservative association in that area:

In October of this year, the president, secretary and others conferred with the Premier. At that time many matters, including several of those mentioned in Mr. O'Hara's article, were discussed. These include the decision to be taken concerning whether or not a by-election is indicated—

Apparently this is left to the decision of the local association.

Certainly no one will quarrel with the tremendous achievement of Mr. Lyons in his lifetime, particularly in those matters where he had been able to make direct representations to the government in seeking all things that are desirable for this riding. What Mr. Lyons was able to do was to bring the fact before the appropriate department of the government so that sensible and beneficial action could be taken. This continues to be done, as it has always been by the association and its officers. Perhaps, if it has accomplished nothing else, Mr. O'Hara's article gives me the opportunity to say publicly that anyone, regardless of party, who has a problem concerning the provincial government, and who wishes representations made on his behalf, may seek and will receive from the officers of the Progressive-Conservative association all the assistance that may be required.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether my small ability in speaking can indicate to you my disgust and horror at the words of this letter. It was no doubt written with very good intentions, but the fact that the Progressive-Conservative party who have a tin-pot Tory party organization up there, could

represent the people of this important and historic riding in this Legislature—I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the letter is in contempt, certainly of the citizens of the area and of this Legislature itself. I further feel that it displays a sickness in the Conservative party that is certainly going to lead the citizens of that enlightened area to give up the party in the coming by-election or election. That is another nail in the coffin of this party that is going down to defeat.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Cowling moves the adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Ninth order, House in committee of supply, Mr. W. E. Johnston in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 216:

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, did the hon. Attorney-General make any statement with respect to the policy of the government about titles here in Ontario? Do you intend to extend the land titles? Do you intend to make any renovation in conjunction with the method of registration in the southern part of Ontario or do you intend only to continue those areas of land titles that are currently under the land title system?

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Well, Mr. Chairman, most certainly it is government policy to continue those areas now under the land titles system, and there is legislation on the books, legislation passed by this House, which provides for the extension of this system, and the extension is taking place in a reasonable and proper manner. At the present time under The Land Titles Act, all the districts are operating and seven counties, York, Carleton, Elgin, Ontario, Lincoln, Halton and the united counties of Prescott and Russell. To indicate that the extension is continuing, I may say that Welland county and the city of Welland have passed the necessary by-law to extend the system and it is now being processed and we believe, Mr. Chairman, that over a period of time it is quite possible that the land titles or Torrens system will be extended throughout a great deal more of southern Ontario.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Well, Mr. Chairman, surely that is not the point. I think what our hon. leader was getting at was the fact of bringing into land titles the tremendous number of properties that are still in the registry offices. Setting up a land titles office for new registrations does not solve this very serious problem and make the task of purchasing real estate any simpler or any cheaper for those people who have to do it. What we would like to hear is whether or not any real steps are being taken to get properties out of the registry offices and into land titles offices.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I think I have answered this with my previous remarks. The machinery for doing this is there and most certainly it is progressing, at perhaps what the hon. member thinks is a slow rate, but it is progressing.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the machinery is there, it can be used by individuals. But it is expensive, it is cumbersome and it is awkward. We want to know if the government is doing anything to speed it up, to get property out of the registry office system, out of the old system—the expensive system, the cumbersome system—and into the land titles system, which is the logical way to do it.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I fully understand what the hon. member wishes me to say. He wishes me to say, I am sure, that we are going to force all the registry offices—

Mr. Singer: I wish the hon. Minister would say what his policy is.

Hon. Mr. Cass: —that we are going to force all the registry offices out of the picture and holus-bolus impose the land titles system. Mr. Chairman, anyone, including the hon. member for York Centre, knows that this is something quite impossible to do.

In the first instance practically, because there is neither the equipment nor the staff available; and second it has not been the policy of this government to force these things on people unless we are prepared to carry it out and make it successful.

That is exactly what we are doing. We have the legislation for that and as the machinery becomes available we are placing lands in southern Ontario under The Land Titles Act, not only new registrations but also in whole areas.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, have we got a new system of local autonomy of registry offices? We have heard about local autonomy

in municipalities and boards of education; and now we have a new one: a local autonomy of registry offices.

I do not think the public is going to be really unhappy if the local autonomy is taken away from registry offices, if a simpler method is set up to determine titles. I do not think that the people who are working in the registry offices are going to be thrown out of jobs because they will have jobs in the land titles office. So really, what or who is the hon. Minister protecting when he says he does not want to force anybody to do anything? He would be providing a public service if there was government leadership in this field.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, what I would like to know is: How many registry office systems or part thereof have been changed to land titles in the course of the past 12 months?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, and I will get advice on it, but as far as I know there have not been any changes from registry office to land titles in the past 12 months. The county and city of Welland are the ones that are in the process of being changed.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I must advise the hon. Attorney-General we are not trying to unnecessarily pressure him for a statement here at all, but I think there are many of us on this side of House who feel that as a matter of government policy this trend should be encouraged rather than simply be permitted to develop of its own initiative. We do not expect and we know that you cannot transfer from the registry office system to the land titles overnight. There would be chaos.

On the other hand, the determination, it seems to me, of government has to be simply this: first, to determine whether or not you are going to encourage the process; and if so, how. Now it can be governmental intervention, assistance; it can be done likewise by encouraging land title companies or at least—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Title insurance?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Yes, that type of thing!

All we are asking, sir, is that the hon. Minister express the point of view of the government in this respect. I think it is a very legitimate question that we are asking.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I thought that I had expressed the point of view of

the government in this respect and that is that most certainly we have encouraged it. Our Director of Titles has provided a great deal of publicity on his own part in various areas of the province, and if I may say so, selling the idea to local county councils who are interested in their registry offices and who will be interested in the land titles offices.

The great difficulty, of course, Mr. Chairman, as is understood and has been said by the hon. leader of the Opposition, is the practical difficulty of transferring thousands of titles in any registry office from one system to another. Most certainly the government encourages this and some steps have been taken, as I pointed out.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 216 agreed to.

On vote 217:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It might be said, Mr. Chairman, apropos of all this discussion, in a lot of ways a lot of people feel that it does not matter whether it is the land titles system or the registry system, because by the interpretation of the courts—

Mr. Chairman: Is the member still on 216 or the Director of Titles?

Mr. Sopha: He is the same person. The land titles system is being interpreted as if it is the registry system, particularly with respect to the matter of notice.

It used to be felt—or I submit it was felt, I was taught this at law school—that when the Torrens system was introduced from Australia where it originated that the manifest genius of the system was that whatever the state of the title appeared to be on the register at the land titles office that was binding upon all people. All you had to do was go and look at the state of the title and you could determine from that page or pages just what the situation was with respect to the title and you took your title subject to what was written on the register.

In other words, that was constructive and legal notice to all persons, to the whole world, and anyone affected by that title. As the matters got into the courts, the courts more and more have been interpreting that with the infiltration of the doctrine of constructive notice, very surprising to me.

I will just cite one illustration: there was a case came up in Timmins that fell to be interpreted by the county judge of Cochrane and, lo and behold, the county judge at Cochrane was the former master of titles himself. He had been promoted from local

master of titles to county judge. You would think having a person with that background he would rigidly adhere to the original philosophy of the Torrens system. But in this case it was a sale of a downtown property in Timmins and an office building, I believe, in which a group of Chinese people operated the restaurant. The purchaser bought, then subsequently he wanted to give notice to these restaurant keepers that they would have to vacate and they said; "Oh, no! You don't give us any such notice. We have a seven-year lease."

Now I may not be accurate in the number of years, but they said: "We have a lease here." They then produced a document to him and they said: "There is our lease that gives us the right to occupy these premises." The Land Titles Act provides that in order for a lease to be valid, notice of the lease shall be registered upon the title, you see. To go back to what I said earlier, that if the register, the state of the title, is going to be the governing factor, then a person, the purchaser, has to go and he has to look to see if that lease is registered.

Along came the judge, the former master of titles and his decision in effect was this: that when the person bought the business, he saw the restaurant operating there as he looked it over, looked over the premises he was buying and he was put on his notice, he was put on his inquiry as to whether these people had a lease or not. Because he defaulted, he did not go and inquire about the lease, he had to take the premises subject to the lease.

That is a far cry from the original intention of the Torrens system which was adopted into Ontario about 1895.

So I say, I start back where I began, that it is getting so it does not matter whether you call it the registry system or the land titles system, it is still being interpreted the same way.

It is just that the land titles system is in many respects a lot handier.

Of course the hon. Attorney-General is a person who has many advisers. He has many departments, sub-departments of his department, and that is testified by the fact that we have 26 votes in this department. His advisers no doubt advise him and his predecessors on what legislation they want from time to time. A good example, I suspect, of legislation that was requested by a sub-department of his department is to be found in The Boundaries Act, a statute that was passed by this Legislature in the spring session of 1959.

I want to take the trouble, or take the time of the House, to draw attention to what I conceive to be an injustice that is created by The Boundaries Act. Let me approach it this way.

Under The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, suppose I go and build a house by mistake on somebody else's land. Supposing a purchaser goes and buys from a subdivision promoter a lot, lot number 26 let us say, and it is marked out, the peg or stake in front of it is number 26. Then he takes his wife along and they say "We will put the house right here, dear, with the dormer windows facing on the south." She says that that is fine; and they proceed to build it under the supposition it is on lot number 26.

Let us suppose that the real estate man, by some error, has put the number 26 on lot number 27, and what he has really started to build on is not the land registered in his name at all but is, by error, another lot. Now that person may, under The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, make an application to a judge of the High Court and, under the doctrine of mistake, the judge of the High Court may make such order in the circumstances as may seem just to him. He may make such award of compensation as will equitably dispose of the matter. Now, mark you, that is an application to a judge of the High Court.

Then again, under The Land Titles Act, if some error in a registered plan becomes apparent, or it is desired to make an amendment to a registered plan or even to remove a registered plan that is on the title; if a dispute arises in that connection the parties or any person affected may again make an application to a judge. The judge may dispose of the application as what to him seems to be just, and he may make an award for compensation and costs in his disposition of the matter.

That's two examples of rectifying things that are in error in respect of land. But, under The Boundaries Act, and very significantly The Boundaries Act, in section 2 it says: "This Act shall be administered by the director"—and the "director" is defined in the interpretations section as, "The director of titles appointed under The Land Titles Act." He is, in fact, the very same person for whom we are voting \$86,000—so that to me, section 2, when it says The Boundaries Act shall be administered by the director, means this little statute here is the preserve of the director. It is his statute.

Then under this Act an application may be made to the director to have the boundaries of a parcel that were established by a survey confirmed under this Act. You see, if there is a dispute or any doubt about the boundaries of a parcel that were established by a survey, an application may be made to a director to have them confirmed.

Or where there is an error that appears as to the accuracy of a survey, or a plan, or a parcel, or as to the true location of a parcel's boundaries, an application may be made to the director to have the dispute resolved, to have the error eliminated; or where a difference exists or is thought to exist between the occupational boundaries of a parcel and the boundaries as shown on a registered plan of subdivision. And in some other circumstances, an application may be made to the director.

Let me give you the set of circumstances that I ran across. After the director had held a hearing in a certain case and after the director had rendered his decision, I became aware of the circumstances because, in my political capacity, this man who was not a constituent of mine but came from the neighbouring constituency of the Nickel Belt, for which I am now the quasi-member—it being vacant—to me and revealed this set of facts.

He had bought a part of a township lot which had been laid out a long time ago, I think it was 1917 or so, by The Department of Lands and Forests. The Department of Lands and Forests, which administered The Public Lands Act, had given a patent from the Crown to some predecessor in title. The Department of Lands and Forests presumably had laid out the whole township—a six-mile township, I believe it was, which means there are six concessions and, well I would not dare to guess, I think it is 12 lots in a township. They had laid it out 36 square miles, and it is an easy thing to do.

He had got part of a township lot and there he had resided for more than 20 years, in quiet enjoyment, and he assumed that his boundaries were located at such-and-such a place. Nobody interfered with his possession until The Department of Highways came along; they were relocating Highway No. 17. When they relocated the highway they registered a plan of expropriation, of course. Immediately the question of compensation arose—if The Department of Highways was going to build a highway, then somebody is

going to get paid. If they cross somebody's land, he is entitled to compensation. So immediately the problem, the question, of compensation arose.

This man, I suppose, looked out his farm house window and he said, "The Department of Highways don't give you any notice, you know. That department goes and registers the plan first." He said, "They are building a highway across my property and now I guess they will have to pay me some money."

All right. He soon learned that his boundary or his corner post was not where he assumed it to be; he discovered that his neighbours to the south, three of those neighbours, were located on that part of the township lot which his title—his certificate of ownership by reason of an original grant from the Crown—awarded to him. In fact he discovered that the three people, in his estimation, at that point were trespassers upon his lands.

When it came to the question of who The Department of Highways was going to pay, of course these three people, little more than squatters, immediately asserted their rights to the compensation.

Somebody, I think it was the squatters—I am not sure about that, it might have been this man who came to see me—made an application to the director of titles under The Boundaries Act, and the director of titles journeyed to Sudbury to hear the case. Under that statute my first point is this: Here the director of titles was confronted with a question of ownership of the land. It was a struggle between the three squatters and the person with the registered title as to who actually owned the land. My submission is that the province of Ontario can never appoint any official to hear a question of ownership. That is the peculiar preserve of the courts of law, the function of a judge, and a judge only, and the province cannot appoint any person who acts in a judicial capacity to determine ownership. I will get around to that a little bit later.

The director of titles, in his hearing, heard evidence from all sides. The man who came to see me was represented by counsel and evidence was adduced of a line run by a surveyor in 1917, I believe it was—and every surveyor in Sudbury has been involved in this case, just about every surveying firm since 1918. This was a line drawn by a surveyor by the name of Stull. Well, up until now, I have talked to every surveyor that was involved and none of them, from looking

at the field notes, could determine why D.S. was running the line, who engaged him, or anything about the purpose of why this line was run in 1918.

He might have been out hunting moose, or deer I suppose, and wanted to get back from his place of beginning. Maybe he blazed a little trail to assist him, as surveyors are wont to do. The line that Stull blazed, in any event, did not go right across the whole of the township lot, it went only part way. So, in the result, after holding the hearing, the director of titles, removed the line from the township from the corner of the township lot, and some 400 feet to the north, and he awarded to these people what in effect was a possessory title because they had no document to produce to the director and say, "Here is an original; we traced our title back to the grant from the Crown," which is always the case in the land titles system. The land originally came from the Crown. In effect, in his decision he awarded to them what was a possessory title. Now, I am the first to admit that these people, having lived there a goodly number of years, and I forget how long it was, that it would have been a real hardship—when one considers the sympathetic aspect of the case—to require those people to leave their land. However, in the broader picture, the man with the documents, who had the certificate of ownership, had got that in virtue of a grant from The Department of Lands and Forests. And notwithstanding the hardships to one person or another, I once again say that the genius of the land titles system, is the fact that the state of the register is the determining factor.

All right, the director of titles, in moving the line from 400 feet as he did to the north, he did in effect establish a possessory title, and a possessory title in my limited knowledge, is a vehicle, a phenomenon that is entirely foreign to The Land Titles Act. But, that is not the most important thing, the most important thing to draw to the attention of the hon. Attorney-General in relating this matter, is that under The Boundaries Act the director of titles, whom I submit is sitting as a judge, has no power to grant compensation. You see, I drew attention to The Land Titles Act previously, where an amendment to a plan is sought; I drew attention to The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, in each case where the application is made to a judge, in each case where the judge has power to award compensation to the parties as they seem just to him in the circumstances. But the director of titles can come along here under this Act and he can act as a judge,

exercise quasi-judicial powers, and cheerfully move the boundary from 400 feet, and rearrange the title to the property. But he has no power under the Act to award compensation to any person, you see. That is quite a departure from the principles of law as we know them, and quite a departure from The Land Titles Act on the one hand, and The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act on the other.

Finally, there is many a surveyor in this province who believes that The Boundaries Act as it was passed by this Legislature in 1959 was intended for the purpose that the director of titles would act under this statute where there were minor discrepancies, where there were minor matters of disagreement, such as a disagreement between two surveyors, about the location of a corner post, or about where a line should be drawn. The director of titles was given by this Legislature the power to be the arbiter and the referee in such dispute. There is many a surveyor who believes that under The Boundaries Act the director of titles has not got the right to come and hold a court, as it were—as he did in this case that I have cited—and determine between two conflicting interests, who shall have the ownership of the land. I have said before, and the courts have said it a good many times—the number of times the courts have said it is legend—that a person appointed by the province may not determine questions of law that are the peculiar right of determination by a judge appointed under section 57 of The British North America Act.

Now, what I really object to, is the use of these powers by the director of titles in setting himself up as a judge. In this case, taking away Kivi Maki's as he did and awarding it to the other three people, and in the result he said that "I shall make a plan, having awarded the land to the other three." He said, "I am the director of titles, I will make a plan of those parcels that belong to the other three." In the circumstances, I saw the man Kivi Maki about two years after the director of titles had made that order. There is the right of appeal. It is a very tenuous and ephemeral one. Within a period of 30 days, or something like that, an aggrieved person may appeal from the director of titles to a judge of the high court. With the greatest respect, that is not much of a right of appeal because if a person goes before a judge of the high court from an award by the director of titles, the judge of the high court is prone to say, "The director of titles heard the evidence, I did not, he is an expert in such matters, he made

the determination, and unless, Mr. Applicant, you can show me something on the face of the record where he is wrong, I will not interfere with it. I am not going to substitute my determination for that of the director of titles who was close to the situation."

I said to Kivi Maki: "Let us get the opinion of an expert in constitutional law and determine and find out whether something can be done about this award made by the director of titles." We sought the opinion, we sought the opinion of a man very able in that field, Mr. B. J. MacKinnon, of the firm of Wright and MacTaggart, an authority on constitutional law. Mr. MacKinnon in his opinion instructed me to tell Kivi Maki that the prospects of success might be about 50-50. The only way we could impeach the award was to impeach the power of the director of titles to make the award he did under the Act. We would have to attack the constitutional aspect of it. The expense would be great, because no doubt we would have to go to the court of appeal and then the hon. Attorney-General of Ontario might take us to the Supreme Court of Canada if we were successful, and the expense to the citizen Kivi Maki would be prohibitive.

Furthermore, said Mr. MacKinnon, two years have gone by now since this matter was determined. The court might feel that Mr. Kivi Maki, if he had any rights here, ought to have instituted some proceedings in the nature of an attack upon this Act at the time and it might be too late now.

To sum it all up, legislative counsel write these statutes. They have been attacked in the courts before, there will be a week of argument before the most learned judges that we have appointed in our system about the constitutional problems involved.

You would never know there were any problems in statutes to go to the private bills committee and see the way the bills go through that committee and the impatience with the suggestion that the wording might be a little bit more clear in that there is a latent ambiguity. It is great fodder for lawyers, you know, great fodder for lawyers. Many are the lawyers, many the lawyers, who have educated their family and put their sons through law school after them by reason of the draftsmanship of statutes. When they are impeached, the statutes of this Legislature are impeached, the argument is very lengthy, the pay is very high to the experts that impeach them and the courts

have to sometimes sit two or three or four days.

This, in my humble opinion, for what it is worth—the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) is more qualified in constitutional law than I, I think he got 59 per cent in the subject and I got 57 but he is not here to assist me—in my humble opinion this grant and exercise of power by the director of titles—because he is not a judge, he is not a judge, he is a provincially appointed official, he has no right—I say it is wrong because I say the director of titles has no right under any statute of this Legislature to determine a question of ownership, to say to Kivi Maki: You do not own that 400 feet; you—Tapper—and the two others, you do. I think that is wrong.

I think it is wrong for the province to give such power to a provincially appointed official. In my humble opinion, for whatever it is worth, sections 5 and 6 of that statute, since they were passed in the year of our Lord 1959, are unconstitutional and *ultra vires* of this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, before I attempt, in fewer words at least, to deal with the matter raised by the hon. member for Sudbury, I would like to advise the hon. leader of the Opposition that with respect to the Torrens system, the county of Lincoln is now starting the procedure, as I understand, to bring that county under the system, too. That, of course, is not being discouraged.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unacquainted with the matter concerning which the hon. member for Sudbury has spoken at such great length and so learnedly. Some years ago in another capacity, as the Minister in charge of highways, I, too, talked to this gentleman personally and I, too, have been aware of the situation for some time.

I would say this, sir, that with respect to The Boundaries Act, so far as my department is concerned, and my advisers, we do not accept the allegation or the opinion of the hon. member that it is *ultra vires*. But like any other citizen he certainly has the opportunity and the right to challenge this legislation in the courts and undoubtedly, as he has said, the Attorney-General of this province, through his legal officials and counsel, will then take such action as may be necessary to defend the actions of this House in the courts.

I would like to say, also, Mr. Chairman, that The Boundaries Act is an Act which merely provides, and I think anybody who

reads it carefully and has any experience will agree, provides for the confirmation of true boundaries, the true location, on the ground of boundaries which have been lost or which are in dispute. The re-establishment of this boundary line must be according to the best evidence that the nature of the case admits.

I would say, sir, that so far as I am concerned, the Act does not usurp the power of the court. In the first place all that happens is that a disputed boundary line or a lost one is re-established on the best available evidence. Second, I am advised, and I think there is some merit in it, the power to decide on the location of boundaries existed before Confederation. Certainly by the sections of The British North America Act these powers were passed on to and left with the provinces and actually The Surveys Act merely confirms powers which existed prior to Confederation.

Now, concerning the immediate case of Mr. Kivi Maki, I am advised, and I have some knowledge of it personally, sir, that what actually happened in the days gone by was that Mr. Maki, along with certain others, in 1918 did hire this surveyor mentioned by the hon. member. There was a survey made and boundary stones were placed. Mr. Kivi Maki at that time raised no question about whether the boundary line was in the proper place or not. Then over a period of time, namely in 1924, Mr. Kivi Maki further indicated his acquiescence in that boundary line by quitting claim to one Hearn of certain lands which lay without the line that had been established and to which he could have had some claim by patent or otherwise. But for the sum of \$1, in 1924, he did quit claim to one Hearn.

Then I am further advised, Mr. Chairman, that patent which obviously was in error, or the Crown grant, was made on the basis of the total overall area as discussed by the hon. member. In deciding where the land lay for patent purposes between the north and south halves, the authorities apparently made the error of not taking into account the case of *Williams v. Salter*, 1912, 23 OWR, page 34, which stated that non-navigable waters would not be included in calculating the area of lands being so divided. This being so, the patent which was given and registered, which forms the basis of Mr. Kivi Maki's claim, would of course not be proper.

If the director of titles had not looked into this matter under The Boundaries Act and The Surveys Act and all the other enabling Acts as he did in 1959, and if he

had not confirmed the boundary which was laid out in 1918 at the request of Kivi Maki and others by this surveyor, then what would happen would have been that this man Hearn to whom Mr. Kivi Maki himself had quitted claim lands for \$1 in 1924, would be deprived of his lands, being the lands which had actually been released to him by quit claim by Kivi Maki in 1924. It would have dispossessed a man by the name of Tapper, who was in the south half of the property, of improved lands which he had prior to this patent being issued in error. It would have ignored the original boundary which is still monumented, as I mentioned, fenced, and had the dividing road between the properties running along it.

Finally, it would have allowed the error in the description of the patent that I mentioned, due to non-compliance with the case of *Williams v. Salter*, to be perpetuated.

Two wrongs, Mr. Chairman, do not make a right.

I would say further that, as the hon. member for Sudbury has pointed out, Mr. Maki was represented by counsel on the hearing before the director of titles in 1959 and that, as everyone else has, he had a right of appeal. The period for appeal is 20 days, not 30, but 20 days is a longer period of appeal than to many courts and no appeal was taken.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say in this particular instance not only was the proper result arrived at by proper process of law, but that Mr. Maki by his acquiescence since 1918 in the survey—which he among others ordered and paid for, by Stull the surveyor—by his acquiescence in that, by his failure to appeal the decision of the director of titles in 1959, that he has lost those rights which he undoubtedly did have.

Mr. Chairman, I am in no position to discuss, and I do not think the House is in any position to discuss, the constitutional aspects or the reliance to be placed in the opinions of my advisors or of Mr. MacKinnon, mentioned by the hon. member for Sudbury. Those are matters of which the courts are seized when placed before them, those are matters which I think we must leave to the courts.

Mr. Sopha: A number of things ought to be said. One, Kivi Maki is a very old man. I would not guess how old he is, I think he is around 70 or past. He does not speak any English at all. He is a very old and feeble man and whenever Kivi Maki came to

see me he brought his daughter with him to interpret for him.

Second, it ought to be pointed out that almost universally every surveyor in Sudbury finds himself in opposition to what the director of titles did in this case. To a man, they are opposed.

Third, to my recollection, and I have not the documents before me, but I have read the decision of the director of titles in this case: (a) there is no reference to Kivi Maki requesting Stull to run the line in 1918.

(b) There is no reference in that decision to any quit claim deed between Maki and these people in 1924.

If these things are true, then they certainly were not elicited at the hearing. And if they are true, it indicates that there has been a rather tenacious investigation since I first interested myself in this case. Those things were not at the hearing; they are not in the director's decision. Perhaps it is a case that, because an apparent injustice is being aired on the floor of this Legislature which is the proper place to air it, there is a considerable amount of embarrassment about. Now the task is to fortify a bad decision, and an improper unconstitutional Act. That is my point of view.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might make just a few brief comments with respect to this matter of titles, and after the technical argument that has been presented in the House, I feel somewhat inadequate. Nevertheless, sir, I would like to make a plea to the hon. Attorney-General to hasten the day when this procedure can be perfected.

I realize there are problems; I realize that there is the problem of staff, getting the necessary personnel to complete this matter, and I would point out that in the long run the present outdated system is costing the citizens of this province many millions of dollars. Whether they pay to have this system corrected now, or continue to pay by being involved in considerable excess legal costs to obtain satisfaction and clear titles, to me does not seem to make too much difference, Mr. Chairman, they are going to have to pay in any event.

I think the money that could be expended at this time to hasten this changeover would in the long run be a savings to the people of the province, because whether they pay this money in legal fees or pay it in taxes, they are going to pay it in any event. The only thing that is happening, because of the

apparent snail's pace at which we are proceeding, is that excess money is being paid to legal firms to search titles under the registry office system.

I do not have any quarrel with the legal firms which do that. It is necessary that they be engaged because of the fact that we seem to be behind other jurisdictions. There are some jurisdictions to the south of us where it is possible to go to these land title offices and get title much quicker and much cheaper, and perhaps much more complete than it is in this province, so I merely say that I think a few dollars expended here quickly would in the long run result in a considerable saving to the taxpayers of this province and the property owners who are affected.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 217 agreed to.

On vote 218:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, 218, emergency measures, is a vote on which I have spoken each year that I have been in the House. I have put forward the very simple proposition before, and I will put it forward again this morning, that in my opinion the money we are about to vote, \$408,000, is protection for no one. We are paying lip service to something that we do not properly understand; that if there is any value in proceeding at all in emergency measures it should be done according to some sort of plan which will provide some sort of protection for the people of Ontario. Insofar as I have been able to ascertain there is no such plan.

Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge again today that unless the government is prepared to come forward with some sort of a plan for emergency measures, which will be a protection for the people of Ontario, this vote be reduced from \$408,000 to nothing. There is no point in going on year after year, spending these sums of money which in effect are just the same as opening the drain and dropping the dollar bills down; because nothing is being produced out of this expenditure of money for the people of Ontario. If there is any sense in emergency measures, if there is any intelligence behind providing a system of protection for the people of this province in the event of a disaster, whether nuclear disaster resulting from war or any other type of disaster, then it should be done properly. But it has not been done properly, it is not being done properly and there is nothing in these estimates to indicate that there is any change in the method of carrying it off.

A recent news story in one of the Toronto papers reads this way:

**SHELTER POLICY STILL LACKING,
EMO DECLARES**

A public fall-out shelter programme for Metropolitan Toronto has suffered from a lack of national policy, Metro civil defence director John Pollard said yesterday. Inquiries made by the Metro emergency measures organization have been unable to produce with any clarity from the federal government on a public shelter programme, Mr. Pollard told the Metro EMO committee yesterday.

Former Defence Minister Harkness supported the shelter programme, but no direction was ever forthcoming, said Mr. Pollard. He said Metro could do nothing but continue with its programme of surveying public buildings for emergency use.

And here is a very fascinating reference in this article, Mr. Chairman:

Provincial EMO co-ordinator, Thomas Tyrell, said in view of the existing political situation in Ottawa, he could not comment on the lack of a national shelter policy.

Well, Thomas Tyrell is the gentleman who, at one time, was a deputy Minister. Subsequently he has become the provincial co-ordinator of EMO and if he is correctly quoted, Mr. Chairman, in this news article, what better condemnation could there be of an EMO programme in the province of Ontario?

Let me repeat what he said again:

Provincial EMO co-ordinator, Thomas Tyrell, said in view of the existing political situation in Ottawa, he would not comment on the lack of a national shelter policy.

Well, since he would not comment on the lack of a national shelter policy, perhaps this is the time that we could try to trace some sort of a pattern through EMO.

Several years ago, 1957 or 1958, we were talking about evacuation policies. And you may remember, Mr. Chairman, all of the people in Metropolitan Toronto, in the event of a disaster, were going to be evacuated to Bruce county. Then somebody began to concern themselves with how the mechanics of this were going to work, and perhaps realized that on a holiday weekend it is very difficult to get the people just up to their summer resorts, let alone to transport all of the million and a half people out of Metro into Bruce county and provide food and clothing, so that sort of went by the board.

Then we switched from evacuation to shelter programmes, and got lovely pamphlets and brochures and blueprints. "Build your own home shelter". That was the great kick at the moment. Everybody made speeches about how nice it would be to build shelters. There were new companies set up which announced, "We will build your shelter for you." Various politicians got onto television and into the newspapers and said, "Build your shelters and protect yourself".

Then people began to scratch their heads again, and say, "Well, this is a very fascinating approach; what are we going to do about school and office buildings or places where there are no shelters available? Is there any public shelter programme?"

Then we waited. We tried to get an answer in this House; we tried to get an answer from Ottawa. Somebody, the gentleman who wrote this newspaper article, went to Mr. Tyrell and he said that in view of the existing political situation he could not comment on the lack of a national shelter policy. So, Mr. Chairman, very briefly—I do not intend to speak at any great length on emergency measures—I ask the government: Is there any programme? If there is, what is it? And does it make any sense? Certainly, as far as I have been able to figure out, there is no programme; there is no sense in what we have been doing; and the money that is being voted for today is a complete, thorough and utter waste of time and effort.

There was one more thing. Somewhere along the line I think there was a shelter constructed up in Camp Borden for the benefit of the provincial Cabinet. There was a rehearsal one day; I do not think all the hon. Ministers went there, but some of them did—six of them, six out of the 22. We were trying to find out how the hon. Ministers were going to be able to get from Queen's Park up to Camp Borden in time to be safe, since the warning was only going to be three or four minutes. We did not get an answer on that in previous years; perhaps the hon. Attorney-General has an answer now? Mr. Chairman, the time has come to remove the sham and nonsense from this programme. If there is any point let us hear, in brave words, what the policy is. If there is not, let the government have the courage to take the estimate out of the programme.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): I am interested in the programme of the EMO. I

think it is because of the lack of leadership in the federal and provincial governments that the people seem to be quite unconcerned about it. I do think that perhaps, if this organization was built up, it may be of some service in times of national emergency, as floods, hurricanes, earthquakes or fire.

But the amount of money we are putting into this organization I think is money down the drain. For the fiscal year ending 1962, we spent about \$258,000, roughly about five cents per capita, five cents for every person in the province of Ontario. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member for York Centre, that if we are going to build up the organization, fine, but if this is all we intend to do, then I think we should throw it out.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I realize the background for the observations and questions of the hon. members, and I will say that the hon. members of the government, and particularly myself, are equally concerned with them, with respect to the necessity, the adequacy and the type of planning and work that should be done with respect to the survival of the people of the province of Ontario should there be, which God forbid, a nuclear war.

When we consider the confusion, Mr. Chairman, on the international scene, with which we are all familiar today, with respect to what should be done at that level, and what is likely to be the type of attack and how it is likely to come, one can readily understand why those at the municipal, provincial and even federal levels very often find themselves frustrated and the public very much in the dark about what if anything is being done.

It is with that background that we must consider what has been done in the province of Ontario with respect to Emergency Measures Operations. I would say to the hon. member for Oshawa that the figures that he quoted are the Ontario expenditures, being 25 per cent of the total expenditures. So that actually the total programme in Ontario is somewhere around \$1 million, in the year that he mentioned, actually \$1,375,000 in that year, but that is merely a point in passing.

I next would like to say to the hon. member for York Centre, that while Mr. Tyrell, who was quoted by him and quoted in the paper, may himself consider he was misquoted, I would merely say that the quotation may be

quite correct because it refers not to the emergency measures or survival operations programme of the federal or provincial people; the statement quoted refers to the so-called shelter programme, and I suspect that perhaps the statement in that respect was a reasonable one under the circumstances. Now, the policy of the Ontario government with respect to Emergency Measures Organization is one which is very difficult to determine and define. The policy of course, must be based on the considerations I mentioned earlier, not just local or federal but international. Within the scope of what we know and what we are told from those levels of government and international government, we must make the best plans possible for our people; we must give the widest publicity not only to the plans but the problems which are to be met under certain circumstances, by all of us. Many of us would not survive long enough to worry about whether there was a plan or not, but we must have everyone aware of not only the plan but of the problem.

So there are about three main stages that we give consideration to, and to which we must give consideration at provincial level, and one is public information, as I have mentioned. We must be sure that the public—that is you and I in our personal capacities, and our friends and families and constituents—realize what the problem is, realize what the danger is, and then are told as far as possible what their own personal role is, what their community role is, and what they may expect from the municipal, provincial and federal governments, in the case of emergency.

Towards that end there has been a great deal of work along the public information line. My people from the organization have been all across Ontario, and are continually across Ontario and to the service clubs and other organizations, attending meetings of the municipal county organizations, and trying to bring to everyone the realization of the problem and the difficulties of leaving that problem when you do not know exactly what you have to meet.

Secondly, there is a survival plan, which has been made out first of all for the government. It does not really provide for a shelter in Borden, as the hon. member for York Centre said, for government people. There is in that area a shelter which is the headquarters for many other organizations and the Ontario government, and in it we take our

proper place as part of the organization to look after this country and this province should the unfortunate or tragic or deadly event happen. I will agree—having been one of the Cabinet Ministers who had to leave Toronto and get to Borden while alarms and excursions were on—I would agree that that particular problem of taking a Minister or member of the government from here to Borden, after the alarm has sounded, poses a problem, and I can assure the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that the problem has not been solved but alternative arrangements have been made and there is a plan now which is about ready for implementation to provide not only for representation to be there at the time, but for regional representation of government and of the elected people throughout the whole of our various areas of Ontario.

Then we did talk, a moment ago, about the shelter programme and I did say and I believe that is true, that there is no national shelter policy or programme at the moment, but we in Ontario believe that a shelter is good not only in the home, but in public buildings and in other places. We have over a period of years endeavoured to encourage every citizen and every property owner to ensure that he does have for himself, his family, his tenants, his neighbours, a shelter that could withstand some of the known risks, but I am sure there are very few people who could have, and very few organizations or property owners who could have, the type of shelter which would provide security against not only a direct hit, but a hit within many miles of their particular shelter. So that again poses a problem.

Then, the survival plan that I mentioned—that provides for something else. It provides for the continuity of government, and I have mentioned it provides and makes designations of those officials—both in the government and representative of the people at the provincial level as well as in co-operation with municipalities and municipal officials—for them to be so arranged throughout the province that government can carry on even if it is in isolated areas for some considerable time after a nuclear attack.

In addition to that, in co-operation with the army, Mr. Chairman, under present arrangements and directions from the federal government, they would have under The War Measures Act, complete control of many of these things. In co-operation with the army and the federal authorities there have been great strides made in making plans for and training the militia as well as the regular groups on post-attack remedial action, either

rescue work or evacuation. All I can say now, Mr. Chairman, is this, that neither the federal authorities, the military authorities nor the provincial authorities have been wasting their time or the taxpayers' money. There have been many lessons learned, there have been many plans made and tried out and discarded, there have been exercises on the national level, on the provincial level, and many on the municipal and county level. We learn from them and so each time we are able to do better.

Then may I say we are very fortunate indeed that throughout the province of Ontario, Mr. Chairman, we have a great many experienced and devoted people who recognize their responsibility to their own families and to their own kin and to their neighbours, and who have volunteered and do serve very often under the county co-ordinator on civil defence. They have the same problem at our level that we have at the provincial level; that is, no one exactly knows what is going to be the situation if we do have a nuclear strike. All they can do is plan according to the best information they have, take the steps to train themselves and their workers in action to be taken if we do have that world tragedy.

I must say that they have made very great progress in many of the counties and municipalities of Ontario. There are, in many of them, very complete plans with respect to these matters. I have had the opportunity of attending but have not been able to get to several exercises which they have had. My information—which I hope to have firsthand before another year passes because I hope to have an opportunity to attend some of them—is that they are an enthusiastic group of people, that they are doing their best. But they suffer under the same frustrations, and the same difficulties, that every other level of government has.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there has been handed to me, and I think that it is a very fitting quotation, a quotation from Sir Winston Churchill made on March 1, 1955. He says this:

No city, no family, nor any honourable man or woman can repudiate this civil defence duty and accept from others help which they are not prepared to fit themselves to render in return. None must deny it as long as they live.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members of this House, that we have found the people of Ontario have accepted that particular challenge which was made to the world

by Sir Winston Churchill almost a decade ago. We have exceedingly good co-operation from the ordinary citizen, who seems to recognize in large measure the difficulties under which we all must work.

This is something which must be done; we must make provision, as is within our power, against the day of the unknown. This is being done. It is not costing a great deal of money as has been pointed out.

There is no use, Mr. Chairman, of this government, or the director of the Emergency Measures Organization, or myself asking this Legislature for money which we cannot usefully use, and which we cannot be sure can be put to the use for which it would be voted. The monies which we have asked for now are monies which fit in with what we anticipate will be the 75 per cent provided by the federal government and fit in with the plans which are made there. All our exercises, all our plans, sir, in order to share in the federal 75 per cent payment, must be in accordance with the regulations of the federal Emergency Measures Organization and must be approved by them.

I would like to say this: I have met them and I know many of them; they are a very sensible group of people in Ottawa who are administering this. They have regional administrators, and the one for Ontario in Toronto here is a man with whom we work exceedingly well and who has given us every co-operation within his power and within the limits of his authority and direction.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say this: This is a very difficult matter to discuss in the manner which will produce exactitude. Exactitude is almost impossible because we start out with something about which we cannot be exact; we only have fear and very high level pronouncements from authorities over whom we have no control, and with whom we have but tenuous lines of communication.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. Minister. There are several things really that I wanted to touch on, re-emphasizing some of the points I made earlier.

He talked about the shelter programme and he admits that there is no national shelter programme, but he says that this government believes in shelter programmes both in private and in public buildings. I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us, if this is the belief of this government, in which public buildings that have been built in the last year or the last two years or the last five years, or in what public building being

planned for the next year or two years or five years, are there any shelters being provided.

Are there any in any of the liquor stores, any in any of the new tourist centres, any in any of the new police centres that are being built, police colleges, plans that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) is making for the new site across the way here? Can the hon. Minister tell us just one public building that has been built in recent years by the province, or is being planned now, where shelters are being provided as part of them? I think this would be very interesting.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I unfortunately do not have access nor any necessity nor desire to go over the plans of public buildings which are in The Department of Public Works. I am sure that in due course, if that question is asked of the hon. Minister, he will be able to answer it. I know of none at the moment because I know of no large public buildings which have been recently built.

The police college that was referred to by the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, is a group of buildings, temporary war buildings, taken over by our government from the federal authorities and consequently, of course, do not have these facilities in them; but I am advised that we have made a survey of all government buildings now in existence and the safety factors of these various buildings are known, and the places which can be used as shelters are tabulated, and knowledge of them is available to the Emergency Measures Organization.

Mr. Singer: But, Mr. Chairman, if this is government policy, as the hon. Minister has said, I thought it would have reflected beyond the remarks of the hon. Minister in the Legislature. I thought it would have reflected throughout the whole of the Cabinet, from the hon. Minister of Public Works to all those people who have anything to do with public buildings, but I suspected that the answer would be just as it has been, that there are no shelters in any public buildings, either presently or planned. So we will let that one go.

Insofar as useful exercises—

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Does the hon. member for York Centre wish me to answer the question?

Mr. Singer: Yes, if the hon. Minister can shed any light on it, certainly.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I think the hon. Attorney-General gave the hon. member the answer. Actually there has been quite a study made of possible places for emergency shelters throughout the province, and as far as the Queen's Park extension is concerned we very definitely are making—the architects are making—plans along that line.

Mr. Singer: Does that mean, do I understand from the hon. Minister of Public Works, that in the plans for the new building across the way here there are going to be shelters, air raid shelters, blast shelters, call them what you may, fall-out shelters?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I said the architects are working on it.

Mr. Singer: Oh, so this government policy has not really reflected itself in anything other than a study; is that correct?

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Well, we are studying it; that is par for the course.

Mr. Singer: All right. Now, insofar as exercises were concerned, I am guessing now but I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General partook of exercise "Tiger" during the war in England. Was he part of that?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Yes.

Mr. Singer: That was the exercise, remember, when it was trying to be ascertained whether or not we had a Canadian army. It was about that time, as a result of that exercise, when one Canadian corps, about half the Canadian troops overseas vanished in southern England for a day and five divisions got lost for about a week or so, it was determined that we really did not have an army that could function as a unit.

An hon. member: That would never happen to the Navy.

Mr. Singer: I thought that this might appeal to the hon. Attorney-General because there is some sort of parallel between the type of exercise, "Exercise Tiger" and, I would suggest, the type of exercises which EMO has been holding. I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General can tell us if any of these EMO exercises have produced any results that indicate to us that there are reasonable ways of protecting the people of Ontario in the event of this horrible disaster which we all hope will never come? It is my very strong suspicion that the EMO exercises are just about as conclusive as "Exercise Tiger" was. They satisfy the people in authority,

this time the hon. Attorney-General, that really what we have is not good for very much.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Wait until you see Exercise Tocsin 3. Well, the hon. Prime Minister, my seat mate, has made the remark, Mr. Chairman, that those things have never happened to the Navy and so far we have not lost any armies in Ontario on EMO exercises; with those two comments I am inclined to agree.

Mr. Chairman, all I can say in answer to the hon. member for York Centre is something which he himself of course rather sets out in his question, and that is that exercises are held for the purpose of learning. Exercises which are held for the purpose of learning are useless unless the lessons learned on these exercises and through them are studied, and changes made in procedures and in equipment and all the rest of it. I am not prepared to believe and I too, was a member of one of the units that was with "Tiger" in the early days of the last war—and I am not prepared to believe that out of that exercise there were not lessons learned and changes—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, all right—and changes made accordingly.

I would like to say to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, through you, that I believe that out of these many exercises that are being held from time to time in Ontario, lessons likewise are being learned and I know that they are being discussed afterwards because I invariably receive either a report or letter from one of the county or municipal people involved, giving me his views as to what actually was learned from the exercise and what should be done with respect to changing procedures, changing what is done and having a better exercise the next time. So from exercise to exercise we improve. So all I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that the comments of the hon. member are quite sound, I accept them and I say that we are learning from these exercises and each time we are improving.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the final point I want to make arising out of the remarks of the hon. Minister was this. Insofar as those good people who have spent of their time and efforts to absorb training, and in an effort to help themselves and to help others, I share with the hon. Minister warm

commendation for the time and effort they have put into it. But my plea, Mr. Chairman, is that government leadership be provided for these people so that the time they have put in and the effort they have put in and the further time they will put in will be of some value to themselves and to the people of Ontario. My suggestion is that up to this moment this whole thing has been a fruitless waste of time. There is no direction, there is no plan, there is no policy.

Hon. Mr. Cass: All I can say is that if that is a suggestion of the hon. member I do not accept it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, since I came into this House four years ago this estimate has been before us in one manner or another. Four years now we have been trying to determine the policy of the government on this side of the House. During those four years as I recall it, sir, we have accepted the theory that primarily the problem of emergency matters is a federal matter. Nevertheless, since provincial participation is needed it has become a joint effort. I suggest to the hon. Attorney-General this afternoon that he has done a master job of evading the problem and evading the giving of any concrete government policies to this House. I think he is to be excused to a certain degree because he has had to work with his friends in Ottawa and we all know that a national election has been precipitated because they have not been able to make up their minds either. I think as a result that this whole thing is unfortunate.

For instance, the hon. Attorney-General told us that the government participation at this level devolved itself into three different phases—I think he said—public information, survival plan and a shelter programme. Now let us talk about the public information. I see we have the total sum of \$15,600 for public information in the estimates. It is ridiculous, it is absurd to indicate that any kind of a job can be done for this type of money. We are trying to find out what the policy is to determine whether or not this is enough money or not enough money theoretically. The hon. member for Oshawa has stated, and I agree with him completely and I have heard him say it in this House before, that this money might just as well be poured down the drain. The reason it is inadequate is simply because there is no policy, there is no direction at the government level.

I am told by some emergency measures people to whom I have talked that a survival plan, from the EMO plan, was placed before the Cabinet some years ago and that it sat in the Cabinet somewhere in the government for some six months without even an answer. Now, I think it would be interesting for the hon. Attorney-General to tell us whether or not this is so. The government took a deputy Minister, who apparently was having some difficulty getting along with his Minister, and placed him in charge of this. I do not know what experience or knowledge he had to direct this very important phase. I am told that other countries on the other side of the Iron Curtain have a plan for survival; I am told that countries in Europe have a plan. They come to some decisions.

With respect to the public information, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is not one-tenth of this population that has any idea what to do if there were atomic explosions, say, in Detroit and the fallout drifted across into this country. I am told by experts that a lot of the danger does not come from the blast but rather from the fallout and it is something that could be protected against. I am told that some countries do something about protecting their population in the event of an atomic war.

It is all right to say that we do not know anything about it; none of us knows what would actually happen. The simple fact of the matter here is, Mr. Chairman, that we have been spending this money for a period of some several years and we have been a complete failure, we have accomplished absolutely nothing. Any success that may have been attained was attained because of the interest of a few people at the municipal level. It certainly was not because of the leadership of this government.

I think my hon. colleague from York Centre put it very adequately when he said we have had a different plan every year. One year the Cabinet is going to go to Borden, another year they have a different decision. And I think this is a responsibility that belongs to all members of this Legislature and this is a matter which this government has failed to deal with sincerely and in a straightforward manner. Every time the matter has been raised in this Legislature the question has been evaded, there has been no straightforward programme.

I think, for instance, it is time that the Emergency Measures Organization told the public of Ontario that they either were in

favour of a public system of fallout shelters or that they were in favour of private fallout shelters. I think if they are in favour of a system of public fallout shelters it is time a survey was made, and the public were informed where these shelters were and what they might do in the event of an atomic attack. It was during the last year that we realized—we were perhaps brought out of our subconscious state of mind by a situation that took place in Cuba, and we learned that it was possible that atomic war could have come to our country and many of our people could be wiped out. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the government has failed completely, and has failed miserably. To suggest that we have completed the responsibility with respect to public information is a joke.

Who in this province, what number of our citizens have any idea of what to do in the event of an emergency such as we were talking about this afternoon? It may be that we should spend many millions of dollars. I am told, for instance, that in Sweden they have a complete public shelter programme. I am told that in the other nations across Europe, which seem to be closer to the actual possibility of a war, they have taken positive steps.

The hon. member for Oshawa pointed out that five cents a person has been spent over the past few years in Ontario for the people in Ontario by the province of Ontario in dealing with this programme. I raised the question some two or three years ago about public buildings. I asked the hon. Minister of Public Works at that time what programmes were going into the construction of new buildings and whether or not fallout protection was to be provided in new public buildings. We are told this afternoon that it is being studied by architects.

Now I have great respect for the hon. Minister of Public Works. I suggest that perhaps the whole problem does not belong to him. I suggest that he is frustrated by the government which fails to come to a decision in this matter. This government, because of its friends in Ottawa, is unable to come to any positive programme. The hon. Minister says that he has great respect for the people in Ottawa, and I presume he is talking about the emergency measures people who carry out the programme. But there certainly has not been a programme forthcoming from Ottawa, nor from Ontario, and these people are absolutely helpless to carry out any type of a programme until the legislators and the governments or politicians come to a deter-

mination on this matter of whether or not they really believe in it and whether or not they are going to get down to business and do something positive.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this matter for a little while. We are talking about civil defence and how it was organized. I was approached, in 1956 I believe—I was on the county council at that time—and appointed to the civil defence committee. Brigadier Whitelaw, speaking to the county council that morning, said it was urgent, it was necessary that they have a civil defence committee of the county of Welland, and that they should establish a committee to take the necessary steps to acquaint the people with the problems that they had to contend with.

I immediately got to my feet in the county council and I mentioned to them that on many occasions, for seven or eight years, while reeve of Chippawa, I attended individual meetings with the city group, with the Stamford group, to find out what could be done about civil defence. Because I spoke on behalf of the possibility of getting some information on what the people should do, I was appointed chairman at that time.

They appointed a county committee of five men, and so we had a county civil defence organization on the road, doing a job. Now then, I felt that it was an urgent thing and I felt that because of the large group of people—the county was a big area, about 170,000 people—we should cut this into four particular sections. We had a committee set up in Port Colborne, with an office, a co-ordinator and a secretary; we had one set up in Fort Erie, with a co-ordinator and a secretary; and one in Welland and another one in the city of Niagara Falls.

Now we were in business—four units, with a civil defence committee of Welland county to tell them what to do. We appointed one, Charlie Blume, who in my opinion did an excellent job of acquainting the people of that area with the problems with which they had to contend. So the four groups were working and taught many people in case of disaster of some type. They had their emergency feeding group; they had police groups, as a matter of fact some of them were in uniform. They had this evacuation route set out on their maps, and we had a lot of publicity in connection with civil defence.

Finally, when they were set up in their offices, ready to do business, they turned to the government to ask them if they in turn

would tell them what to do. They found themselves in this position—all ready to work but no instructions.

Up to that point the figure of money that was spent in the county of Welland was some \$38,000; \$38,000 to operate five offices on a five cents per capita basis. It got to the former Minister of Planning and Development—I am sorry the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) is not here to help me, but I think Mr. Tyrell is here, he might remember some of our meetings or some of the problems that we had—and I found that I had made a very serious mistake. I spent money that I should not have spent without the approval of Toronto. The authority did not come through. Now, I thought, there might be a chance of a disaster; no one would think about a few dollars when people needed support and action. We spent the money from the county level, anyhow.

Finally we did get to a convention. You know, members of small town councils often go to conventions and most people think they go there just to have fun. I wound up in Ottawa at one of these conventions. While there we decided to take a trip to Arnprior, to see what they had and how they taught the people. Mind you, every co-ordinator in our county was sent to Arnprior for a course, to learn what to teach their people what to do when they got back again.

In Ottawa, I said, "Our money is not coming through but this is what we have done." Well, as far as Ottawa was concerned at that time, 50 per cent of the dollar would be provided by them immediately if the province would approve that requisition. So we were told that the half-dollar, as far as Ottawa was concerned, would come through.

The Minister at that time was leaning on his oars and a delegation, including the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar), did get to his office. I recall that he did not have time to read the brief which was submitted to him. He said he would read it on the way home on the train. Mind you, the mayor of Niagara Falls, George Ingles—or ex-mayor—who was the co-ordinator in the city of Niagara Falls, asking for instructions, asking to be told what to do, finally threw up his arms in despair and said, "I will not take the taxpayers' money to pay me a wage to come into my office to read the morning paper. I have tried to get equipment. I have tried to get co-operation. I have tried to get instructions. No one is telling me anything. I will resign. I am not going to take this any longer. It is a silly thing for me to be sitting there in

that office doing absolutely nothing because we lack instructions."

As a matter of fact, our county co-ordinator built a shelter in the city of Niagara Falls and another one in Welland to teach the people how the evacuation method was going to be changed. They were going to take people, who are accustomed to living in cities and towns, white-collar people, out into Bruce peninsula to rough it in the middle of the winter; they found out that if they did not die from the bomb they would starve or freeze to death out there. Now finally these experts decided that they should stay at home and hide in their cellars, or at least in these fallout shelters. So the thing was nothing but confusion. Let me tell you the final chapter in this book, and—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Final?

Mr. Bukator: The hon. member for York South amuses me; this leader of this great group over here. You know, when I first came here four years ago—

Mr. MacDonald: Obviously he had nothing to say and I have given him a chance to talk.

Mr. Bukator: Four years ago when I came here he had a lot of nonsense, a lot of meanness, a lot of ugly remarks and nasty remarks, and a little bit of good.

But finally, our leader, the hon. leader of the Liberal party, began to pick up the good and the constructive criticism and show you people on that side of the House what should be done about not only civil defence but many things. The hon. member now finds himself without anything good to talk about, so he winds up with one particular area to work in, only enough to be ugly and nasty; nothing else to do but be mean.

As a matter of fact, when you read the papers—and I do read a little bit—you do nothing but find out that this man says something that was nasty, something that was out of the ordinary, but nothing constructive.

The public in the province of Ontario, when the time comes and I am not saying to the hon. Prime Minister that he should call an election—

Mr. Chairman: Get back to the estimates.

Mr. Bukator: I am getting to that, that is exactly the route that I was taking with this civil defence. That is what happened to the civil defence, it got all over the province and did not wind up anywhere.

I quit. I quit in 1958 as the reeve of the village; after serving the village and the

county for 12 years, undefeated by the way. I got out of politics. A few months after that the civil defence organization in the county fell apart. They closed the four offices. Mr. Ingles quit, as he said he would. He felt he should not take any more of the taxpayers' money for doing nothing.

I do not know where they put all of their furniture. There were many people taught to do certain things, but there was no direction from the government. Now they have one unit in Welland county, and I see they are advertising for an assistant there.

That organization was doing well. The show was on the road, but the instructions did not come. The direction did not come from the government and that is why they had to close shop.

I should quit here, I suppose, but I do not get on my feet very often, Mr. Chairman. Someone said I had better quit while I am ahead; I will do that, but I can assure you that the people of the county of Welland are trying to do a job.

Many people were taught. Many people wanted to co-operate, but they were not getting the instructions from the government that happened to come at this level. Ottawa was willing to contribute the funds but we were not getting directions from this department.

Mr. Minister, believe me, I am not trying to take it out on anyone. I remember Mr. Bevis coming into our area. Mr. Bevis, I understand, has not been feeling too good; he had a heart attack and I am sorry to hear that. Mr. Bevis came into our area on many occasions and said: "You are doing an excellent job here. I wish the rest of the province had a similar organization to what you have here."

But the bottom dropped out. I am not going to say that I quit; maybe I should have stayed there and persuaded you people to give us a little more money. That is all that was required. We did not have the funds so we could not keep the whole operation going.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 218 agreed to.

On vote 219:

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: Before I put this motion I just want it understood that we will be on 219 when we start these estimates again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday of next week this House will meet at 2 of the clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, we will have a night session on Monday, and Tuesday there will be no night session. Wednesday no night session; Thursday there will be a night session, and we will continue with estimates on Monday. When we finish with Lands and Forests and the Attorney-General we will deal with the estimates of The Department of Health. A week from today, March 1, we will have the ceremony of swearing in the new Lieutenant-Governor. This ceremony will take place in the Lieutenant-Governor's Chambers at approximately 12 o'clock noon. I propose to adjourn the House early on that occasion so that all the hon. members may attend this historic ceremony.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Prime Minister advise us whether any estimates other than The Department of Health will be called next week?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, it all depends on how much we can accomplish in our night sessions, but after these two estimates are completed, The Department of Health, and tentatively I would say, after that The Department of Agriculture. As soon as we finish one department I propose to call another.

Mr. Wintermeyer: It will be in that sequence?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It will be in that sequence.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Monday, February 25, 1963

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Monday, February 25, 1963

Statement re Department of Mines, Mr. Wardrop	1025
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	1026
Answers to questions on the order paper	1026
Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Roberts, continued	1027
Recess, 6 o'clock	1066

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery students from Humberstone Collegiate Institute, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would ask your permission to speak very briefly on the review of The Department of Mines which you have kindly allowed me to have placed on the desks of all hon. members.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that at the time the estimates of my department were before the House in December I stated that it had not been possible to give any very complete picture of the progress of the mining industry for the year because a large part of the necessary data was not yet available. I am now in a position to correct that omission, and I feel that the best possible way of doing so is to draw the attention of all hon. members to some of the salient facts which are set out in the review which is on our desks.

The cover itself is interesting in that it is devoted to several phases of the iron ore industry which, by the way, established a new production record last year, and which I predict will continue to grow and take an increasingly important place in our economic development. The map inside the front cover shows dramatically just how widespread is the mineral industry in this province. It shows the location of mining enterprises across the width of the province from Gordon Lake, just inside Ontario's boundary with Manitoba, to Cobalt, which is almost within shouting distance of the province of Quebec. And, Mr. Speaker, there is a graph on page 2 of the review which points up very dramatically the tremendous growth that Ontario's mining

industry has experienced during the last few years. An increase in productivity from \$190 million in 1946 to a peak of \$983 million in 1960, surely speaks for itself. That is a five-fold increase.

I would also draw to the attention of the hon. members the shaded portion of the same graph which indicates that profit is not at all synonymous with production; and this is most important, I believe. It will be noted that only a relatively very small proportion of the total output can be devoted to dividends after the payment of operating expenses, development costs, purchases of fuel and electricity, purchases of supplies and equipment and the payment of taxes. That, I think, Mr. Speaker, is something that must be understood if we are to see mining in its true perspective as a principal sparkplug of our whole industrial life in Canada.

Naturally we cannot take much pleasure in observing that the graph line showing production has taken a downward trend from the 1960 peak. It has in fact dropped by some \$81 million in two years. However, a study of the tables on pages 5, 6 and 7 will show that this reduction in 1962 is confined almost entirely to uranium, nickel, copper and gold. And almost without exception the other metallic minerals, non-metallics, fuels, and structural materials showed increases over the previous years and reflect a very healthy condition for the industry as a whole.

As is pointed out in the summary on pages 3 and 4, the loss experienced by the uranium industry was to be expected and, I hope, fairly temporary. Reduced output of nickel and copper resulted from the decision of International Nickel Limited to cut back production in an effort to reduce world stockpiles of nickel and so avoid market disruption in the years ahead.

Pages 8 to 12 in the review are worth studying as they give a capsule picture of just what is transpiring in the industry—the companies that now have mines in production; those that are proceeding with development work, those that came into production during 1962 and, unfortunately, four operations in which production has been suspended, either temporarily or for good.

The graph on page 14 shows a slight upturn in prospecting activity following a constant downward trend from the peak reached in 1955. This is encouraging, but for the good of the industry and of the entire province it appears that mining companies and individuals must again be convinced that the search for minerals in Ontario can still be as rewarding as it was a few years ago.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members who seek to be brought up to date on current developments and activities within one of the most important industries in this province should read part 1 of this review with careful attention. It contains a great deal of factual information, some of which might come as a surprise to those having only a superficial knowledge of mining, mining practices, and mining problems.

The latter half of the book deals with the operation of The Department of Mines, and the work of each of the branches and offices is outlined in whatever detail is required. The maps on pages 71 and 77 will show that, for a department whose total staff numbers only 251, the services these people render is widely spread indeed.

When I presented my estimates for the coming year I referred to the very considerable sum that this department is able to add to the consolidated revenue fund, in comparison to the relatively very modest appropriation required to keep the department functioning. In support of this appraisal, I should like to refer the hon. members to the statement of revenue and expenditure on pages 85, 86 and 87 and the graph on page 88. That, I believe, shows very definitely that the mining industry, and the department with which it is associated, are most useful adjuncts to the province and to the government.

I will not say anything more about the review at this time, Mr. Speaker, except to repeat the opinion I have expressed here before, that it is an extremely useful publication—and that its value to this House will be in direct proportion to the attention with which hon. members read it. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the book is worth careful study, and retention as a source of reference.

Its production, within eight weeks of the close of the year under review, is an achievement in which members of my staff take real pride. I believe it is an achievement which is unmatched by any department of any government in Canada. It has required very intensive effort and a fine degree of co-operation among the various offices of the department, and between the department and the mining

industry. For this I would like publicly now to acknowledge my sincere appreciation.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following:

(1) The 38th annual report of The Department of Health, Ontario, for the year 1962.

(2) The 76th annual report of the Niagara Parks Commission for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1962.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to beg leave to table answers to questions Nos. 1, 3 and 7.

The Prime Minister tabled answers to questions as follows:

1. Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South)—Inquiry of the Ministry:

(1) What were the total reserves of Blue Cross at the time the Ontario Hospital Services Commission began operation?

(2) What proportion of those reserves were for standard ward coverage?

(3) What disposition was made of those reserves for standard ward coverage?

Answer by the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond):

The Ontario Hospital Association administers the Blue Cross plan. It is a private agency not in receipt of public monies, and the information sought is not available through the government.

2. Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa)—Inquiry of the Ministry:

(1) What is the total payment each year in grants to hospitals for unmanageable debts since the establishment of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission?

(2)(a) To which hospitals, and (b) in what amounts, have these grants been made?

Answer by the Minister of Health:

(1) 1961—\$1,680,000; 1962—\$675,000.

(2) (a) (b)

1961

St. Joseph's Hospital, Elliot Lake	\$750,000
Salvation Army Hospital, Toronto	100,000
Sydenham District Hospital, Wallaceburg	80,000
St. Vincent Hospital, Ottawa	260,000
Ottawa General Hospital, Ottawa	315,000
St. Louis Marie de Montfort Hospital, Ottawa	80,000
Hotel Dieu Hospital, Cornwall	95,000

1962

St. Vincent Hospital, Ottawa ..	\$243,000
Ottawa General Hospital, Ottawa	257,000
St. Louis Marie de Montfort Hospital, Ottawa	80,000
Hotel Dieu Hospital, Cornwall	95,000

7. Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora)—Inquiry of the Ministry:

(1) How many complimentary licences of any kind were issued by The Department of Lands and Forests in 1962?

(2) To whom were these licences issued?

Answer by the Minister of The Department of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts):

(1) 549.

(2) Complimentary licences were issued to:

Members of the press, principally the group known as outdoor writers;

Senior officials of Canada and of other provinces and of federal and state governments of the United States;

Certain other officials who had co-operated actively with The Department of Lands and Forests;

Visiting military personnel of NATO countries; and

Certain persons who for some special reason were guests of the province.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton) in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1105:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the hon. Minister (Mr. Roberts): Have any surveys been conducted in the northern part of Essex county with the intention of possibly establishing a second provincial park in Essex county?

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): I think perhaps under the parks branch, when we are dealing with parks, might be the better place for that question.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1105 agreed to.

On vote 1106:

Mr. Newman: I have just asked the question, Mr. Chairman, and rather than repeat it, I would ask the hon. Minister to reply.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say there has been a very general survey made of possible sites in all the counties that are in the Aylmer district of Lands and Forests, which is a very important district in relation to tourist possibilities and tourist accommodation. Undoubtedly there are some in the county of Essex. These will all be looked at and I hope, if our estimates are passed and we get the green light to go ahead in the coming year, that there will be acquisitions in many places, including, I would anticipate, some in the county of Essex.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may follow through, has the department considered or done anything concerning the possibility of the acquisition of Peche Island in the Detroit River? Was that considered by the department?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That particular property at the present time has been under review by the Parks Integration Board and a study is being made at the present time.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, I take it we are still on vote 1105?

Mr. Chairman: 1106.

Mr. Newman: While we are at the parks branch, Mr. Chairman, is the department considering increasing the number of boat ramps in provincial parks?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would like a little clarification of the question.

Mr. Newman: As we all know, boating is becoming quite a popular summertime activity and quite a few of the tourists now do visit our provincial parks with the intention of making full use of the accommodation there, including the use of a boat. Now, do all provincial parks have boat ramps to accommodate the tourists or the residents of the province who may visit?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I understand that question to be concerned with a supply of boats on the spot. The practice is to have concessions where necessary to take care of those situations, with boating as the concern of whomever has the actual concession. They would have a certain number of boats available, canoes particularly in Algonquin Park for example, and in some other areas—for instance, Quetico Park.

Of course today, I think the hon. member will recognize, if you are dealing with larger boats than that, transporting your own boat is becoming quite a part of our life these days.

Mr. Newman: My reason for asking the question is that at the provincial park in Essex county you have a ramp facility for putting your boat into water and my thought is that possibly it might be a good policy to follow in all our provincial parks.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is the marina end of things, and we are going ahead with the development of harbour facilities for pleasure boats and that sort of thing as part of our general plan in relation to recreation park expansion.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about this vote and first I would like to be quite complimentary to The Department of Lands and Forests as far as the provincial park situation is concerned. We are very fortunate in Bruce County; at the present time we have two—in the Inverhuron area and the Sauble Beach area—and, as the hon. Minister knows, inasmuch as he was in Wiarton just a week or so ago, we are after a few more up there.

When I say "a few" of course I do not mean that we want a whole lot more, but on the other hand at that time and this afternoon it is my intention to point out that in the Bruce peninsula, which is one of the better tourist areas of the province of Ontario, there are no provincial parks at all at the present time. This is a beautiful stretch of land, stretching 55 miles out into Lake Huron and Georgian Bay. Thousands of tourists go through this area every year on the way to Manitoulin Island, and stay in the peninsula where they have cottages and camping grounds.

But up to the moment it seems, we have not been able to convince The Department of Lands and Forests that, if there should be a park anywhere in Ontario, one of those areas is in the Bruce peninsula.

Now I am informed by members of the hon. Minister's staff—not just one but several—that they are very interested in this peninsula area. I know that the members of his staff have suggested that not just one area be taken over there, but many areas, for this particular reason, that at the present time there are no roads into many sites of prospective parks. They can be bought for a very limited amount of money when one compares the price with that of parks in some other areas of the province. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would strongly suggest to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, if at all possible, that he listen to the recommendations of his staff and people in the area—in fact, people in Ontario. The *London Free Press*,

just as an example, has pointed out on numerous occasions that this is a natural park area and it seems to me a shame that up to the moment there is no provincial park.

I have a suggestion that I would like to make to the hon. Minister. I have talked to the tourist committee under The Department of Economics and Development about this, and I might say that they have been most helpful in my discussions with them. This is the suggestion: That in an area such as the Bruce peninsula—and, of course, representing that area—we would have what might be known as an animal park; that we get some acreage of land—it would not take a large amount by any means, perhaps 10 or 15 acres—and that there we might cage every known animal that lives in the province of Ontario.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Put them all in the Bruce Peninsula?

Mr. Whicher: One of every kind, of course, or two of every kind, or three or four or whatever it might be. I did not want to take all the wolves away from northern Ontario, I assure you. But this would be a tremendous tourist attraction. It has been suggested by people on the economic council with whom I have discussed this, that perhaps we could have over-walks or walks over the top of these pens and cages so that the children could take pictures, and I know it would be a great tourist attraction, and I think that it could be done with a limited amount of money, so, Mr. Chairman, I leave this suggestion to the hon. Minister.

I am sure that he would get complete cooperation from the residents of the area. I do not believe that there is one like that in the province at the present time. It would bring many, many people into that area and we could use this as a starting point, and perhaps if it worked out, it could be developed in other areas of the province.

So far I have suggested a provincial park, at least one in the peninsula, I have suggested an animal park, and now I wish to bring up something that I would appreciate if the hon. Minister would look into also. I am wondering about the amounts of money taken in in provincial parks, if they in any way compare with the revenue or the amount of money that it costs to keep up these parks, and if the hon. Minister would answer that question, then I would like to carry on a little further.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I would just say on that, at the present time we are running a little behind what might be classified as

strictly operational costs. I think last year it was about \$1.2 million revenue and about \$1.4 million in operational costs, but we hope within a short period of time to get it at least on a balance with respect to operational costs. Now, when you get beyond that, return on investment and so forth might become a matter of importance, but I think we have such a programme ahead now that it will take a while to get it balanced on operational costs versus revenue.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I agree with the hon. Minister. I believe that the operational costs should be paid by the people who use these parks. Let us not forget that in the area of provincial parks—in the area of many of them, certainly in the area that I represent—we have many tourist resort operators who are in direct competition in some respect with the provincial parks, and I think that there should be realism in the amount that we charge people for the usage of the provincial parks. I do not think it is fair that the tourist operator and the other taxpayers in the province subsidize the people who come in and use them.

I know that there are many people who cannot afford to take holidays unless they go to an area such as a provincial park where they can get reasonable accommodation very cheap. But on the other hand let us not forget that our tourist operators are paying taxes to the municipalities where they live and to both the provincial and federal governments. For this reason I hope that we do not infringe on free enterprise to too great an extent by subsidizing the parks too much as far as operational costs are concerned.

I have one other point, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: As I think I indicated in a more general way the other day, the policy at the present time is that where we have park concessions—there are areas where we must have those concessions—we provide the capital for the installation in some areas; in some cases the equipment is brought in, but it depends on the terms of the tender, and then we ask someone to bid for the concession and operate it on a private enterprise basis.

Now, if we find we are located on the fringe where there is ample of that type of thing already set up, as a result of tourist operators and private enterprise locations, we do not go in for these concessions—only where they are necessary. So to that extent we are co-operating. Really, the only change, I think, would be that for the right to go through the park and camp in the park, and we charge—

I think it is \$1 a night in Algonquin, do we not? It is \$1 a night for a camping site, which we think is a fair figure at the present time. We do not think people going through and camping that way with their families will be kept back from going to tourist operators' resorts later on or for part of their holidays or ultimately, perhaps, after they have got through the great lure of canoeing and camping out more permanently, they will be pleased that the two operations can be reconciled and will go together.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear what the hon. Minister said about the problem of concessions in the parks—I do not know, of course, what his general policy on the overall province is—but I am going to speak about the Sauble Beach provincial park for a moment. There we have a concession which, incidentally—I believe this to be true, that the man who was running it last year certainly lost money so doing; but, nevertheless, there are stores all around that particular camp and he is in direct competition undoubtedly with some of those stores. Now, I appreciate the fact that in running a provincial park there are some things that you have to sell. Maybe the twist runs out of toothpaste or a bottle of milk or something like that and he likes a place where he can buy them immediately, but nevertheless he must not forget that these tourist operators are in business really for only two months out of 12. They have large capital costs and I am strictly a free-enterprise man myself and I would hope that the hon. Minister will remember that these people are paying large taxes for just a short season, and that he will, as much as possible, ensure that people who have concessions in provincial parks are not in too great competition with the local business men.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I might say that we are in agreement in connection with that policy, and I have in front of me here a resolution presented by the Joint Board of Ontario Travel Associations, regarding the Ontario tourist industry, to the Tourist Industry Committee, Ontario Economic Council. The gist of their recommendation is that they urge the government not to go beyond the present type of facilities, which are now in operation. I think it can be said that we would be very careful in making any moves beyond that to take into account the position and views of these organizations.

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister would not like to say anything about the Bruce Peninsula area inasmuch as he was there?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say I have here in the analysis of possible potential areas in the Lake Huron district a whole bookful of suggestions, which my excellent department's officials have put together, and there are a reasonable number of pages referring to Bruce county.

Mr. MacDonald: In the fulness of time.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): I have two questions. I am glad to see that the hon. Minister has said that they will consider seriously this resolution of the tourist operators. I have two questions. The hon. Minister, both here in the House and in other places has spoken in glowing terms of the possibilities of the provincial park in the Killarney area. I know that he has found it an ideal area for winter sports. Is it the intention of the department of parks themselves to go into that particular operation; are they going to operate a winter resort area themselves there—skiing and other winter facilities—or is it to be a private enterprise?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I would say to the hon. member that we are having a very detailed survey going on at the present time. One of the assistant deputies and a number of experts are working on that right at this time, and I would not want to commit ourselves except in very general terms at this point, because we will have to deal with these analyses when they come in. But certainly the idea of this park in the Killarney area would be to use private enterprise to the full in its development and have a type of park area that would be quite different—for example, despite its magnificence—quite different from the type that has been laid out over the years in the Algonquin Park area. If the hon. member understands what I mean by that.

Mr. Troy: I am glad to note that, because in that section of Ontario and all that section north of Muskoka, there are a great number of winter resort areas and I would not want to see the government go into competition with them.

The second question is in regard to that large area that has been set aside in Nipissing in Haddo township as a provincial park site. It is probably one of the largest outside of Algonquin, maybe Quetico too. Is there anything on the schedule for that particular park this year, getting it ready for use, such as clearing of roads and things of that nature? Haddo township in the northwestern section of Nipissing where there is not at the present time any provincial park.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not think I can give my hon. friend anything definite about that just at this moment other than that it is one of those under definite review. The Champlain park is getting quite a bit of attention at the present time. I am trying to get in my mind's eye the location of the other one.

Mr. Troy: It is in the northwestern section up in the Noelville area, Noelville-Monetville, that area.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is really in the potential area at the moment rather than active development.

Mr. MacDonald: I am just looking for the chairman to referee here.

Mr. Gibson: Last year in this House during the debates on the estimates of this department, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) stated that there would be no change in the 1956 legislation prohibiting mining operations in the public parks. Since that time we have had conflicting statements from the various Ministers, including the present hon. Minister of Mines and the former Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Spooner) on this subject.

I wonder if the hon. Minister could advise us as to exactly what the policy of the government is on these mining operations at this time?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think the hon. Prime Minister made a definite statement on that and it is on record in relation to provincial parks that are presently in existence. As we proceed with this development on a very wide scale, wider than ever before, I am certain that we will use common sense and a wise approach to any particular area.

I would not hesitate for a moment to say to the House, knowing the Sudbury area, that if we took into account 4,000 square miles bordering on the north, close to the city of Sudbury, areas of that nature on the fringes would not be just immediately and overnight removed from any possibility of mineral development. But the general parks position has been outlined—Algonquin Park for example, Quetico Park. I would say that is on record clearly at the present time and there is no quarrel with that situation.

Mr. Gibson: I wonder if the hon. Minister would advise the House as to whether or not prospecting or mining operations are presently being carried on in any of our provincial parks?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. Minister of Mines says not to his knowledge. I would say, advisedly, not to my knowledge.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have two questions that I want to raise with regard to parks. May I say before I deal with these two that I am very glad to have the reassurance from this hon. Minister of Lands and Forests; to learn that unlike his predecessor, he does not regard a mine as small as a farm and therefore no real problem if it is dropped in the middle of as big a park as Algonquin—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not want the hon. member to put me into any position as to what I think; I just gave a general statement a moment ago.

Mr. MacDonald: The general statement of the hon. Minister was quite explicit: in new parks that might be created around Sudbury he was not going to draw the line firmly, but in existing parks he was. I was just noting that this is somewhat in variance with the statement of his hon. predecessor, though I would agree that the hon. Prime Minister made a statement that is apparently four-square with that of the hon. Minister's.

So at the moment we have the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister more or less at variance with the former Minister. The safeguarding of our parks for the moment is going to be protected. My hope is that this is not just a pre-election statement and after the election is over, in the four years in which any outcry could die down, the government will revert to the so-called realistic approach of having a few developments that are no bigger than a farm take place in our provincial parks.

Mr. Chairman, if I may turn to the two points I wanted to raise: the first one is a follow through, considering further aspects of the situation at Wasaga Beach that the hon. member for Bruce has just touched on. My information is that within recent years, because of the difficulties the township organization in that area—Sunnydale township—in coping with the problem of looking after the beach—this allegedly was the reason—The Department of Lands and Forests has taken over all this beach strip. This is some six or seven miles—really an uninterrupted beach, but as far as names are concerned some three beaches: the Oakview Beach, Wasaga Beach and another one along the way, completing the seven miles.

When they took it over, they closed 32 of

the 36 roads that lead down to the beach. The net result of this, so I am informed, is that those operators who had been established for quite some time in this area now find that their business is dwindling off. In part it may be because of the competition from The Department of Lands and Forests' establishment that has been put in there; but my information is it is mainly because of the fact that the beach has been cut off by this closing of some 32 of the 36 roads leading down into it.

There is another problem related to this to which I think, Mr. Chairman, we in this House are going to have to give more consideration: that is the problem of reconciling the interests of what might be described as the all-year-around residents and taxpayers in municipalities like this and the summer residents and taxpayers. We have heard a great deal about this in another context in recent months, the so-called cottage voters and the right of cottage owners to have a vote in these townships.

On the basis of having representation if you have to pay taxes, there is a good deal of validity in it. I was rather disturbed, I must say, Mr. Chairman—if I may just pursue this digression for a moment—the other day when I was up in the Parry Sound area to be informed that in one area one of the immediate results of the cottagers, namely, some of the city folk, getting control of the township was that the people who were in the employ of the local township immediately found that their wages were cut. Apparently they had some rather hard-bitten businessmen from Bay Street, or thereabouts on to the township council, and the immediate result was something in the nature of an anti-labour policy by the reduction of wages in the area.

This is only one manifestation of this problem of reconciling the interests of the all-year-around residents and the part-time residents. It is part of the problem that I wanted to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister and to seek his comments.

My understanding is, for example, in the Oakview Beach area, which falls in Sunnydale township, 58 per cent of the taxes come from the people who are there for only three months of the year. They get services for only those three months and yet, allegedly, the township could not provide the services. This was the situation that provoked The Department of Lands and Forests to come in and in effect take it over.

There are other municipal arrangements that are emerging there. For example the

people in the Oakview Beach area have apparently applied to be annexed to the Wasaga Beach area instead of being part of Sunnydale township, which runs back into the rural hinterland and with which they have not as many common interests. I am informed that at the same time Wasaga Beach, the village of Wasaga Beach, has sought to annex 15 per cent of Oakview Beach and that the Ontario Municipal Board in effect has sent the issue back to them for consideration of a full annexation rather than only 15 per cent.

I just bring this into the picture, Mr. Chairman, to show you that there is a great stirring at the local level on the part of people who are trying to get some more effective solution of this reconciliation of the interests of people who are only there for three months and others who are there for the full 12 months of the year, full-time residents.

The question, Mr. Chairman, that I want to address to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests is this. After the department moved in and took over the beach—and in the view of my informants by cutting down the number of road inlets or accesses to the beach from 36 to four, cutting out 32 of them, has reduced their business—my information is that they have drawn up a petition and they got 2,000 of the 2,900 eligible taxpayers, ratepayers, in that portion of the township. Incidentally, I understand there were only 1,200 others in the back portion of the township.

So they got 2,000 of the 2,900 eligible people in this portion of the township to make representation in a petition to The Department of Land and Forests to, if I may put it bluntly, get out—in the belief that they were entitled to get these services from the local township rather than allegedly seek them, with all the unfortunate consequences, from The Department of Lands and Forests.

My information, Mr. Chairman, is that this petition has been presented to the department. It was presented, I understand, in the first instance, to officials of the department at Maple and presumably has gotten through to the head office here. Though a considerable lapse of time has gone by, there has been no reaction at all. This sizeable percentage of the petitioners has sent their document down here and they get no reaction from the hon. Minister or the department. Therefore, I raise it with the hon. Minister now and ask him in the first place why such an impressive representation, or rather why a representation from such an impressive number of the ratepayers, should be ignored; and

secondly, now that it has been brought to the attention of the hon. Minister, what is his comment on it?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, the Wasaga Beach problem is: In addition to being one of the greatest beaches that we have in the province, a magnificent sand beach used by a great many people, it is one which has for a long time been a problem. I remember, when I was occupying the office of Attorney-General, a great many problems with policing came up from time to time. We were constantly having delegations coming down to discuss that feature. At the present time my hon. friend has referred to a petition that was presented last summer, I think, before I took office; and perhaps during the cold winter spell nobody is stirring too much at the moment. But in the meantime—

Mr. MacDonald: Lots of them stirring up there.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, we are stirring at this end because we are having a very careful study made of this whole picture. Fairly recently a group did come to see me, not in connection with exactly what my hon. friend was speaking about but in relation to another section of the same great beach. In that particular case there was a very definite feeling that we should block a number of roads; their chief complaint was that there were far too many cars on the beach. That is another problem.

Now, I am hoping that this will be solved. I hope we will find places in the area where parking lots of some considerable size can be established off the beaches altogether, so centred as to be attractive to people wanting to shop, and within sufficiently close distance that walking will not be a problem to get to the beaches to use them.

All of that is part of the problem, and we are working hard to get it solved to the satisfaction of everybody concerned. I do not believe the petition to which my hon. friend referred to has ever actually come to this department. Whether it has or not, if it is in existence, it is the sort of thing that fits into this whole picture.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised to hear that it has not reached the department, because my informant is a person who is involved in the drawing-up of the petition and the successful seeking of some 2,000 of the 2,900 ratepayers who signed it. However, I just draw this to the attention of the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not want to give a false impression. I think the branch head for parks has given me a note that he knows of no document actually on file. Actually I have a note here, I think, that indicates that a phone call came in last July, so probably—perhaps it is known but it is not actually on file.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I shall pass the word back that the department is not certain where the petition is if it arrived, and perhaps those interested in the topic can help to revive it and bring it to the hon. Minister's attention.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, we are working on it anyway, so they probably are aware of that.

Mr. MacDonald: Good.

The second point I wanted to raise, Mr. Chairman, is chapter 2. How many more chapters there will be in the story I do not know.

Last year I raised the question of what I think can accurately be described as the desecration by lumbering work being carried on in Quetico Park. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that Quetico Park is regarded as being one of our cherished wilderness areas. Perhaps it and Algonquin are the two outstanding areas and Quetico almost gets into a category by itself because of international arrangements with the neighbouring state.

Last year I raised this matter because I was informed—I was convinced reliably, and I am convinced since, that my information was substantially correct—that work permits had been given to a well-known Tory in the area. In fact he is, if I may put it bluntly, something of a sawdust Caesar in certain parts of that area, and in many ways has bullied local citizens who dared to challenge him in many particular fields. I am referring to the Mathieu Lumber Company in Sapawe, but it operates in many portions of this area.

Mr. Mathieu was given work permits and did considerable cutting. In fact, my information is that the work permits he got first were sufficient for a considerable length of time; that they rushed over this rather quickly; that he was given a second and a third work permit to the south and west, and all of that has been cut over. Whether or not he has received more in recent months, I do not know; whether he is going to seek more, I do not know.

One of the reasons why I emphasize this point in passing is that apparently, as so

often happens, he got the work permits but he sub-contracted the work. According to my information more than one of his sub-contractors have gone bankrupt in the deal. In the process of rather unsupervised and sloppy cutting throughout the area, Mr. Mathieu is freed of some of the responsibility for this because it was done by a sub-contractor. But they have gone broke and he is looking for somebody else who presumably can be exploited, as he makes a fair amount of money out of cutting in a very questionable way in Quetico Park area.

When I raised this last year, Mr. Chairman, I was very interested to be informed that it caused something of a stir in the department. On June 16 last year, which would be some two months, or a little better, after I had raised it in the House, the area was visited by Mr. Brodie of the timber division of the department, and by regional directors Bray and Boulton and by the local district forester by the name of Balkwell. My information is that from their discussions after they had examined what had happened, they sounded somewhat worried. I would say that a copy of the memo that the hon. Minister sent to me, which was returned to him in answer to the queries which I raised in the House, gave some indication as to why they were somewhat worried.

Even more interesting, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. Minister of the day, now hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, visited the area under what seemed to me to be a rather peculiar arrangement. When he arrived he invited Mr. Mathieu to come up with him and take a look at the situation for which Mr. Mathieu was responsible. And the two of them, budding Tories, bosom pals, visited the place for an hour or so, and departed.

I do not think that this situation should be left just there. I want to give the House some more documentation of the kind of thing that is going on. I am informed, for example, that one of the scalers' reports called the operation sloppy and said, "It appears to be very poorly supervised". Surely, Mr. Chairman, cutting should be supervised under any circumstances when there are rules and regulations that should be lived up to. But when this cutting is taking place in one of our prize wilderness areas the proposition that it is not being rigidly supervised is intolerable. It is not being supervised adequately, I submit, Mr. Chairman, because civil servants in that area are to a considerable degree terrified or terrorized by Mathieu as one of the big wheels in the Tory machine, or terrorized by other Conservative politicians in the area who have

to respond to the cracking of the whip by the same Mr. Mathieu.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, I think under circumstances like this there is no excuse for the kind of inaction and failure to have pretty rigid supervision; and this, apparently, is what was lacking. But I want to cite three instances in which there were serious violations of the park.

The first one, as I outlined in the House, and which is somewhat disputed, but which I submit was correct, is that the original entrance to the park was made by a cut by Mr. Mathieu at that point where the Dawson trail crosses Highway 11. What Mr. Mathieu did was to desecrate the area immediately where the Dawson trail is crossing Highway 11. Is it Highway 11? Yes, Highway 11. At that very point where he cut in, with his bulldozers, and carved a wound in this wilderness, he followed the Dawson trail a certain distance, then followed the power line back, and then a lumber road that went directly south into the park. It was only after some representations were made, and I had raised the matter in the House, that the officials of the department found that their hand was strengthened enough to bring an end to this. More particularly, they planted trees to remove this wound in one of the historic trails.

I am sorry that the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie) is not here because I am certain if he had this solid evidence of the desecration of the Dawson trail that he would rise up in his wrath, good Tory though he is, and say something about a government which permits this kind of thing.

Mr. W. G. Noden (Rainy River): He did not follow the Dawson trail.

Mr. MacDonald: He did follow the Dawson trail; in fact, I will give the hon. gentleman a map to show him what happened.

Mr. Noden: The Dawson trail is east of Highway 11.

Mr. MacDonald: The Dawson trail is north of Highway 11; it crosses it. Mr. Mathieu followed the Dawson trail in from Highway 11 for a distance to the power lines, and he came back along the power lines to what was subsequently a road cut directly south from the original entrance. I have the map and I have informants who have been there. Now, I trust that the department will not spend all of its time in a witch hunt to discover who the informants are, instead of really coming to grips with the problems revealed.

However, let me pursue this matter. It was, as I said, something of a disgraceful eyesore for a time, but the department has now planted trees and bettered the situation where the cut was first made. The real issue, however, Mr. Chairman, as I am informed is the location of this original entrance. Entering where it does, the road must cross the Cascades nature trail. The logical point of entry would have been east of that, at the French Falls trail, where it would have been comparatively inconspicuous. But this was rejected, allegedly because the terrain was too rough. Even assuming this to be true, which it is not, I am informed, the department is again at fault for not placing the interests of the public first, and Mr. Mathieu's second. This is the underlying theme throughout the whole matter.

The second violation, Mr. Chairman, is with regard to nature trails. Now, in the road—both as it was cut up the Dawson trail and back along the power line to the timber road that now runs directly in, and south—it does not go very far south until it crosses one of the first nature trails. My information is that the work permit stated explicitly that no cutting was to be allowed within the vicinity of the nature trails. In fact, the actual boundary was determined by the naturalist who helped put in a peat line around the trails.

Now, two violations occurred on the French Falls trail, where a white pine, a huge tree right on the trail, was cut. Incidentally, there is no disputing this, because in a copy of the memo that the hon. Minister gave me it is acknowledged that this happened. They expressed regret that it happened, but unfortunately it was cut, and you cannot put a tree back once it is cut. The first of these violations was of course, as I say, admitted in the report that was sent me, but neither of the violations was sanctioned by the department but are just attributed both to the sub-contractor's poor supervision. This is really the nub of the whole thing. The practice of sub-contracting gives Mathieu an opportunity to disclaim his responsibility. Although, of course the reasoning is questionable.

Now, the Cascades trail, Mr. Chairman, had to be crossed in order to penetrate into the park, nevertheless a paint line had been put south of this Cascades trail in order to keep the operations away from the trail itself. In other words had this original intention been carried out, the only evidence of the cut visible from the trail would have been the single road crossing it. However, the department was somehow persuaded—

and I use that term "persuaded" advisedly—into extending the cut north to the trail itself, and the reason of course is that there happened to be good timber in this area, just south of the trail. The situation now is that there is bush to the north of the trail, and slash to the south of the trail, and I have seen pictures to prove this. The trail itself is useless, or certainly has been desecrated. The official reason was that the trail was no longer in use, but my information is that if the department had consulted the naturalist, they would have discovered that the trails used for conducting hikes are rotated from year to year, and that the Cascades trail had certainly not been abandoned. It just did not happen to be in use in this particular year.

Now, the third and, in the view of my informants, the most serious violation of all, is the cutting along the navigable portions of the French River and along Baptism Creek. This cutting is not confined to a few isolated patches along the river, but is on both sides of the river, and extends for at least a quarter of a mile. My informant said that he had only been up in a motor boat, and was unable to go much further than the junction of the French River and Baptism Creek, although of course, canoes can, and do go much further. This violates explicitly stated policy regarding logging in provincial parks, and the question is raised—and I think it is a very good question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, who was recently Attorney-General—that this kind of action is in violation of The Navigable Waters Act and probably of The Crown Timbers Act. In fact, I believe the regulation is under The Navigable Waters Act that you cannot cut within 300 feet of the water's edge. Yet this cutting was sanctioned by the department, and the only winner in this instance was Mathieu, the losers being the canoeists and even the ordinary campers.

The department argued that the canoe route is unpopular, but this is largely irrelevant. The department also said that only two parties used the route last year. This was the excuse they used. You see, Mr. Chairman, what disturbs me is that there are all manner of excuses used to explain what is tacitly admitted as a violation—namely, cutting right up to the water's edge, and they say, "not many people are using it". This is the open door into an uncontrolled desecration, of Quetico Park and some of the other provincial parks. They state that only two parties used the route last year. My information is that this is based on the fact that only two travel permits for the routes were issued last year at French Lake. The fact is that

relatively few canoe parties leave from French Lake, the majority enter the park from the south end, and I am told that some of these parties use this route—indeed that some of the local outfitters are planning to use this route more frequently.

In other words, the records of the department, for the reason I have just explained do not indicate the number of people who are actually using it, because they approach from another area where records are not kept. Beside the cut, Mathieu's camp is clearly visible from the river. It is a cleared area larger than a football field, and has in it an enormous, two-storeyed bunk house, 150 ft. long and perhaps 30 ft. high, a large cook-house, and numerous stables and shops as well. This is right at the junction of the French River and Baptism Creek. The site of this camp along a canoe route clashes garishly with the popular image of Quetico as the world's finest wilderness canoe country. The cutting to the river's edge and the placing of the camp were completely unnecessary, and the department must bear the blame for the sanctioning of both of these moves. It would have been no trouble at all to have Mathieu build out of sight from the water and prevent him from coming down to the river except, of course, where his roads cross. The only place where the department—this is rather an interesting point, Mr. Chairman. The sanctity, so to speak, of the park itself, is not where the department really was tough. Let me draw attention to where they were tough.

The only place where the department did a competent job was in the matter of seizure of unscaled wood in December, 1961, after repeatedly warning the Omachinsky group—that is the man who was the sub-contractor for Mathieu—against hauling unscaled wood, a loaded truck and stockpiles at Sapawe were seized. I am rather interested in this conduct—that a man who incidentally comes from a family that formerly had a Conservative member in this House, who is one of the top Tories in the area, should be engaged through his sub-contractors in attempting to bring out unscaled wood, a deliberate effort by an established lumberman to try to violate the laws of the province. Not only a lumberman, but the man who, when the hon. Minister went up to look into the situation for which the lack of supervision was responsible, the hon. Minister goes to the very culprit and asks him to come out and view the desecration.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I did not do anything of the kind.

When the hon. member finishes I will talk about it.

Mr. MacDonald: That is fine. I will be interested to hear what the hon. Minister has to say when he talks.

The Fort Frances office backed the scaler to the hilt in this case, much to the consternation of Mathieu, so my informant is told.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Let us hear who the informant is.

Mr. MacDonald: No. I have no intention of disclosing my informant. The hon. Minister is either naive, or something a little bit worse than naive, if he thinks I am. Furthermore, I will suggest to the hon. Minister that the name of my informant is completely irrelevant. What I am bringing to the hon. Minister's attention—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: What he says is pretty irrelevant, too, from what I hear over here.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this is characteristic of this hon. Minister, who is a professional at covering up messes instead of cleaning them up. He is out of the Attorney-General's department because he had that kind of an approach to problems; he is now recreating them in The Department of Lands and Forests at Kapuskasing and I hope he is not going to recreate this kind of an approach now in the situation that I have submitted to him. Because I submit to the hon. Minister that if he goes back and reads the alleged rebuttal of what I raised in the House, that as my informant comments, when the civil servants from the department came and took a look at it their observations indicated they were worried—they had a reason to be worried. They admitted some of the violations in the official report and they tried to produce excuses for the others. All I am doing now is showing just how rather flimsy those excuses are.

Against the background of this revelation of what might be government policy now, I ask this question: how far is this kind of policy going to continue? For example, what will happen on other canoe routes in the park as Mathieu logs more and more of the park? What are the department's intentions regarding the logging in the rest of the park? How does the department reconcile its preaching regarding the park as a wilderness area to be preserved from exploitation, with this practice as shown in these operations?

It might also be mentioned, that in Quetico Park the logging can take place only in the eastern edge of the park without crossing

major canoe routes. Will the department play toady to the Tory politicians and let Mathieu cross the big routes, or will it tell Mathieu where and when to cut, keeping in mind the wilderness and the recreational values in this area as is done in Superior National Forest on the Minnesota side?

I do not know what the hon. Minister is going to say, Mr. Chairman, but the ex-Minister who is really responsible for this has indicated that he has something to say. When they speak, Mr. Chairman, I hope that they do not try to do what they did last year, and that is to dispute the validity of some small details in my comments. I am not going to defend every little detail in the story that I am presenting to you, but I have every reason to believe it is substantially correct.

The point I am making is that there is no doubt in the world that what happened was that a prominent Tory, a businessman, who terrorizes anybody in the community when it serves his purpose, and whose interests have been served by this government for years, was given work permits to cut. He cut right up to nature trails, in violation of the regulations. He cut on both sides of the navigable waters in violation of the regulations in The Navigable Waters Act. There is, generally, a lack of supervision. My query to this department is: Is this the kind of thing we can expect to continue when local Tories crack the whip and want to get work permits to cut in the provincial parks of the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, if you will pardon me, I just wanted to make one statement. The hon. member has said that I invited Mr. Mathieu to come with me to view this situation. I want to assure him that I invited Mathieu to nothing, that Mathieu may have arrived on the scene after I got there. Well, that was his business. I was not going to call a policeman to send him home. But I did not invite him to come with me; I want to assure the hon. member of that.

Mr. MacDonald: The point, Mr. Chairman, is that Mathieu was there at the time the hon. Minister went to see what Mathieu's operations had been doing to the park—which just shows how closely Mr. Mathieu was following the situation to keep it in hand.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, Mr. Chairman, this I think is perhaps a pretty good illustration of ballooning to a point where the balloon is just about to break by its own pressure. If it has not blown to pieces by now, by the

words that the hon. member has already blown into it, I think we can do so without very much trouble; because while he might have had some grounds for making such allegations, they were so minimal as compared with the extent to which he has blown them up that they lose all sense of proportion.

First of all let me say that Quetico Park is not a wilderness area; Quetico Park is a park area. It has something like 1,148,000 acres of bushland and lakeland and trails and that sort of thing. I was in the area just a few days ago myself and I can assure you that it is a tremendously big area, as are many of our northern park areas. To suggest that those park areas would not have to be cleared once in a while, or there would not have to be lumbering operations going on in them in order to have the proper harvest, would be showing a very great ignorance of the whole problem of reforestation and I do not think for a moment he is in that class; I think he understands considerably about the problem of reforestation.

Jim Mathieu—Lumber Limited—is not the old gentleman, who is a remarkable man for his age—he is something over 90 years of age today. This is a grandson, actually, who is operating this company. He has certain cutting rights in that area.

The hon. member described some exit at Highway 11. I point out that no part of Highway 11 is in the park at all; it is all to the north of the park a distance of a mile or so. Anything on Highway 11 of that nature, bursting through Highway 11, would be pretty well out of the park area in any event.

But it is true that Mathieu, in his operation, did trespass in relation to cutting, in relation to the requirements that were laid down for his cutting in the park area. They admitted that, very definitely. They carried on what I do not think would be described as any immense trespass, but it was a trespass on the reserve strips in the Baptista Creek area. It was discovered very early by the department, and the maximum penalty of five times the Crown stumpage charges, which amounted in this case to \$1,058.60, was levied and paid. That, in a nutshell, is what happened there.

There was a trespass. It was located in the early stages; he was fined a penalty of five times the stumpage in relation to the cut in the trespass area, and he has paid that.

I do not think it goes beyond that. I would say this: The strictest of supervision goes in our park areas in regard to lumber operations, and I think my hon. friend is not for a moment going to criticize the mem-

bers of my department individually for failure to carry on their work in that respect. Certainly they are not given the slightest instructions whatever to discriminate between people or anything of that nature in doing their job.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me make one or two comments on this. The hon. Minister is quite right. I am not saying that we should not have cutting in the parks. If you are going to remove over-mature timber which is just going to make the park a less attractive place—selective cutting, managed cutting, is a desirable kind of proposition.

However, what the hon. Minister has done is a standard practice on the part of this Minister and that is to allege that what I have said is grossly exaggerated, and then launch an attack on me. But I am sure, Mr. Chairman, if you were listening carefully you would notice that his counter-attack was very, very weak. Indeed, it admitted most of what I had said.

He says, if I understand the hon. Minister correctly, there was a fine by larger Crown dues in the area of the juncture of French River and the Baptista Creek. But let's consider another example—the original plans were to keep the cutting away from the Cascades trail, but because there happened to be good timber immediately south of the Cascades trail, why was the department persuaded to condone cutting right up to the Cascades Nature Trail? This is the kind of thing that I am talking about.

I am not being critical of the civil servants in the department. As a matter of fact we had some very interesting testimony about civil servants in other departments, before the Roach commission, who are terrorized by people who happen to be very high in the Progressive-Conservative Party. What I am submitting is that it is very difficult to decide, sometimes, who really is running the show in this area: the civil servants or some local big wheels in the Tory Party. In some instances, the "big wheels" try to get away with it.

They did not completely get away with it in this instance, but it is admitted that they were charged because they were hauling unscaled lumber. Now, the hon. Minister tells us that they were fined by five times the regular Crown dues for violations down at the juncture of the French River and the Baptista Creek.

My question, Mr. Chairman, is why does this department even contemplate—why do

they contemplate giving work permits to people who operate in this fashion? I would submit it would be a questionable procedure outside of provincial parks; but I insist that inside of provincial parks anybody with this kind of a work record should not be considered at all when they seek a work permit.

Which brings me to another question, Mr. Chairman. Have any further work permits been given to the Jim Mathieu lumber operation, or any other lumber operation at the present time, in the Quetico Park area?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They have not been cut off their operations at all in relation to this work. They have paid the penalty for what is described by my people here as a trespass matter. It is not a gross trespass such as my hon. friend has suggested and we have had a letter of explanation from them as to what was done and they in effect indicated that they were very—the senior people in that company—were very sorry that this had happened and they paid their penalty for it.

Now I want to make this abundantly clear if I can: the people in northwestern Ontario in the department are headed by Mr. Al Bray, who is an excellent whole regional forester of very high standing. The men under him take their instructions from him where they need it. They do their work at the local level.

I met the gentleman in charge at Quetico Park, and he struck me as an extremely capable man, a few days ago. He has a staff of eight or ten during the winter and more than that, many times that, in the summertime. They are watching the situation and when these things come to their attention, if there is something gone wrong, on their inspection they report it.

There is not the slightest pressure, I can assure the hon. member. I am certain there never was in the case of my hon. predecessor, and there certainly has not been in my case, any pressures at this end, at the headquarters, at all in relation to permitting anything that is in the nature of illegal action on the part of cutters. I have never heard of it personally and I hope I never will. I want to assure the hon. member that there is certainly no fear on the part of any of these people in charge of inspection in relation to doing their job in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the hon. Minister has not had any pressure at his level. They do not need pressure at his level. Up until now they have been successful by their pressuring at the local level. That is point one.

Point two is—and I would submit to the hon. Minister, as the new Minister in this department, that this is a point he might take a careful look at. On issues where there is a clash of interest between what might be described as park interests and timber cutting interests, there is a very great tendency for the timber cutting interests to be predominant. I submit that this is the kind of thing that happened in this instance.

I am not putting a finger on any single individual. This is a human problem, particularly when you have somebody who is pressuring to get timber cutting rights through these work permits.

It is very easy.

He says: "Well, if I am going to operate, I have got to have certain freedom". And these freedoms then begin to violate the regulations of the parks department and the protection of our parks interest.

On this basic conflict of policy, I think if the hon. Minister examines it in a very objective fashion he will find that what happened was that it was the timber cutting interests that were given predominance over the parks interest. If the hand of the people who were there to protect the parks interest had been strengthened none of these things, or certainly many fewer of these things, would have taken place.

However, I want to get some clearer picture of this business of the work permits. The hon. Minister's reply to my question a moment ago is that they have not stopped Mathieu's cutting operations. My information is that he had completed the cut-over in the first work permit, which was north of the French River, that he had been given a second and a third work permit, which was south and west of the junction of the French River and Baptism Creek, and that this had been completed. Now, am I correct that he has completed the first, second and the third working permit, and has he been given others? I would judge from the hon. Minister's comment that the operations have not been stopped, that he may have been given others, but I would like to know.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is information that would be at the local level, I have not got that at my fingertips here at the moment. As far as I know, I would imagine they are carrying on their operations.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. We have in the province a \$3 admission fee for all cars entering provincial

parks. Would the hon. Minister say: will this admission fee be the same through 1963 as it was in 1962?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes, there is no suggestion of any change in the immediate future.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1106 carried?

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Not so soon, Mr. Chairman, I have 45 minutes or an hour to talk on this problem because of the negligence, not of the hon. Minister but of the hon. Ministers before him, in not bringing to the people of Niagara Falls the required amount of dollars to be spent for park purposes to entertain the many tourists that come through that area.

I remember making a statement here two or three years ago to the former Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Frost) and I mentioned the fact that Erie Beach could be a part of the Niagara parks commission system. I realize that the hon. Minister might say to me that should come under the Niagara parks commission, but I believe that with this \$1 million that he had to spend for acquiring land and developing parks, a good place to spend some of that money would be in the Erie Beach area.

I mentioned this to the former hon. Prime Minister and he said: "You make a point with me, I would like to talk with you about that matter". A short while after that I was invited to speak to the Prime Minister, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) and the chairman of the parks commission (Mr. Daley). Last week when these estimates were before this House, the three hon. gentlemen that I referred to were here. I was hoping we could have gotten to that vote at that time, because maybe I could have refreshed their memories. You people must have a large department of pigeon holes. So many projects start and then they wind up in a niche some place and nothing more is said about them, at least not to a member of the Opposition.

I think that this government, because of things that may happen within a year or so, is smart enough to know when to give the token of appreciation to a riding, and so I think that you should look up that file, Mr. Minister, and let me know what did take place.

Let me give you a little of the history. After I mentioned Erie Beach we met with the then Minister, or the chairman of the parks commission, Mr. Daley, and at that time he acquired quite a section of land just

out of St. Catharines, beyond the Niagara parks commission parks system, about 20 miles on the lake front.

I hope the hon. Minister is listening, because this is most important to the people in my area.

They acquired a large park and they named it "The Daley Park". Now that is quite all right, to take funds out of the parks commission where there is quite a lot of profit and spend it in another area when you have developed an area such as ours with the money you have made. Not too long after that, the parks commission, with the assistance of the federal government and the provincial government, acquired Stoney Creek—the batlegrounds and the monument—and have developed that into quite a concession. I understand it is going to be a profit-making unit once they get rolling in that particular park.

I like to see development throughout the whole province, naturally, but I think I would be excused if I quoted just what the former Prime Minister said. He said to the chairman: "You people in the parks commission have a lot of money, I think you should buy Erie Beach; take a look at it, anyhow."

They did me a service by sending a delegation, or a committee, down. The former Minister of Lands and Forests was there, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) was there—and I was glad to see him because he is the man with the money—and also Mr. Daley, the manager of the park, and they found that sufficiently good enough to send their appraisers in. This I get by the grapevine; I hope the former Minister will bring me up-to-date. They sent their appraiser in and looked over the land and found that there were a lot of acres there that could be used right near the lake, about half a mile on the lake front overlooking the city of Buffalo, and so their appraiser came into that area and I understand the owners and the appraiser were only \$20,000 apart in their figures.

Now this is all supposition on my part; that you are that close to acquiring this large park which used to be formerly Erie Beach—which was a large amusement park, with its many paths and nature trails that you speak of; a big dock out into the lake where boats could come and where you could cater to the travelling public by the lake. So I believe, Mr. Minister, that you could acquire these lands to render a service not only to the people of that area but to the travelling public who come into Canada by Fort Erie bridge, the Peace Bridge that is. They find nothing to keep them there for any length

of time so they travel on. I do believe this area could be developed.

Another thing that I would like to draw to your attention: In the Welland-Port Colborne *Tribune* I read that you, the Attorney-General of that time, made the statement that in the next election you were going to bring the Niagara riding back into the Conservative fold—this was a newspaper clipping. And I thought then, why would the hon. Attorney-General go about using government time to go about campaigning to defeat a candidate in Niagara Falls who is trying to do a good job, at least?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: I have the clipping and I will send it to you; I did not think it would be worth reading to an audience such as this. I understand that when an hon. Minister goes to a certain area pertaining to a certain project he sticks to government business which is the proper thing.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): That would help you up there, I suppose.

Mr. Bukator: Oh, no, no, no. I have a lot of respect for this new Minister in the new position that is—

Mr. Reaume: You are the only one that has.

Mr. Bukator: I am going to appeal to his good nature and common sense to provide the necessary parks for the people of that area. I suggest that if you would like to look at Niagara Falls again and take it back into your fold, into the Conservative camp, you just do these little things that I ask you. No doubt, then you could take the credit. You say, "This park is required; we the Conservative government have given it to you; we have a bright young candidate" whoever he might be and you might win. But as long as you come to Niagara Falls and sit in the Brock Hotel and overlook that beautiful river and have wonderful meals with your group, with your own key people—as long as you do that and do nothing more you will never take the Niagara riding back from this little member, I can assure you.

I thought that I would like to ask you, sir, now that I have finished what I have to say, would you be good enough to promise me that you will take a look at this? I think it merits another look from your department.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, yes, I would say to the hon. member. When hon. members opposite have to disappear, he would be one

of the last I would like to see go; I assure him of that. But I would say that the Niagara Parks Commission is a separate—

Mr. Bukator: I know that very well.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: —entity and that particular discussion that the hon. member refers to would be one that the chairman of the Niagara Parks Commission would know a good deal more about than I would. As the hon. member has mentioned Erie Park, we will certainly have a look at that among the many other areas we are looking at in the peninsula and elsewhere.

Mr. Bukator: I am satisfied, but I think the members of your department, your working staff, who do such a great job in the field, will go along with what I have said for many years that that is a nice spot for you to acquire.

Mr. Chairman: Is 1106 carried?

Mr. Reaume: On vote 1106—I want to say to my hon. friend that any time you want to come up to our part of the world, it is perfectly all right.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The last time I went up there you were ill. You were sick the last time I was up there.

Mr. Reaume: I cannot think of anybody I would rather have than you, because the mere presence of you there would really help.

Under this vote, we have been actually asking for a park in the eastern part of Essex county every year since 1951. In this area there is approximately, I would say off-hand, 80,000 people. Then, of course, if you will observe, practically every day in summer there are coming over from the States, over the bridge or tunnel, a long line of people coming from all parts of the States. As you must know, about half of the people entering Canada enter by way of Windsor; other than that in the area of Detroit, I would say in a radius of approximately 50 miles, there are about 4 million people. And of course, every day, and especially on Sundays, there is a flock of people coming over. Now, in the eastern part of Essex county, that is as you go east, of course, you will find no beaches there at all, no beaches that are owned and operated by the province.

A very strange thing happened not long ago. In Essex county we have four seats in the House out of which we hold three, so that you finally in the other seat—Essex South—established a provincial park. I do not know what happened, actually. I do not know

whether it was arranged or not or whether it was by some shrewd planning on the part of the people in power but it just so happened that out of this large, large area in Essex that that one park wound up in the only riding that your party holds in the whole of the county. If I might just point out that in this eastern area practically all the property is owned by private people. There are many thousands of homes there, belonging to people who have come over from the US—we are happy that they are there—people from the opposite side of the line, who have built homes there, summer homes; and when anybody from Windsor, especially the working type of people, want to find a spot where they and their families might go bathing on a hot afternoon, it means actually that they must drive if they want to go on a picnic. For bathing and things of that kind, they must drive approximately 45 miles or more. There is no park operated by this province in the easterly part of Essex. Of course, that area embraces Kent as well and there is no park in that area either. I was wondering when you probably might go up there and think of the problem. There is plenty of land available.

I have heard it said that some of your officials—and of course there are people, we have every year, taking up this problem—but just about the time that we have everything going along fine, the head of the department goes and another one comes, and then we have to start it all over again. I was wondering if we might not have somebody up there and make a study of the possible changes of the acquisition of property in the easterly part of the area. People are there and they are swarming over from the States practically every afternoon in the months of June and July and August. This is something, I think, that probably needs the study of the department.

Now, I know that probably I should not mention this but here is a new book having to do with parks, put out by a different department of the government, and I have looked through this beautiful book, with a nice picture, incidentally, of the Prime Minister in it, and it does—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. Prime Minister takes a good picture.

Mr. Reaume: Oh, he photographs well. This will attract, I am certain, many people to the province. There is not one mention any place in this book at all of the area in which most of the people from the States arrive. It might well be that the people who

actually planned these books might spread it around; but I have searched on every page of this booklet, and not one word is mentioned in there of one of the important areas of the province. I sometimes wonder if the reason for it is the fact that there are in this House three members in the Opposition, and only one over on your side.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister without Portfolio): None over here.

Mr. Reaume: Oh yes, he is over there. In the little place.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There will not be any next time.

Mr. Reaume: Well, I am very happy to hear that my hon. friend informs me that the Speaker is over there; he could be over here for a moment, but actually speaking he is over there, and you know it is always nice when we are informed in the House of something of grave importance by the hon. Minister without; and if ever was an hon. Minister in this House without, and I mean without anything, it is you. I am hoping, the more I look at you, that one day the Premier of the province, whoever he happens to be, will stop this business of picking a Cabinet by looking at the map; that he may someday wind up and pick a Cabinet in keeping brains, and things of that sort, of some importance.

However, I want to thank you for your very informative information advising me that the Speaker is over here. Well, that is fine. It will not be long from now that the Speaker, I think he is a fine fellow, will be again not a permanent Speaker, but permanently employed in a little town in Essex, where he has purchased a little chicken farm. He will go back and hatch little chickens out of little white eggs.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Now that we have a new hon. Minister of this department, I would like to make one more brief plea on behalf of the salvation of the Niagara escarpment. I made this in this House before. I am sorry—I understand the hon. Minister is going to answer previous questions; I will be pleased to withhold my remarks until he does.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I thought my hon. friend had gone on the record putting his viewpoint generally, but I would be glad to say that Essex county is regarded very highly in government circles irrespective of representation. Actually the review of suitable areas includes Essex county just the same as others, and we have a number in mind. We do think that,

geographically, it is correct to say that the south part of the riding has the better beaches. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. Reaume: That is absolutely wrong. That is probably an old report you have there. If you would just come up there some time, I will arrange to drive you around.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I thought my hon. friend was going to assassinate me a few minutes ago if I came up, but I would be glad to come up now and go around with you at the first opportunity.

Mr. Reaume: Would you? That is fine. When?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, right after the session closes.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I could persuade the hon. Minister to take another look at the Niagara escarpment area while he is in such a generous mood. I have made this request several times before in this House with respect to the acquisition by the Ontario government of the Niagara escarpment area, particularly between the area of Grimsby and Niagara Falls, perhaps extending almost as far as Hamilton. This is an area which has been studied by a tri-county committee and, I am sure, that the report has been submitted to the Cabinet and to the particular department charged with this responsibility.

I think it is time to commend the department for the farsightedness and, I believe, the leadership that has been shown in this province in the acquisition of many areas for park lands, for the recreation of the people that will follow us. I think, however, that one mistake is being made in the acquisition of these lands in that the big majority of them are located some considerable distance from the heavy concentration of population of the province.

It has been suggested that the Niagara escarpment area could be acquired now, before it is developed commercially, and could be used for camping and recreational areas in that it would not be as far removed from the built-up areas as are the parks we are now acquiring. I wonder just how much it would cost the citizens of this province to travel to the parks in the north as compared with the area which is available in this escarpment district, and which could be used by a great number of our people.

If we consider the strain and stress on our highways, the traffic problems on a weekend,

either on Highway 401 or Highway 400, as the people make a mass exodus to the recreation areas in the north, and I think this is something that the hon. Minister might very well take into consideration, I think it would be wise if the lands were acquired now. It would be something that future generations would likewise be able to commend this government for. I suggest, on the other hand, that if nothing is done now to preserve this area, one of the last natural areas in which there is a considerable amount of wooded lands, nature trails and the like, will be gone for all time. It will be gobbled up by commercial interests, and I think that the people in these heavily populated areas will suffer for it.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would take this matter under advisement, or if he could advise us whether or not any progress has been made in this direction.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I am very glad to say to the hon. member for Wentworth that the Niagara escarpment is certainly quite an extensive area. It extends, of course, beyond the Niagara part; it goes right up to somewhere in the neighbourhood of Owen Sound and perhaps even beyond. It is an area in which we have a number of conservation authorities operating. There are already quite a number of parks through there and the potential is still very considerable and will certainly be developed.

As a matter of fact, the Bruce trail starts and has several hundred miles of possibilities in that area; the hon. member for Bruce and myself, sir, after the next general election in Ottawa, both intend, whichever one wins on that, to walk quite a considerable distance along that trail. We think it is a good trail.

Mr. Whicher: You want a park at the end of that trail.

Mr. Roberts: Well, I would say that from March 4 to 6 there is a conference on North American wildlife. We will have representation at that conference, and the study of that particular part of the subject in relation to the acquisition of some of these areas will undoubtedly be a fact.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague from Windsor-Walkerville some time ago mentioned the interests that we in the county of Essex have with regard to marinas. I worked during the past year with your predecessor for the establishment of a marina in my riding.

However, due to the lack of interest and the red tape and so forth, the interest of the parties dropped.

I would like to know, Mr. Minister, what is going to be the policy of your department in the future for the establishment of marinas in the provincial parks of the province. The boating interest has increased considerably and we in our area are doing all we can to establish marinas. The city of Windsor itself at the present time is considering the establishment of marinas along the waterfront in the downtown area to attract people who will be using the beautiful Detroit river in the summertime. I am just wondering whether the department has any policy for the establishment of marinas and whether the amount of money that you have mentioned in your speech from the Throne—that you are going to spend some \$200 million for acquiring park properties along the Great Lakes—whether a certain amount of that will be used for the development of marinas.

Then while I am on my feet, I want to bring up this question also. If the hon. Minister will recall, some time ago there was an announcement from the federal government that Point Pelee National Park may be turned over to the province. Has there been any decision of the federal government and what is going to be the attitude of the province to acquiring this park?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say to my hon. friend that I was having a little difficulty in just getting whether he was talking about marina or arena, but I take it you are referring to water in summertime and not an arena.

Mr. Belanger: Marinas—M-a-r-i-n-a-s.

Mr. Newman: You do not expect a marina in a park, do you?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No. I do not either!

Mr. Newman: You are not that way are you?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No. I thought I already dealt with marinas earlier on. Perhaps my hon. friend was not in his seat when I did it. The policy is we are having a very general survey made in connection with that subject and there is a very definite intention to integrate harbour facilities for pleasure boats; marinas, as they are being called; in a wider interpretation of meaning in relation to this whole recreational programme for the future.

Mr. Belanger: Just a minute! All I hear is that you are going to have a study. Now what

do you mean by just a study? Have you not got any definite ideas of what you are—

Mr. Newman: My goodness, you cannot tell me that the increase in the boating business in the last five, eight to ten years, I would say, has left the department at the point where they are just starting to make a study. This is the thing that we are trying to find out. Have you any ideas at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes. The marina survey that I mentioned is being proceeded with. The preliminary report is anticipated, and it is quite possible that it will be available to be tabled in the House before this House rises—that is the preliminary. The general programme I have referred to is in relation to carrying on this broad programme if the House gives the authority to do so.

Mr. Belanger: If they had given me that in the first place! Why did you not do it in the first place?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister still did not answer the question that the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich asked concerning the Point Pelee National Park. There was talk last summer that the provincial government was going to take over the park. Now has the talk any basis of fact or not?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The answer is no.

Mr. Newman: The provincial government will not be taking over the park? That is right?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Not at this present time. We have not had a request as far as that goes.

Mr. Newman: All right. We are satisfied to hear that.

Mr. P. Manley (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister a request, shall I put it that way, of a number of people in Stormont county, especially in the area of the village of St. Andrews.

We have there a very famous landmark. We have the first Prime Minister of the province buried there, as well as the late Simon Fraser, the great explorer. A number of people have approached me to see if the hon. Minister's department would not do something to acquire some of the land right next to the burying ground and along the Raisin River.

I think it would be an excellent setting for a small park and I think that it would be a place where the people would come—and of course they do come there to see that very historical spot. If you had a small park with some picnic tables and benches it would certainly be a place where people could rest. It could be made into a very attractive little park there. I would like to know if the department would consider that and have someone take a look at it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I might say to my hon. friend that we have had some preliminary work in that area. I will be glad to have that particular point examined if it has not already been examined.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the hon. Minister, how far along is the development of the provincial park in Huron county?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Where is the area to which you are referring?

Mr. Gaunt: Huron county.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Of course, the whole county—if you are referring to the whole county of Huron—why, in that area we have a number of possible projects because Huron, and especially on the Lake Huron side, is one of those very favourite areas for beach possibilities. We have quite a number of books that have been prepared in connection with the survey of the Lake Huron district and they are being looked at carefully. I would not wish to start to pinpoint areas just at the moment, for various reasons which I think my hon. friend would understand.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell us what direction the officials of the parks branch have over the parks of the conservation authorities, if any?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think once the parks have been established they are run by the authority, as my hon. friend knows. The authority is made up of provincial government representatives or nominees; local authority, local municipality nominees; and then we have what is known as, I think it is, the district field officer. We have a district field officer in each district attached, practically *ex officio* in all cases, to conservation authorities. Through this field officer we get reports and we pass on our views and suggestions. There is no other direction than that.

Mr. Nixon: Nothing more than that?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think that is correct, except that of course in any development the major plan must be approved by the department before it is undertaken.

Mr. Nixon: Your parks branch would recommend capital grants for setting up these parks, but they do not contribute anything to the maintenance of them. Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Once they are taken over!

Mr. Nixon: If the hon. Minister should consider helping with the maintenance of some of these parks it would be a great thing. I had the pleasure of attending a meeting of the Grand Valley conservation authority three or four weeks ago. They said that although they got help and direction in setting the parks up in the first place, that sometimes they hesitated to do so because the responsibility of maintaining them over the years was something that could not be accurately predicted. They sometimes hesitated to do this, to set these parks up, because there was no maintenance grant. I wonder if you would comment on the possibility of such a grant being instituted.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say to the hon. member for Brant that the thinking to date at least has been that these parks should become self-supporting as soon as possible after they are established; and that the authority itself, by virtue of the fees that they are charged from revenues derived in relation to the operation, should be able to break even. Now that is the thinking at the present time.

Mr. Nixon: Still on this point, there was some confusion as far as the local conservation authorities are concerned, with the claim that people who came to the conservation authority parks with provincial stickers on their windshields should be allowed to get in without paying the local cost. Evidently there were some people who made quite a disturbance about this. It is obvious that they are separate organizations but perhaps some working arrangement might be accomplished along these lines.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think that is worth looking into. At the moment of course they would not be entitled to enter but I think perhaps that is something that we may take a good look at.

Mr. Nixon: The last thing that came from this meeting that I attended was that there was a feeling that the money that was forthcoming from the department for the original

capital cost of developing these parks was very late in coming through—sometimes 15 months late—and they had to revamp their costs because of this and sometimes their original purchase agreement had to be changed.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think it is a three-way arrangement, as far as this government is concerned. The accountant informs me that we are paying, even in some cases before the audit is complete in order to assist, and getting the funds into circulation.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): The amount of money that was set aside a year ago for park improvement—was it more or less than is being set aside this year?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Was it used? Is that the question?

Mr. Wintermeyer: How much was appropriated last year?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: \$1.5 million last year but \$500,000 of that is being transferred now to the land acquisition vote, so that, in effect, we are asking the same number of dollars this year as last year.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1106 agreed to.

Vote 1107 agreed to.

On vote 1108:

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, under vote 1108 dealing with timber, I should like to ask the hon. Minister—I will put it this way: Last year under the table or over the table, but very quietly, the option that Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company has near Sioux Lookout for some 937 square miles of timber country, was renewed for a period of one year to, I believe, May 1, 1963. I have heard nothing either above the table or below the table this year, about the present status of this option and I wonder if the hon. Minister might tell me what the situation is and what the possibilities are of Anglo-Newfoundland actually developing this particular area.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The position there is the Anglo-Newfoundland Company has not presented any plans for the development referred to by the hon. member for Kenora as of the present time, and in the normal course of events that licence would expire shortly. Involved in the expiry would be the possible forfeiture of the deposit which amounts to \$250,000. Of course, the main purpose of the granting of the licence in the first place—

or granting of the rights; this is scarcely a licence—and the negotiating and the spending of certain amounts of money by the company in connection with roads and that sort of thing and the payment by them of various charges was all with the view to possible development of that area, for the pulp and paper industry.

Whether or not something will develop that would either partly take the place of it or be related to it, still remains to be seen, but at the moment, I think, in answering the question, I would say that I do not expect that this company is going to give us any assurance of proceeding within the next few weeks.

Mr. Gibson: I wonder if the hon. Minister would advise us as to whether or not any negotiations have been carried on between him and representatives of the Anglo-Newfoundland Company with respect to this option.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say that, to be quite frank with the hon. member, outside one approach some while back, by way of a feeler as to whether or not we were going to insist on the deposit being forfeited or not, the answer would be “no” because they have not come forward with any project, and unless there is some very good reason in joint efforts to develop the industry, the deposit would be forfeited.

Mr. Gibson: If I might deal with another subject under this particular estimate: In connection with these cutting permits to settlers in the past years, as I understand the situation these permits were originally to be issued to true settlers, those people actually living on the land who were attempting to establish farms and related type operations. The idea was, of course, to aid these people who were living on a bare subsistence level. In recent times, I understand these particular cutting permits have been issued more on a welfare basis, in a haphazard system, with no great reliance on the fact that a man is, or was, a settler at the time the permit was issued.

This particular method of issuing these permits led to a number of abuses. The basic abuses, I understand, Mr. Chairman, is that the cutting method, utilized as a result of this system, tended to lead to the ignoring of areas that were over-mature in terms the foresters use. In other words, those areas that should have been cut were not cut for a number of reasons, basically because there was no incentive for anyone to cut in these areas. Now, judging from my conversation

with the officials of The Department of Lands and Forests, it would appear that these permits are issued on a different basis in every region of the province; and as I understand the situation, there is no overall co-ordinated policy in the issuing of these permits. As we have seen from recent events in some cases the rather chaotic system for issuing these permits has led to other abuses and other problems which the government has failed to handle. I would ask this hon. Minister if any consideration has been given to establishing some coherent, overall policy whereby these permits would be given on a reasonable basis to the people who most needed them. Secondly, has the hon. Minister given any consideration to the expansion of the stumpage appraisal method of setting stumpage rates in this province?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well it was my intention, Mr. Chairman, to make a short speech but when this vote was called and some portion of what I had prepared to say would in effect apply to what my hon. friend is referring to—I will try to go beyond that at the end of this short statement and deal a little more specifically with what he said. We have in the province a fast forest production potential and particularly in the accessible forest area. The accessible forest area—the term would in a broad way refer to everything south of the Albany River and the extension westward to Lac Seul and the English River to the border. Anything north of that, while it has potential, is not included in the term “accessible forest area” as shown in the forest resources inventory. When one considers the allowable cut of wood fibres of all species, in these accessible forest areas—and when I say “allowable cut” I am referring to the carefully calculated annual allowable cut—it can be asserted with confidence that there is a substantial supply for future needs, looking to great growth in the province and in uses not only in the species presently used but in others such as jack pine, poplar and birch now in great surplus supply. As a matter of fact, at the present time the allowable cut is about double the actual cut. On first thought, critics might say that this shows lack of full exploitation of our resources, but I would like to draw attention to the following four points:

1. There must always be a substantial reserve for contingencies such as fire and disease.

2. There must also be a reasonable and sensible allowance for possible expansion.

3. The policy of the government, as I indicated earlier in my remarks, has been

and, I would think, would continue to be that it desires assistance of the local economy by a certain amount of cutting by settlers.

4. The effects of the recent discovery of utilization of chips previously mentioned.

One of the hon. gentlemen opposite indicated—the hon. member for York South—in his view that there was a lavish handing over of natural resources to certain favoured big operators. The doubters would, in pursuance of his philosophy, approach the matter in a very different way. However, I would like to state that in the view of the responsible experts of this department, the policy which is being followed goes considerably beyond anything recommended in the Kennedy report in our management planning, particularly by the management units with respect to sustained yield across the province.

Without going into a general discussion on world trade and competition, new uses, and many other avenues relating to the economics of the forest industry, I think we can take pride in the co-operation that exists in this province resulting in the industry as a whole being in a healthy condition and certainly showing its capability to keep pace with world trade competition.

As a matter of fact, substantial amounts of money have been invested by private industry in their mills and their latest equipment, and provision for future expansion, as already indicated in some cases, is close at hand. These are matters that are calculated in matters of billions of dollars, certainly in excess of \$1 billion. They are matters which must be taken into account in policy. I think the latest figures show something like more than 16,000 people employed in bush operations in the logging pulp industry and in the mills themselves; and another 27,000 thereabouts, so that you have people employed in this great woods industry in the province in the neighbourhood of 43,000 or 44,000.

The government, in granting cutting licences, some of them of considerable mileage, to individual operators, is of course always protected by virtue of The Crown Timber Act. I would draw particular attention to section 26 of that Act, which contains the following provision:

1. Notwithstanding anything in any general or special Act, or in any regulation, or in any licence, or in any master plan, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, having regard to reasonable business requirements of the licensee, may cancel or vary any licence in respect of one or more parts of a licensed area or in respect of any type or size of timber designated by him. By virtue of this provision

the Crown is in a position to distribute and redistribute, as the need arises, in relation to new industry or new uses. That situation arose pretty recently in a case in the north, where there was a definite redistribution and rearranging to meet the needs of two or three different companies in relation to their previous holdings and what would be the most practical way of cutting in relation to their present needs. That is all something that goes on in the department.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask the hon. Minister: Can that power be exercised at any time, or only when the licence has run out?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No. It can be exercised at any time, having in mind reasonable business requirements. We had a case where a mill was set up to go into operations, without dealing with the department for timber operations, and then the owners came to see if they could get wood. It was fortunate enough that we were able to find these means of getting it for them out of several other areas that were already earmarked for other purposes; the type of wood that was required was there and we were able to work that out, but it is certainly better for the people to come to the government first with their plans before they get involved in capital expenditures and not know where their source of supply is. People like the Perim brothers in Cochrane did just that and got everything set up before they came in with that new veneer plant which is now in course of construction, and to which perhaps some reference was made to when the hon. members were touring last September in that area.

The question of different, varying conditions. Perhaps the hon. member for Kenora, Mr. Chairman, will recall that. I mentioned it in my remarks earlier when I was giving an outline of the permit system for settlers, cutting production in the Kapuskasing area. There are widely varying conditions from district to district and that involves some difference in approach on that account. At that time I referred to the position in the Port Arthur district where the Fort William management unit is located; I outlined the system there.

I would point out that all that appears in *Hansard*, and I will not repeat it now. I would point out that we have, definitely, forms and regulations and instructions that go out in connection with cutting licences and there should not be any great difficulty in being able to follow them in the particular district concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York

South raised some question the other day on these estimates concerning prices being paid to settlers for their pulpwood and referred to The Settlers Pulpwood Protection Act, and to some legislation he said existed in the province of Quebec, alleging that as a result of the Quebec legislation better prices were being paid to the settlers. I presume he was referring to a marketing scheme that was set up in 1961, under which certain companies in Quebec were required to pay fixed prices for pulpwood.

I am having inquiries made into that whole field of price, but I would point out that it must be remembered that under our system of forest management units the location of available wood is very important and has a great deal to do with the price. Investigations take place constantly in relation to price differential; at the present time the supervisor of the timber section of this department is collecting material in connection with several areas to make cogent comparison and to see just what the picture does appear to be in detail. I think, perhaps—I see the hon. member for Kenora is not in his seat, but he is over there—I think I have covered both in this, but if there is anything further he wants perhaps he will ask me.

Mr. MacDonald: Now that the hon. Minister has raised this, I would like to pick up on a couple of the points he has just discussed.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would like to say that I was really doing this in relation to what the hon. member for York South raised, as I understood it, in his remarks. I was trying to bring him the answers as I saw them.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, some years ago, when I was raising in the House this rather controversial issue in the north country—and it persists as a controversial issue notwithstanding the hon. Minister's explanation, which would seem to suggest that the problem has now been met—the hon. Minister said that if a new industry wants to be established the department can and do make readjustments of limits to provide them with the necessary supply of raw materials. I repeat: Hardly a period of six months goes by without another instance getting into the headlines of protests on behalf of people in the industry in northern Ontario. The one that comes to my mind most recently was last October or November when a lumber operator with a mill in the Nipigon area—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is the very one I referred to a moment ago.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the one the hon. Minister referred to?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They got their mill before they got their wood, but they have got their wood now. That is the one I referred to.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, as I said when I was last speaking on this estimate, I spoke to one of the long established industries in Port Arthur a year or so ago. I had a lengthy discussion with some of the officers of that company. They had been trying for years to get something other than an *ad hoc* arrangement in terms of getting a supply almost on sufferance from the limits of existing companies in the area.

My problem, Mr. Chairman, is this: I cannot quite reconcile the continued protests and complaints throughout the north with regard to this situation with the hon. Minister's contention that it is all being met. It would seem to me that if the situation is being met that these complaints would cease. and that they would all be happy up in that great blessed Tory land of northern Ontario.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Purest city in Ontario.

Mr. Whicher: Liberal land.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, in the area where some of these people operate you would think it was a Tory land. However, we will see what reaction is produced in the north country when the hon. Minister's statement suggesting everything is in hand up there reaches them and they have time to ponder it.

Let me deal now with The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act. I am glad to see that the hon. Minister, as a new incumbent in this office, is looking into comparable legislation in other provinces to which I drew attention. What I am curious about, Mr. Chairman, is this: without spelling out once again, as I did both last year and this year, the various powers that are available under The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act by way of assuring these people of something more than just a position of helpless exploitation by the companies—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Would the hon. member let me interrupt there?

Mr. MacDonald: Fine, but just let me ask my question: Have any of the powers of The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act ever been exercised by this government?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes! The answer is yes. But the position I would like to draw to my hon. friend's attention is that The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act relates to production on the settlers' lands and does not relate to production by settlers on Crown lands. That is a very important difference.

Mr. MacDonald: Suppose we accept the difference for the moment. The problem is: has The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act been exercised to make certain that these settlers will get a price that is a closer approximation to what the company would have to outlay themselves if they were doing the cutting on their own limits?

The hon. Minister's reply was that some of the powers have been exercised. Maybe this is getting down into details and it is a bit unfair to put the question to him, but let me try it on for size. When and where and under what circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There have been one or two definite negotiations under that Act, or the Act used as a means of negotiating, in the recent past according to my instructions.

Mr. MacDonald: Have they resulted in getting the settlers any better protection?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The answer is yes. They did in the particular instances in which they were used.

Mr. MacDonald: Where were those instances?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am not in a position to give any more details than that at the moment.

Mr. MacDonald: I think we are back where we started. I suspected we were going to end there. We have gone around in a circle and we are back to the starting point.

The hon. Minister has indicated that he is looking at the way governments in adjoining provinces are handling this problem. I would hope that when he looks at it that he would give some consideration to exercising some of the far-reaching powers on behalf of these settlers, so that they are not in a position of such helpless exploitation by these companies.

Two or three years ago, if I may just make this addendum to my comment and leave it for this year—I will be back next year, make no mistake about it on this issue and many other issues.

Mr. Chairman, I recall two or three years ago the government acknowledged the exist-

ence of the problem that these people have by an amendment to the co-operative legislation which made it possible for pulpwood settlers to get together in a co-operative and to market—presumably as though they were a co-operative group under The Farm Products Marketing Act. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, this was a gesture acknowledging the existence of the problem. But it was an idle gesture, because it is so easy for a company not to play fair with any group that seeks to organize itself, particularly when this group is going to be supplying only a very small proportion of the requirements of the company.

All the company has to do in face of a request for negotiations from this co-operative is to say—we will not buy anything for the next two or three years and the co-operative collapses. So that while theoretically this is a very fine idea, in practice I do not think anything is happening and I do not think anything can happen.

I submit you have a situation here in which these settlers who have the right to cut, whether it be on Crown land or whether it be on their own land and sell it to companies, that these are little people who will never have sufficient bargaining power to cope with these big companies. My guess, and I think it is a very safe guess, is that The Settlers' Pulpwood Protection Act was originally passed, undoubtedly on the eve of an election, as an indication that the government then was giving consideration to protecting these people, giving them a stronger position in the law, so that their bargaining power would be stronger when they attempted to sell to these big companies.

The hon. Minister is being rather vague as to exactly when and where and under what circumstances the Act has been implemented. I suggest to him you are never going to solve this problem unless you implement some sort of legislation such as this and the government in effect steps in and backs the little fellow in his uneven negotiations with the big companies.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I mentioned the Quebec marketing plan, which is the way it apparently is done there. It is drawn to my attention that settlers in the North Bay and Sudbury areas have been discussing organization under The Department of Agriculture marketing legislation here in this province. So that there is perhaps a way for them to look after themselves if they want to.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister had been listening to me, I have just recounted

how an amendment was made to the Act that permits this, no more than two or three years ago. I have expressed a view that I hope experience will prove that I am wrong, but my guess is that a little group like this, which is going to supply only a small proportion of the requirements of any company, is going to be in a very weak position to come and say: "Now look, we want to negotiate with you; we are only getting \$16 a cord and we feel that we should be getting \$20." What they are likely to be told by the tough-minded businessmen is go chase themselves. They will not do any negotiating and the organization will not survive to do any negotiating. However, if events prove me to be wrong I will be delighted.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It represents 15 per cent or more of the total production, you know.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It represents 15 per cent or more of the total production. It is quite a substantial figure.

Mr. MacDonald: If one has control of only 15 per cent and the other 85 per cent is in the control of the company, whether on their own cutting or from elsewhere, you are in a very weak bargaining position.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not want to get into an argument, but I have already outlined that there is very definite policy involved in this in connection with the settlers being given a proper percentage.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to come to a final point, and this is really extremely important. We in this House have been giving a good deal of thought to the tragic developments up in the Kapuskasing area in the last few weeks. I would be the last person who would want to minimize the importance of a situation in which human lives were lost, but in the long run the issue of fundamental importance facing us as members of this Legislature is that we have the kind of law which is going to assure us of a perpetuation of the forest resources of this province for future generations.

In my introductory remarks to the estimates of this department I spelled out the ineffective attempts to come to grips with this for the last 30 or 40 years. I suggested at the time—and my examination of the debate last year when the government brought in on its own initiative an amendment to The Crown Timber Act, strengthens my conclusion that we have slipped back. We are away back

near scratch in terms of coming to grips with this issue.

Let me start by asking the hon. Minister a question. As a result of the amendment to The Crown Timber Act last year, which made it possible for the government to enter into a bilateral arrangement with each company rather than having overall regulations for regeneration, will the hon. Minister inform me how many of these agreements have been reached with companies that are now engaged in cutting operations across the province?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The answer is 41.

Mr. MacDonald: I am now trying to get this into perspective. How many companies are in operation in the province cutting with approved management programmes? Approximately how many? I am not really interested in the exact number.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would like the timber branch to give me a figure here. I suppose if the hon. member would look at page 140 of the book here he might get some idea of it.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister's officials cannot come to a conclusion on the basis of the figures, I am not going to try to estimate it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say approximately between 400 and 500. It is 600 licensees in the province.

Mr. MacDonald: This really makes my point stronger than I thought it was. Mr. Chairman, one year ago—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Now just a moment until I get that figure, because half an answer is not too good—any better than that kind of a question. But there is a provision that under 50 square miles this plan does not take effect, and that would involve a fairly large number of the 600 involved.

Mr. MacDonald: What? Half of them?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: More than half, as I understand.

Mr. MacDonald: More than half of them! Well, let us suppose, for example, that it is 400 of the 600; that means you have 200 of them over 50 square miles, and you have 41 agreements that have been reached in the past year.

Mr. Chairman, this is what I want to try to emphasize to the House: A year ago this government moved on this new approach to

this problem. I am not arguing against their action, because while I have been pleading for years for them to make up their minds what the requirements should be for regeneration, I would be the first one to concede that the requirements will have to vary from area to area. Therefore it was not possible to have an overall set of regulations, when the government came in and said, "Well, fine. We will negotiate *ad hoc* agreements with each company." This at least had sense—if we were certain that the government was going to move with vigour in doing this. But now we have had conclusive evidence that they are not doing it.

Let us, for purposes of trying to make my point, accept the fact that 400 of the 600 licensees are less than the 50 square miles, and 200 of them are in excess. The hon. Minister has just said that they have had agreements with 41 of them in the past year. Now the section of the Act which they replaced, Mr. Chairman, was one which obligated every company in every year of cutting to bring in a regeneration programme. So in the first year they have displayed so little vigour in terms of coming to grips with this, so that they have approximately 41 of the 200—the arbitrary figure that we have picked—operators that they have worked out agreements with. This just proves to me what I suspected from the outset, that this government—and it is not only true of this government, it is true of every government, Liberal and Tory, since the first world war, or since the Drury administration—has never come to grips with this problem of protecting the future of our forest resources in the province of Ontario.

Let us get down to the essence of the thing as it came into the House last year. It is rather interesting to go back and look at it. The amendment that was made to the Act was a most inoffensive-looking amendment. In Bill No. 56, subsection 4 of the said section 25 is repealed and the following is substituted therefor. And the new subsection 4:

The Minister may enter into an agreement with the licensee for the promotion and maintenance of the productivity of the licensed area.

This was a substitute for the obligation placed on the licensee when The Crown Timber Act was passed in 1953. In 1953 what in effect the Act said was that no licensee shall do any cutting until he has got approval of his cutting programme for that year and has provided evidence to the department of a regeneration programme.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that there have been no real programmes for regeneration because they varied, with such wide variations across the province, that one could not come to the conclusion that if this one was satisfactory then another one could not be satisfactory. But you wiped out all that; you came in with this amendment, which says the licensee must sign an agreement "for the promotion and maintenance of the productivity;" and now the hon. Minister says that in the first year they have signed only 41 of these.

Let me recall last year's debate, just to indicate the approach of the government. Frankly I think it is just deceiving the people of this province who think that the government is protecting the trust that they hold for future generations. The former hon. Minister (Mr. Spooner) at the time that he introduced the bill made this comment. It is found on page 509 of *Hansard* for February 20 last year:

The second section provides for placing the responsibility for regeneration of cut-over areas on the licensee are deleted from the present Act and the Minister of Lands and Forests with this amendment is authorized to enter into agreements for this purpose.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what they did was delete from the Act that section that placed a responsibility on the licensee for regeneration. In the first year they have covered only a fraction of the people cutting, with this alternative procedure which was going to protect us and make certain that we get regeneration. This is a shocking failure to face up to the responsibilities of the government and the department in protecting the resources of this province.

I was interested in looking through more sections of the debate. For example, I said on page 559 on February 22:

I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister would explain why the government has felt that this change should be made and whether it is not going to open the door to an uneven application of the law. In other words, in one area a company would be forced to carry through with a regeneration policy that is much more vigorous, and in another area another company would be permitted to get away with a less vigorous regeneration policy.

And then the Minister of the day answered, and his comment was this:

Having this amendment to the Act the foresters then will be able to analyze the

needs of the regeneration of the forest based upon the actual situation as it exists from time to time. From that we will be able to enter into agreement with a particular operating company or companies so that the regeneration which will be required to be assisted, that is, assisted beyond the forces of nature itself, will be decided upon for a particular area.

Now the hon. Minister comes in and is informed by his department that in effect they have done very little on this; they have reached agreements with only 41 licensees; there are literally hundreds of licensees with whom they have reached no agreement; therefore the operators are free to ignore regeneration, which I submit is what they have been doing down through the years. That is the reason why the government removes this section from their Act. But they bring in something else which is equally ineffective.

Mr. Chairman, I raise this—I do not raise it with any hope that the government is going to act, because this government and, I repeat, governments for 40 years have not acted to protect the heritage of the people. But just to show you how we were deceived into believing that something really was going to be done, I put this question to the hon. Minister last year. At the bottom of page 560:

Does this mean that in effect, in the regeneration of the forests, the government is willing to tolerate—because of the nature of the industry that has been established there—a regeneration of the inferior species, rather than trying to keep as high a proportion of the premium species in our forests?

In other words, if I may go back and illustrate the point I was trying to focus attention on, Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of situation you have up in the Long Lac area where you have two companies on either side of the road, and their approach to regeneration is fundamentally different.

The Kimberly-Clark approach is that you cannot expect nature to regenerate it, that it will do it to about 15 per cent and you have to have artificial regeneration for about 85 per cent. Roughly speaking, Marathon's approach on the opposite side of the road is the very opposite, that nature can do 85 per cent of the job and all you have to do is fill in the remaining 15 per cent. If one accepts the approach of Marathon, it simply means that in many of these areas your next forest crop is not going to be in the premium

species of spruce, it is going to be in some of the inferior species.

So I put the question to the hon. Minister. I said: are you going to insist in these agreements with companies that in the recreation of the next forest crop, for the next 50, 60, or 75 years, we are going to protect and maintain the premium species? And what was his answer, Mr. Chairman? His answer was this:

Mr. Speaker, in every instance we will attempt to improve the forest by regenerating the superior species, as the hon. member calls them.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is really a ludicrous situation. Not only have they given no evidence that they are going to re-create the premium species, but in the majority of cases they have not yet reached an agreement. So they have left these people—who get resources from us and pay so little that the amount of money coming into the department is not even sufficient to finance the department, which means that we, the people of Ontario, have to dip into our pockets to finance a department that is serving an industry which is based on our resources—and the net return to us is nil. It is a minus quantity.

We have to dip into our pockets. And in spite of all that, we have not even had a government that has had the intestinal fortitude to stand up to this industry, to face its responsibilities in protecting the heritage of future generations and make certain that they will have agreements that will see that the forest crop for future generations is going to be regenerated.

The hon. Minister has proven the point. I put it to the House once again, and I suspect that we have got to come back next year and the year after—I hope we will not have to, we will turf this government out and get a government in—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Let me say this, if the Liberals want to intervene when I was trying to make my point: if there is one issue on which the Liberals have proven that they are sycophantic and just slaves to the dictates of this industry up there, it is this one!

The leader of the Liberal Party has gone around—and has suggested that we should reduce our forest resources taxes to nil.

In other words, instead of us getting a few million in terms of revenue to meet the needs

of The Department of Lands and Forests, what they are suggesting is that we should reduce the revenue that we are getting and dip into our pockets even more. When they are doing this—

An hon. member: You are really worried.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not worried, I am just pointing out some facts to you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: When they are doing this, Mr. Chairman, their words are the words of Charlie McCarthy, but the Bergens are the Ambridges and those who have taken the place of the Ambridges in the forest industry. I am wondering how much is going into their slush funds as a bribe for not being willing to protect our resources—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: —for them not being willing to protect the future resources of this province any more than this government has. A plague on both your houses; it is another case of the pot calling the kettle black.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to let this balloon go without being punctured either.

First of all, let it be clear that the government accepts full responsibility in this field of reforestation. Let that be made clear! The latest policy is for the owner, which is the Crown, to accept full responsibility for regenerating all the cut-over areas. We now have a federal-provincial agreement providing for federal assistance.

Mr. MacDonald: How many years are you going to exercise it?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. member has taken up a lot of time and I will have to put something on the record here. Perhaps for everyone who reads what he says in *Hansard*, a dozen will read what is on the record as the government's position.

The department operated seven main nurseries located at Dryden, Fort William, Kemptville, Midhurst, Orono, Swastika, and St. Williams, and four small nurseries at Chapeau, Gogama, Sault Ste. Marie and White River. First of all, you have to have trees to start with, you have to have treeings to start with, they do not just come up overnight like that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Approximately 44 million!

I am going to give these figures because if you cannot look at figures and accept them, at least the figures do not lie.

Approximately 44.2 million trees were supplied from these nurseries during the current fiscal year; 34.6 million for Crown projects and 9.6 million for private lands. Production of 57.5 million will be reached in 1964-65. That is an increase of about 18 or 19 million in that period or more.

Production is more than that, it is about 23—no, I beg your pardon, it is about 14 million of an increase in that period. Approximately one million are being used for nursery production during the current year and a similar amount will be used for this work in the fiscal year 1963-64.

Now tree seed, of course, is the beginning of this. The department collects tree seed required for its nursery programme and operates a tree seed processing plant at Angus, Ontario. Cones and other unprocessed seed are collected from trees throughout the province by our district organization.

The seed crop again in 1962 was only fair and seed collection targets will have to be increased in 1963-64, providing seed is available, to meet the year's requirements and rebuild reserves for future years. First of all you have to have enough seed to do the job!

A total of \$135,000 is being used for this work this year and a like amount will be used in the fiscal year 1963-64. The next seed inspectory at Angus is expected to be in operation in the late fall of 1963 at an estimated cost of \$225,000 for building and equipment. It is designed to process in excess of 27,000 bushels of cones.

Then comes the planting on lands managed by the department. I mentioned a moment ago the figures—34.6 million. Then I have in my hand a list of tables by districts showing just what has happened and the increases involved in most cases in the various districts concerned. This is a long list, perhaps I would be permitted to table it without reading it in full.

Mr. MacDonald: It is in the book, you do not even have to table it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is given by district. If it is in the book that is sufficient perhaps for the moment.

But the total, if one looks at the Chapleau

district—I will just take an example—in 1961-62 in the Chapleau area the number of trees planted was 2,691,500; in 1962-63 it was 3,580,000, an increase of somewhere in the neighbourhood of 900,000 trees. In Cochrane district there were an additional 200,000-odd trees; in the Fort Frances district there were 800,000 additional trees over the previous year; in Gogama there was a 300,000-odd increase; in Kemptville area there were nearly 700,000 trees increase; in Kapuskasing it was about the same; in Lindsay a slight increase; in Port Arthur about the same; in Swastika a slight increase; Sault Ste. Marie, a slight increase; Sudbury, an increase; Tweed, an increase; and so on. The total increase is something like three million additional trees in 1962-63 over 1961-62 and that represents quite a substantial increase.

The department managed over 160,000 acres of land for counties, townships and conservation authorities during the current fiscal year. It is expected that the acreage will be increased during the fiscal year 1963-64 by approximately 13,000 acres. About \$500,000 is being used in this work this year and a like amount will be used next year.

In the field of private forestry, nursery stock may be furnished to owners of land for forestry work and approximately 9.6 million trees were furnished to owners of private land.

The forecast for 1963-64 is 48 million trees—total dispositions from nurseries 48 million trees—which is a substantial increase over the estimate for this year of 44.2 million trees. There again is an indication in figures of the policy we are carrying out in relation to this very important matter.

The forest inventory is proceeding and I could give a good deal of information concerning the technical ways in which this is being carried out, such as re-photographing and many other methods being used to get an accurate forest inventory. With the Canadian government participating, this year we expect a few hundred thousand dollars will be spent. We get a dollar for our dollar and that will be \$400,000, I understand, in connection with that work.

Now I think also I should say that under the management units to which I referred previously a great deal of this work is carried on by the company and a great deal by the government and that will carry on, notwithstanding that we are assuming full responsibility. The actual acreage covered is 184,000 square miles of this province covered at the present time by this type of reforestation under control, under management. That is a

very substantial amount of mileage in this province.

I think I should say also, since this policy has been attacked and the department attacked, I think I should say something about expansion of the forest products industry in recent years. Actually, and I have in my hand here a list showing the different companies, the expansion that has taken place in the capacity of mills during the period 1950-1962 is substantial. For instance in newsprint, the Abitibi, this great "octopus" that my hon. friend talks about, has increased its capacity by 250,000 tons per year of newsprint; fine paper by 74,200 tons; ground wood specialties 14,000 tons; corrugated board 5,000; hardwood 24,600 tons; particle board 23,000 tons; and bleach sulphite 63,000 tons.

Canadian Johns-Mansville in 1957 constructed a new plant for production of insulating board and ceiling tiles for the capacity of 30,000 tons per year. The Eddy paper company in the same year increased capacity for the manufacture of kraft paper by 70,000 tons. Now, this could not be done and go on with the certainty in the future if we were not carrying out a proper policy in the very field that my hon. friend has been talking about.

Great Lakes Paper Company, Fort William, has increased its expanded capacity in 1955 by 90,000 tons for the manufacture of newsprint, and in 1957 expanded capacity for newsprint production by 115,000 tons per year. Hinde and Dauche of Trenton in 1956 converted plant for utilization of wood to replace straw plant. It has a capacity for the manufacture of liner board of 50,000 tons per year. The Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company at Kenora expanded capacity in 1957 for the production of newsprint, by 80,000 tons per year. St. Lawrence Corporation, Red Rock, increased production of 200 tons of newsprint was started in 1953 which was additional to the sulphate pulp being produced. In 1958 it expanded to six million for the production of bleach sulphate. Currently this company is carrying out engineering studies to raise production of sulphate pulp from 380 tons to 700 tons per day. Spruce Falls Power and Paper Company, Kapuskasing, is currently expanding facilities there by building a new plant which will produce 200 tons per day by means of a new pulping process called the magnifite process. This is believed to be the first mill to introduce this process in Canada.

I already referred to pulp chip production by saw mills. The plywood industry has been expanding in Ontario. We have these various

companies, Canadian Veneer Company Limited at Pembroke, 200 cords per year; Maple Leaf Veneer, Durham, 10,000 cords per year; D. A. Clark Veneer, Burk's Falls, 2,000 cords; Plymetals Limited, Calabogie, 2,000 cords; Box Veneer Limited, Fergus, established current utilization is about 1,000 cords. Quality Plywood and Veneer Limited, Cobocok, current utilization 3,000 cords. In 1952 Roden Lumber and Veneer, Sault Ste. Marie, constructed a veneer mill to produce six million fbm of hardwood veneer. Jamar Plywood Company Limited, Kirkland Lake, a couple of years later is now producing, or is able to produce, 5,000 cords of poplar and birch per year. In 1956 Northern Plywoods Limited, Nipigon—we talked about that earlier today—is now utilizing 6,000 cords of poplar and birch per year. Jamar Plywood Company increased plant capacity to 9,300 cords of poplar and birch per year. A & L Plywood Limited, Chapleau, erected a plywood plant in 1961 to utilize up to 10,000 cords of poplar and birch per year, and Lavee Plywood Limited at Hearst started production in 1962 and its plant has a capacity to utilize 7,000 cords of poplar and white birch a year. Then the Particle Board Industry—I could lay down here a company at Hanover, the Jamar Plywood Company at Kirkland Lake, and the Rexwood Products Limited are all operating. Sawmill industry during the period 1952-1962: Many sawmills in Ontario have been increasing their efficiency by the installation of new equipment, or by the complete rebuilding of sawmill facilities. Some of the larger units coming into production during this period are listed below. Mathieu Company, which was assaulted a few minutes ago by my hon. friend; the Gillies Brothers at Braeside; the Dubreau Brothers at Dubreauville; the Lac Seul Lumber at Hudson; William Milne and Company at Timagami; the Fog Company Limited at Cochrane, and the Rainy River Mathews Lumber, a new sawmill just completed at Fort Frances—an annual capacity of from 5 to 6 million fbm.

Now that is the positive side of the story, and my hon. friend, by his attack, has enabled me to put on the record something that is positive and something that this government is proud of.

Mr. MacDonald: I have finished for this year, but the hon. Minister's so-called reply is so weak that I almost feel I am picking on him to get up and come back to it again. In the first place may I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the reading of this list—all these companies and their increased production—is completely irrelevant to the issue

we are talking about. Bully for you, that you have more companies that are producing more, but what it simply means is this, if you have not got a regeneration programme that ensures the perpetuation of the resources upon which they are producing and increasing production each year, then you are destroying the possibility for production in future generations.

This is what I am talking about. I was talking about what the hon. Minister had done in terms of getting some sort of an agreement with each of these companies in accordance with the amendment of his government to The Crown Timber Act last year; and if I may just make this point, Mr. Minister, as soon as your department can provide it, I would like to know the number of companies that are operating on more than 50 square miles, so that we can find out the number of companies that have been missed beyond the 41 with which you have made the agreement. I recognize you cannot give that to me immediately, but then the hon. Minister goes off into a long dissertation in which, Mr. Chairman—may I put it in blunt terms—he is deceiving the House once again, as to the facts of the situation. He says for example, this year we have had 44 million trees. Well, the department's book says 43—we will not quibble over a million. Then he said by next year it will rise to 48 million. But what he has not told you, Mr. Chairman, is that last year it was 49 million, so this year it is 6 million less trees produced in the nurseries, and even by next year they are not going to have regained the number of trees that they were producing last year.

I am disturbed, for example, when he says that this year was a bad year to pick the seed. This means that if it is a bad year to have gotten the seeds, that two or three years, when these little treelets are two or three years old and are going to be planted, we will have even fewer trees from the nursery. He is warning us that this year's experience means it is going to get even worse. His predecessor in this House said that if we were going to come to grips with this issue we needed 100 million trees to be produced.

The hon. Minister went on, Mr. Chairman, with other figures that have no relationship to the facts as far as I can interpret the facts in this handbook. He referred, for example, to the fact that 3 million more trees were planted on Crown land this year than last year. What are the facts, Mr. Chairman? They are right here. On page 144 of the booklet and 145, last year there were 49 million trees produced in the nurseries, this

year it was 43,194,000; last year it was 31 million that were planted on Crown lands; this year it was 26 million planted on Crown lands. So the record and the figures are clear that you are doing a poorer job this year.

However, the real reason that provokes me to get up again, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. Minister has completely ignored—by this dissertation on reforestation in the nurseries, and by this lengthy listing of the production and the increase in production of various mills across the province—the point that we have been discussing. The point that we have been discussing is: What has the government done to implement their own amendment last year? Not with regard to replacing trees on the Crown land that has been cut off prior to 1953, but what is going to happen in the cutting for this year and next year? What sort of an agreement have you made? The hon. Minister has given the House his own information to the effect that they have made agreements with only 41 companies and there are 200 to 300 of them with which they should have made agreements. In other words, they are failing to accept their responsibilities. It is as simple as that.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some remarks. Early in this debate I asked when I might discuss the situation in Kapuskasing. I was told that it would be under this vote. I should like to ask the hon. Minister initially some questions with respect to the policy in that area. Directly, these questions result from a brief which was submitted to the Cabinet by the Ontario Provincial Council of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. I have a copy of that brief in my possession, and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that there are some pretty serious charges in that brief, which the government has a responsibility to answer.

Now, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, there must be some substance in this brief. The brief, in particular on pages 9 and 10, deals with the matter of timber permits which have been issued, particularly the ones that have been issued to so-called bona-fide settlers. And the brief points out that under The Crown Timber Act, the licence shall not be assigned, pledged or charged without the consent in writing of the Minister. First of all, I wonder if the Minister could advise us, in the Kapuskasing area, how many licences were assigned or pledged during, say, the last 12 months; and whether or not those licences were approved by the Minister? Do you have that information now, sir?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I have not got more than what I already gave the House the other day when I gave certain definite figures, which would now appear in *Hansard*, and I am not going to weary the House by repeating them. But I would say that the number of transfers that were effected would be very small.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Can the Minister assure this House that none of these permits were assigned without his permission?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Of course, if they were not brought in. Again, as I say, my hon. friend may not have been in at the time, or he may have been busy about something else. I realize—I do not expect that everything I say here will be digested by everybody—but I did put on the record the other day what the situation is there. I gave figures, and I pointed out that the supervisors at the level of chief ranger, rather at the level of the forest ranger and the people who are charged with the various jobs, including scaling, are in relatively close contact with what is going on in the bush. This sort of thing could not have been carried on in a wholesale manner without them being able to have some knowledge of what is going on.

I do not question the information given to me, by the local offices, to the position, which information is that there has been no trafficking in any broad sense of the term whatsoever in relation to permits.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to read into the—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It never has been, because there might be an occasional situation; but certainly there has been no trafficking in the sense that it has been used by some of the people making allegations, according to my information.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, I believe that the hon. Minister is probably answering in good faith, and I also realize that he has not been familiar with this department for a number of years. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that the members of this House be acquainted with some of the charges that have been made, which certainly do not coincide with the opinion that has been given to us by the hon. Minister this afternoon.

You will recall in the brief, which was presented to the Cabinet, these people say on page 10 and I quote:

Almost two years ago a brief was presented by our district council to the ad-

visory committee of the Minister of Lands and Forests on these matters, pointing out that the licence holders, through contracting out, were in violation of the Act, and showing the end result of what is commonly referred to in our industry as "shacking" and "batching". To date, the only answer we have received is that our requests are under consideration, and certain sections of the brief have been referred to The Department of Labour. Now we know that the wheels of government turn slowly, but surely an organization can expect some action or answer on matters within a lesser period than two years. The prime purpose of The Crown Timber Act, in our opinion, is defined in section 2, subsection 1(b) which reads—

and it goes on to quote the Act.

This charge is a serious charge, Mr. Chairman, and I have said in this House before and I repeat this afternoon that I think some of the basic problems, and the trouble which was created in the Kapuskasing area, is directly the responsibility of the government and partially this particular department of government. I realize that it is interwoven with The Department of Labour and I do not think this government can get off scot-free.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: They never try to do so; they always accept their responsibilities.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, I am very pleased to hear the hon. Minister of Mines say that they do accept their responsibilities for this situation there because I think they have a responsibility to do so. Had they done so sooner, had the policies of this department been a little different sooner, perhaps the problem would not have developed as it did.

I should like to ask the hon. Minister with respect to the policy of issuing a timber permit, particularly to large companies, and before doing I would refresh his memory by quoting from section 8 of the report of the select committee on labour relations in the Ontario Legislature. I do so because it refers to this particular department of government. That section says, and I quote:

It is brought to the attention of the committee that trade union organizers have been refused permission to enter upon company property during off-hours of employment solely because they were on trade union business. The situation apparently exists on certain management properties where workmen are housed in bunkhouses, usually in the mines or lumber industry.

The committee deplores this attitude on the part of management and unless this situation is corrected, it may be necessary for the government to introduce legislation to overcome this situation.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if this department of government had really meant what it said when it passed a labour relations Act and adhered to the principle of free collective bargaining; that when these permits are issued to people that cut Crown lands, certainly it should be possible for the government and for this department of government to ensure that it will be possible for visitors to visit people that are housed on those Crown lands. It has been brought to our attention, for instance, that one particular company refused permission for union organizers to use the roads and to visit personnel who were housed in the lumber areas simply because those union organizers were there for the sole purpose of organizing the workers.

One particular instance, I am told, was that not only did they refuse them, but they called the provincial police, served them a quantity of beer, and were successful in persuading the provincials to arrest those organizers. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, since this matter was brought to the attention of the department by a select committee as far back as 1957, it would have been possible for this department of government to ensure on all future Crown contracts that the collective bargaining process would not be impeded on Crown lands.

It seems a little bit absurd, Mr. Chairman, that these employers would be able to use a technicality to prevent the free collective bargaining process simply because they have leased a large quantity of Crown lands and it is necessary for the sawmill, the logging industry, to provide housing and to provide boarding and lodging. It seems unreasonable that these people should be able to prohibit union organizers the use of the roads and the permission to visit these people after hours because they are housed on the property. They only leave the property, I understand, for short periods of time during the time they are at work; and if the employers are permitted to keep these people off Crown lands it seems to me a sort of discrimination which ought not to be allowed by the province on Crown lands. I think these charges are substantiated, I think they are genuine, because they have been substantiated by the select committee report.

I wonder if the hon. Minister can tell us whether or not any provision will be made in future permits to ensure that the collective

bargaining process is not hampered with in these various logging projects? I wonder if anything has been done or can be done.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I would say to my hon. friend that it seems to me that this type of thing is in the field of collective bargaining and that the unions concerned should be able to get provision in the collective bargaining for items of that sort where they do exist. In many cases, of course, this is not that type of thing; using the roads and sleeping quarters is not common; but in areas where it does apply it seems to me that when they sit down at the bargaining table it should not be too difficult to get that sort of thing cleared right in the bargaining agreement. I would say that that is probably the better place for it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am sure the hon. Minister could not have understood me. Perhaps I did not make it as clear as I should have. What I am saying is these companies are prohibiting these employees from becoming organized by denying the organizers the right to visit the workers during their off hours, and they are doing it ostensibly because they have leased the entire Crown lands and they prohibit these organizers from entering Crown lands to talk to these people.

Under any normal circumstances organizers would not meet this problem. They could meet these workers either at the gates or at their homes in after hours, and they could talk to them; but by the very peculiar nature of this work these organizers are being prohibited from entering these Crown lands to talk to these people. It is discrimination, because my information is that this is the only group of citizens in the province of Ontario which is prohibited from entering some of these logging camps. If the government really did believe in the collective bargaining process, I claim it is because of the anti-labour policy of the government that it is permitted in the first place, they would now take collective action.

I think it is a basic philosophy. I think that the government is giving lip service to this principle of collective bargaining and they are using every manoeuvre they can to prohibit it. I think if the government really meant what they said and they intended to see that this system would work; if they really believed in it—I do not think they do—then something could be written into these contracts to guarantee these people the right of free access to the lands. It seems unfair that one particular group of people should be restricted.

I am told that any other type of social worker is permitted free access on to these grounds by these logging firms; and I do not speak of all the logging firms, I speak of the ones who oppose the principle of free collective bargaining. I think that this is something that could be written into the permit, and I think if the hon. Minister stands in his place and says that this is something that could be resolved at the bargaining table, why he is of course evading the situation. I would not like to think that he approached it with this wrong philosophy.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, the other alternative, of course, is that that was a labour committee and there was a revision of The Labour Act following it.

Mr. MacDonald: And this government did not act.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I did not follow that closely. Apparently it is not in The Labour Relations Act or any of our labour legislation, and if there was to be a provision of that sort adopted as policy it ought to go in the statutes. It is not a matter of incorporating contracts as an ordinary procedure of any department.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Why not?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I will leave it at this: I say to the hon. Minister that I believe it is a matter of incorporating it into Crown contracts. I think this is the sort of thing that goes on in the government, of shifting responsibility from one department to another. I think here is a situation where this department could provide for this protection without being bothered with The Labour Relations Act, or without making any amendments to that Act. I think it is simply and purely that here is a way they could deal with it. They do not choose to do it because they do not want to do anything about it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to add one brief word on this. This labour committee, of which I happen to be a member—so I know whereof I speak on this—brought in a recommendation which was unanimous. Therefore it included eight of the 11 members who were Tories from your side of the House.

Mr. Singer: Several of them Cabinet Ministers too.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. In fact, the chairman subsequently became a Cabinet Minister.

This recommendation was brought in but this government has not acted. Quite frankly, for the moment, I am not going to spend any time weighing the merits of whether one does it by putting in some Crown timber agreement for those who are going to do cutting, or not. The simple fact of the matter is that this government by its basic anti-labour approach has refused to accept the unanimous recommendation of its own eight members on that committee. Admittedly, Mr. Chairman, even if they had accepted it and put it into The Labour Relations Act, it then would have got into one of the categories of unfair bargaining. It would not necessarily meet the point if the government is not ready and willing to enforce the Act in an impartial way—and we have had no evidence that the government is willing to do even that. But what I rose to underline, Mr. Chairman, was the fact that we had a clear request, unanimously from a committee of this Legislature, with eight of the 11 members being Conservatives, this point should have been met some four or five years ago, and this government has done nothing about it.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I think the point that has been raised by the two hon. speakers who have just preceded me is a very valid one and that we should expect some enunciation of government policy from the hon. Minister.

I suggest to you that this is a fundamental problem. We are never going to reach any mature relationship between management and labour as long as government permits itself to be identified with one side or another, whether rightly or wrongly. But, sir, I suggest to you that if we believe in collective bargaining as the normal way to settle management-labour disputes, and the problems of labour, then certainly we, as a government, and we as a Legislature, must assure that we permit nothing to come in the way of the formation of collective bargaining units; and that is exactly what is happening here.

I have had the similar kind of complaint made to me, sir, that persons trying to organize collective bargaining arrangements, that is the formation of a union to start with, are obstructed because they are precluded from meeting with the workers or the employee group, and they are precluded simply because they are not granted permission to go on to the lands, which are Crown lands to start with, lands basically owned by the people of Ontario; certainly we are making a lie to our contention that we believe

in collective bargaining if we refuse that permission.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that while we are debating this matter back and forth here this involves a very fundamental principle that we cannot set aside on a partisan basis at all; we can and should expect a clear enunciation of principle by the hon. Minister that the practice that has been demonstrated to be a fact in Ontario must cease, and that the workers must be given an opportunity to organize into collective bargaining units just as any other group in the province. We have had several illustrations recently, sir, that in my humble opinion have fomented and developed into serious problems only because there was this type of immature and amateurish approach to the problems of management and labour. Many of the serious problems had their beginnings in a sense of injustice; and I do not blame any group of employees who feel a sense of injustice and a desire to take the law into their own hands when the very concept of collective bargaining is denied them from the outset.

Sir, we cannot tolerate this type of thing, and it seems to me that the government has an obligation to clarify its position in unquestionable language that we have not had this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I would say to the hon. leader of the Opposition that if there is any need for enunciating policy I would expect to see it done in the form of legislation and the House is open to receive legislation, but I am not going to make any announcement at this time of a piecemeal nature—

Interjections by several hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Roberts —of a piecemeal nature, in relation to one segment of this thing at all.

I imagine it was thoroughly discussed at the time it was revised and it can be discussed again at some time in the proper forum, but I am not going to make any statement about it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Then I am going to make one final plea to the government to consider this problem; and if I happen to be here next year I am going to be back asking the same questions. I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that he consider this matter and if future contracts are let by his department that this principle be considered and that they make provision; because I think to take any other action having been acquainted with the problem is simply to underscore the

point that we have made from this side. To begin with, if they fail to act on this then they have proven that they, in their philosophy, are not committed to the collective bargaining process. These are Crown lands, these people that want to organize them are taxpayers the same as anybody else and I suggest to you, sir, that they have some basic rights and this is one of them.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1108 agreed to.

Vote 1109 agreed to.

On vote 1110:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the Junior Ranger programme, I notice, has been expanded tremendously over the amount of money allocated to it last year. Is it the intention of the government to use this as part of the physical fitness programme? Is it the intention of the government to use this as a year around programme, or is it solely for summer activity?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The Junior Ranger field of course is confined to the age of 17 and that bracket of boys attending high school, I assume, and it is meant for the summer holiday period—for training during that period. It is certainly not intended to cover periods of the school year. Any programme of this nature is confined to the summer months. My hon. friend, by the way, who put his question might have indicated that he would like to see a program of this sort expanded into wider fields, but that would be on some other type of organization. This particular organization is for approximately two months of summer holidays confined very largely to people who are students at the university, and it should help them both physically and educationally, and also assist them in getting a little pocket money for their own education and their own use.

Now I think it is a very excellent undertaking. I think in previous years it has been very popular and I can say from the rate the applications are coming in, it is very popular this year, and I hope we will get it well distributed through the province and it will probably have to be on a first-come-first-served basis, if applications keep rolling in as fast as they have been lately.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is the programme to be solely for the young fellows or is there a programme intended for young ladies also?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Not this year. There is no programme for young ladies this year.

That would take a bit of working out but we are certainly not having it for the present year.

Mr. Newman: Will the programme go into the provincial parks too, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They work in all different parts of the province. In many cases the park facilities where they have been working, will probably be doubled, so that double the quantity will be working in these different areas where they worked last year and there will be additional places and also additional organization necessary this year with new camps to look after this.

Mr. Newman: Then we can expect Junior Rangers to be working in the provincial park in Essex county?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, I don't think Essex county is one of those involved. This is mostly confined to the northern part of the province. As a matter of fact, part of the policy is to get them away from home and get them right into the bush and into the north country.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell me how many boys from northwestern Ontario—the four ridings of northwestern Ontario—participated in this programme last year and secondly how many boys of Indian descent participated in the Junior Ranger programme last year?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I would say to my hon. friend that we do try to get this distributed well across the province. I was looking at the list of applicants last week and I can assure you that they are well distributed in northwestern Ontario. A number of applications are in from northwestern Ontario. I saw a number from Kenora, a number from Fort William, a number from Port Arthur district, and we do try to see that there is good provincial distribution in this work. With regard to Indians, I made a comment—I think my hon. friend was here at the time—in regard to expanding that. On Saturday I was talking to the chief at Moosonee, and I feel that there will be a number of 17-year-old boys available in that area to come down and be distributed in northeastern Ontario in our camps. We are going to make a special effort to add young, likely Indians in that age group to this work.

Mr. Troy: I understand, Mr. Minister, in your answer to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville that this particular programme about which your hon. leader had apparently spoken—a physical fitness programme in con-

nection with the Junior Rangers—that has nothing to do with the particular programme we are discussing, that is another programme is it?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I would say the physical fitness part of this may enable us, through The Department of Education and the federal Department of Health, to get some additional funds. In that case we would be able to have some further numbers taking this work. That would be the use of the words “physical fitness” in the sense of the grants. But we do feel that this training is certainly a very important feature in physical training and I think my hon. friend, who is experienced in the field of education himself will agree that this ought to be excellent for students of that age.

Mr. Troy: I do, sir, but I should think, if the physical fitness part of it is emphasized, then I think the personnel ought to be from a different bracket of our youth than in the past because, probably those that are not in school need that particular part of the programme.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say a word on these Junior Ranger programmes, because over the years I have watched them in my own area, in the northwest, and it is one of the finest of programmes that The Department of Lands and Forests have ever instituted—taking boys 17 years of age out of school and teaching them to be men. I have visited the Junior Ranger camps many times. These boys are taught to handle a fire watching tower, to discover fires in the forest. They are taught woodcraft; they are taught roadbuilding; they learn about game and fish and they have been taught character. These programmes are building character into our youth, and I would suggest that these Junior Ranger camps should be enlarged each year to take in more of these teenage boys. I know I have many requests from mothers and fathers to get their boys into Junior Ranger camps, and it is next to impossible to get them in because there is such a large list and so few camps.

I think that all the hon. members of this House should visit some of these camps if they have not already done so, and see the results of character-building and knowledge these camps are instilling into these young men in their junior university years teaching them to know something about our north and teaching them the vocations that will be of use to them in the future, forestry and flying and other skills. Inviting them to spend their lives in the north and help build

that great unpopulated part of our country that teems with natural resources so they won't have to return to the cities to get a job. I think through these Junior Ranger camps we can attract men to our northern areas where there are jobs available and where they can make a life for themselves that is a little different than city life. So, Mr. Chairman, I would say that any enlargement you make in that programme of Junior Ranger schools during the summer is all to the good for the young men of this country and as one of the hon. members opposite mentioned, if it was extended to girls too, I think it would be something that would benefit our young teenage women—strengthening their bodies and training their minds.

I had not thought of that, but I think it would be good for our teenage girls as well. But I have nothing but praise for the whole programme.

Mr. Singer: No letter today?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: No, just the one about Port Arthur being the purest city in Ontario.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, a question of the hon. Minister: How many Junior Rangers do they intend to accommodate with this programme this year?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Between 1,300 and 1,400; double last year's number.

Mr. Newman: How many applications has the department to date?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I had on my desk last Friday, I think, 1,050.

Mr. Newman: I doubt very much if the hon. Minister has gone through the applications to find out the areas from which they come and my thought is, how many would have come in from the urban areas rather than the—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I did actually have a breakdown. I do not have it with me here in the House, but I have a breakdown of the applicants so far. The purpose of asking for it was to keep an eye on that very point. It seems as if the distribution will work out pretty satisfactorily and pretty representatively if they keep coming in the way they have.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister going to allocate the individuals who are going to take this programme on an area basis; or is it a first-come-first-served basis?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think it is probably a combination of both, if there is going to be an over-subscription. We do hope for, and so far there has been, enough attention in the various areas to indicate that we are going to have a good number of names from each area from which to choose. I sincerely hope that everybody who wants to go in this year will go; but, when I say that, I am limited to about 1,400.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the age limit is 17. Am I correct? Suppose we say a boy of the age of 17 applies and there is no vacancy. Is it the policy of the department that he can be taken on the following year? Am I correct in assuming this?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The yardstick we are using is 17 by July 1 in the year in which the lad is taken on. Also, it is a one-year programme. They do not get someone who went last year coming again this year, it is a one-time programme only.

Beyond that there is always the opportunity for some, at least those who took the course, say, last year, to get some other type of work this year for which he will be particularly fitted or better fitted as a result of last year's training.

Mr. Belanger: I understand that the purpose of the department is that in the future you will have out of this group some who will attend the forest ranger school and go on to university and be an asset to the department, which I believe is a point well taken. But I would be interested in knowing how many of those who have been through as junior forest rangers in the past have gone on to university and studied and the department has benefited from their experience.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I understand that over half the people who have recently been attending our forestry school, which is a 33-week course to qualify for work in our own department, over half of those are people who have been junior rangers originally.

Mr. Belanger: When they are attending these schools, does the department give them any financial assistance at all or are they entirely on their own?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: With reference to attendance at the ranger school there is no financial assistance, if that is the question, except that where a person is a member of the staff and sent there we pay a certain percentage of the cost of his attendance there.

But the cost is kept to a minimum, I understand. The fees are low and the actual cost of boarding is held down. It is down below the actual cost, I would imagine. Also, a certain number of that group are trained for industry as well.

Mr. Belanger: I would gather from the reply to the hon. Minister, that he does have some people from his own department who are sent there and are helped financially?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes. Just to give an illustration of that, I was talking to one of our—an inquiry was made concerning the use of our Indian population—I was talking to a young Indian in the employ of the department just the other day and he informed me that he was hoping to get down and take this course in the next year or so. We encourage members of the staff to work towards that course and of course the terms of entry for various categories require having the course before being able to get into the particular category applied for.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1110 agreed to.

On vote 1111:

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I have two questions regarding this vote having to do with the public accounts for the year ending March 31, 1962. There is one item in these accounts to the Lyons Fuel, Hardware and Supplies Limited, \$7,079. I was wondering if that item had to do with the firm owned by the deceased member for Sault Ste. Marie? If so, were there tenders for that?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: This is on vote 1111?

Mr. Trotter: That is right, it is under basic organization. It is the public accounts ending March 31, 1962.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): I do not think the late member had any—

Mr. MacDonald: It is like the George Hees Company of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Or the Donald C. MacDonald legend in York South.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am under the same impression as the hon. Minister of Economics and Development that the late Mr. Lyons sold out his business some few years ago, but I am only speaking from hearsay, so to speak, as to this if it is his business. I could not give the hon. member an answer at the moment without having some inquiry made, because

I do not know anything about it. I think the hon. member is talking about the year ending March 31, 1962.

Mr. Trotter: 1962, yes. It is in the copy of the accounts. In any event, whether Mr. Lyons had any interest in the company or not, do they tender for these contracts for this amount of money? These accounts are listed on page J10 of the public accounts of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I understand that on accounts of this nature, quotes would be asked for and then on the submission of the quotes the choice would be made.

Mr. Trotter: When you say quotes are asked for; are they tenders or are they closed tenders or open tenders, just open to friends of the Tory party or how is this dealt with?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We have a lot of friends! That is why we are in power here, we have so many friends around the province.

Mr. Trotter: I was curious how public money was being spent and I want to know if we are getting our money's worth. I think the answer the hon. Minister is giving me is a mighty poor one.

In the first place, it looks very suspicious. You have a well-known Conservative, in fact a deceased member of this House. I see his name here, getting over \$7,000, almost as much indemnity as a member—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: All right, suppose he was not connected. It looks rather suspicious. Who owns it, his son? Nephew? Or the president of the Conservative Party in that district?

Now here is the principle! All right, this may be perfectly on the level, I do not know, but anything like this should—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Maybe this would give the hon. member, if he wants to find out what the situation really is, he can come over to the office and the accountant will show him all the selection that was made at that time; the tenders and the way it was done.

Mr. Trotter: Then was it tendered? The hon. Minister still has not answered my question.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: As I say, in connection with calling for quotes, we will show you exactly what quotes were received and who got it and the basis on which he got it.

Mr. Trotter: Can the hon. Minister not ask—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not think the hon. member realizes that this department in many respects, all across the province, is in business and has to get things at different times almost off the shelf, so to speak, sending out for this and that, just like anybody else in business.

Mr. Trotter: Yes, but it is \$3,700,000 worth!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: On matters of larger import the policy I outlined the other day in relation to tenders is followed; but in normal, ordinary procedures at the local level these things are dealt with just as you would in any other business. That is about the general position in relation to it. If you do not think that is good, of course, you have a right to that opinion.

Mr. Trotter: No, I think it is a very poor policy. Especially when it amounts to \$3.7 million-odd; that is a lot of money.

The second item I want to ask about, also in the same accounts—to the Westbury Hotel, \$9,516.07. What is that for?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: You are reading from the public accounts?

Mr. Trotter: Yes, for the year ending March 31, 1962, services rendered.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That would involve a number of attendances there when conferences are held. It would involve lunches, I suppose, in relation to these conferences, and that sort of thing. This department has a great many of those types of conferences from time to time.

Mr. Trotter: I have mentioned this before, there is too much spending going on in this type of thing. You say lunches are going on. Well, over \$9,500 worth is a lot of lunches!

We do not know who is getting it and I think you should give a fuller explanation, because this thing is going on in practically every department of government and amounts to an awful lot of money—

An hon. member: The hon. Minister of Economics and Development spends more than that on one dinner, in his consumer trade campaign.

Mr. Trotter: —anything I have looked into and checked, most of it seems to be wasted; have you any further explanation of what you are spending this on? Could you name any organization you treat; or who is it, just a bunch of the boys?

An hon. member: Who gets the sandwich?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would draw attention to the committees and organizations as they appear on pages 173-4-5 of the pamphlet showing the very wide scope that this department has in relation to advisory and technical and other committees meeting in relation to its work; it would be in that field and in connection with the branches themselves and work that they do that this would be incurred.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I have listened to the explanation of the hon. Minister with respect to these purchases. There must be a policy in the department; when does it become a local matter? When is it not a matter of tender, and when are tenders called for in these purchases?

Secondly, are these tenders public or are they invitation tenders? I think it is a pretty important principle, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think the general rule is that anything over \$200 requires quotes, in other words, competitive quotes; anything over \$2,000 is referred to head office as to how it is to be dealt with and has the authority of head office for whatever steps are taken; and there might be cases of emergency in that smaller figure where action has to take place on the spot; but subject to that, that is the procedure.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I can fully understand on small matters that you do get quotes, and I do not know how else you could deal with it efficiently; on the other hand, when it gets over \$2,000 it is referred to head office, I believe you said. Then would the hon. Minister tell me, when these matters are referred to head office, is it then a matter, generally speaking, of calling tenders?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, again the regular theory is that tenders are called in some cases, quotes in others, depending on the situation as recommended at the head office level. It would be either quotes at which there will be competitive bids, or it will be actually by tender, in which case the regular tender procedure would apply.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Just one last question. Is anybody permitted to quote or tender when they call these quotes or tenders? Is any firm in the area permitted to give a quotation?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: In the case of quotations the effort is made to select the known suppliers, so that the answer would be "yes", subject to the people being in the business of the type of thing that is desired. Anybody

can quote if they write in. With regard to tenders, anybody who is competent, of course, can tender.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what is wrong with not having the tenders down the line. For example, you just pick out items: S. W. Mound—\$27,500. We do not know what he gets, or what is behind it. Is it a tender and how are you spending the money? Yet it amounts up to \$3.7 million. I do not think you are giving an explanation of this at all.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The particular item to which the hon. member refers is the price for pheasants which are raised by an individual or a group—then they are purchased by the department to be used for distribution to assist in the hunting facilities in different parts of the province. As far as I know, I do not think there are many people in that business, but if anybody else in that business wants to get in on it, then let the department know. I would imagine if he can bid competitively or quote competitively he could do some of the business.

Mr. Trotter: If the department had a policy where they asked for tenders and this was literally the law, we would not have to question these, but as I look down these items, my own view is that the majority of this—a good percentage of it at least—is probably used to assist and help the friends of the government. I think it is pretty obvious.

Several hon. members: Oh, no, no! They would not do that.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am sorry I cannot answer this and I do not like to throw out a suggestion without knowing the facts here in this responsible office. But if you go on down there, I see Smith and Chapple Ltd.—\$27,814. That may be the hon. member's old firm, but I do not know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: So what? I think they should tender, and then there is no question.

Mr. MacDonald: That was pretty good digging.

Mr. Trotter: I think they should tender because it is well known that the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Chapple) is the only member of his family who is a good Liberal; the others are obviously Conservatives.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr. Chapple of the Chapple and Smith was my uncle who sold out of the business in 1929. After the crash in 1929 he sold the business, his share in it, and no member of the Chapple family has been in that business since.

An hon. member: The Liberals were in in 1929.

Another hon. member: You proved the point.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, of the hon. Minister: The department certainly must be the user of large numbers of automotive vehicles. What is the policy of the department in the purchase of automotive vehicles, trucks, automobiles?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The policy is to endeavour to get distribution across the province, and it is done on a selective basis with that in mind.

Mr. MacDonald: From Tory to Tory.

Mr. Newman: Are the tenders called for?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No. That usually is done by quotes. We do not get many at any one time, we do not get any large number; I think it is usually one or two at a time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the frankest admission so far.

Mr. Newman: Are all dealers allowed to quote?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes. Any dealer is entitled to quote.

An hon. member: As long as they are good PCs.

Mr. Newman: How does a dealer know that the department is going to be in need of X number of vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I understand from the accounting branch that invitations to quote are given at the local level.

Mr. Newman: In the purchase of these vehicles, is there any set vehicle preferred over another, any set make?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Ontario manufacturing is given preference, but no one company, no one make over the other, provided they meet with those requirements.

Mr. Newman: Wherever possible the department purchases vehicles that are made in Canada, not of foreign make? Does the department purchase all made-in-Canada vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes. That is what we aim to do.

Mr. Newman: Do you do it?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1111 carried?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Minister if that is his policy.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is the general policy that is followed. As far as possible that is done. Occasionally, of course, there might be something—

Mr. Wintermeyer: Are there any exceptions?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, there might be something. For instance, a few days ago I was travelling in a Bombadier, the snowmobile. I imagine it was manufactured in Winnipeg, because there is not any manufacturer that I know of in this province for that particular thing. But to stick to subjects, to the specifications being sensible and available, we buy in Ontario. You have surely heard of that; "Buy in Ontario" is our policy.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, when does the department replace the vehicle? I want to know if you replace it at 25,000 miles, 50,000 miles.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Based on mileage and length of time, a three-to-four-year period, I understand, is common. Sometimes a 50,000 mileage is considered a good time to change, too.

Mr. Newman: Has the department considered simply replacing the motor in the vehicle, and using the vehicle? There are taxi-cabs in the city of Detroit still being used that have mileages well over 300,000 miles on them. It is simply a matter of changing the motor.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There are always exceptions. Of course, the Bombadier I was talking about was 17 years old, that particular piece of equipment. We do have good mechanical service in various parts of this province. As a matter of fact, the job that is done on our aeroplanes; you would think we were practically manufacturing them if you were to go into the place at Sault Ste. Marie and see the engines all being over-

hauled and the planes painted and everything looking as if it is brand new.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, how many Volkswagens does the department have?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): Let's face it, some things have to be imported.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not know the number off hand. I would imagine very few, but we will try to get the number.

Mr. Newman: Well, I understand the hon. Minister just recently replied that all their vehicles were made in Ontario. Here we come along and we find that we have Volkswagens.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There might be a special reason for a Volkswagen.

Mr. Newman: Well, this is still contrary to what the hon. Minister informed the House.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think the answer from the accountant on that is, sir, two old Volkswagens.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I would like to ask—I have been through two cars since that one.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Why don't you keep it for 300,000 miles?

Mr. Bryden: I personally do not recommend keeping any car for 300,000 miles, but with the facilities of this department they might be able to maintain a car somewhat longer than I am. However, that is not the matter at issue, Mr. Chairman. I would like to inquire of the hon. Minister if the department has given consideration in the purchase of vehicles to dealing direct with the manufacturer and getting quotes from them instead of through dealers.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think perhaps, in view of the staggered requirements that we have in this department and the number required—I am thinking in terms of, for instance, when I was Attorney-General and the Ontario Provincial Police were on the roads all the time, we would have large quantities of replacements, and that practice is what applied over there. The manufacturers would pretty well determine how the bidding was to take place among their own agents and in localities, from time to time, to meet that situation and distribute it. But here the

number of vehicles is quite different, much smaller, and the requirements come up in a much more staggered way because they do not drive them to the same extent they did in the other department. We believe that a practical way of dealing with one, two or three vehicles at a time is the way in which it is being done, and we think it is fair.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, in the 1962 edition of the highlights of The Department of Lands and Forests, page 17, it refers to the flying hours flown by the department aircraft. There are a few items, at least one item that is particularly interesting to me and it is listed as transportation—special 448.20 hours. Just what type of transportation is covered under this item?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The breakdown that I have is: fire ranging, 1962, 7,130; timber management, 799; fish and wildlife, 3,628; lands, 260; parks, 266; administration, testing transportation, instruction, 1,999; mercy flights, 33; interdepartmental flying, 370. That totals 14,485.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman what I wanted to know was just what type of flying was done and included in this item, transportation—special; what is done? The 448 hours?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The breakdown I have in front of me—I gave it to you; that terminology is not used exactly that way. I would imagine it must be in the interdepartmental flying; 370 would be part of it at any rate; mercy flights are not mentioned there. That is a different table altogether from what I have, in one or two spots.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, what I particularly wanted to know here was: under

what item are the flights made by Cabinet Ministers included?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: How you are coming out with what you want! Interdepartmental flying, 370 hours, would be the figure, I imagine you are referring to. Some of it at least would come in there.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would undertake to provide me with the information showing all flights made by Cabinet Ministers—their starting point and their destination point—between the period from November 1, 1961 to January 18, 1962. Would the hon. Minister undertake to provide that information?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The accountant will take a note of it and he will have to turn up his records.

Mr. Gibson: The information I want is the number of hours flown by the Cabinet Ministers from their point of origin and their destination, in the period November 1, 1961 to January 18, 1962. Mr. Chairman, while I have the floor, on page 12 of the public accounts: wages expenses, maintenance and operating of extra fire fighting. I see an item here: Green Airways Limited, \$24,126.30. Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. Minister to tell me what this aircraft company did for that amount of money.

Mr. Chairman: Being 6 of the clock, I do now leave the chair and will resume at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the House leader what the agenda will be this evening?

It being 6 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

(Wednesday, February 20, 1963)

Page	Col.	Line	Correction
892	1	49	Change to read: Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chair- man, I wish to raise a question—



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Monday, February 25, 1963

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Monday, February 25, 1963

Estimates, Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Roberts, concluded	1069
Estimates, Department of Attorney-General, Mr. Cass, continued	1078
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Macaulay, agreed to	1108

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1111:

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, I had the floor when we adjourned and the question I put to the hon. Minister was: what services were rendered by Green Airways Limited of Red Lake which involved the payment of \$24,126.26 to that particular company?

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Do you want me to answer that?

Mr. Gibson: I want to know what Green Airways Limited of Red Lake did to entail the payment of \$24,000 to that airline, which has two aircraft operating.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: If the hon. member would be good enough to explain what he is talking about, where he is getting his information, so we can follow him, then I will be glad to see what I can do to answer it.

Mr. Gibson: I refer you to page J.12 of the public accounts of the province of Ontario. I already gave you this information before—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, all right, give it again!

Mr. Gibson: It is under extra fire fighting—wages, expenses, maintenance and operating. It is approximately three-quarters of the way down the page. They are listed in alphabetical order and I refer you to about the 15th item which says: Green Airways Limited, \$24,-126.26.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That would be for engaging extra aircraft during the fire period to fight forest fires.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell me to what period of time he is referring.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Of course that is not at my fingertips. We would have to ascertain that

information from the Sault area out of which the craft was flying, I take it.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister undertake to provide me with the details of the nature of these flights, what was done and the reason for the payment of that amount of money?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The answer is yes.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1111 agreed to.

Vote 1112 agreed to.

Vote 1113 agreed to.

On vote 1114:

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, under 1114 I would like to say a brief word about this business of subdivisions.

As I understand the situation in this province, a person who wishes to build a summer camp for his personal use is basically required to purchase land in an area that has been subdivided by The Department of Lands and Forests. The individual in question is required to pay certain additional costs, or a proportion of certain additional costs, incurred by The Department of Lands and Forests when they set up the subdivisions.

Mr. Chairman, this might be a fine thing in the southern areas where there is a great shortage of land and where a great many people are building in small areas around certain particular lakes which attract a number of residents. In my part of the country we have thousands and thousands of square miles where a good many people would like to build but they cannot because the department does not wish to, nor will it, subdivide in these particular areas.

The attitude of most of the people in my part of the country is this: if we want a subdivision to live in for a summer camp, we will stay at home. Why would one go to a subdivision and be forced to live beside the people he is trying to get away from in town?

So what I suggest to the hon. Minister and to you, Mr. Chairman, is this. This department has established a system of regional zoning committees for recreational land. What

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that we use these committees to zone out areas as closed areas in which we do not want summer development or summer camp development. In other words, let us make the law in this case negative: you shall not build here, but you may build there. What we are doing now is telling them that you may only build in particular areas.

As evidence of the fact that this system is working, The Department of Lands and Forests' people tell me this: now look, every time we offer land in a subdivision for sale we have hundreds of people lined up trying to get the land. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, this is not a sign of success, it is a sign of failure. I cannot see that in a country such as ours, and in a province as rich as ours, that any citizen should be forced to come to a Lands and Forests office two or three days before a sale is actually to open and stand outside, under temperature conditions which you all would recognize are bad in the north, just for the privilege of buying a 50 or 60 ft. lot in the subdivision set up by The Department of Lands and Forests.

In all sincerity, I suggest to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that he give consideration to opening up land for summer resorts in certain designated areas. Let the individual buying pay his own survey costs if he wishes, but I think that some recognition should be given to the individual who likes to build a summer camp in some place where he has some sort or form of solitude.

While I am on the subject, if I may add one more word. I recognize full well that when one applies to buy land in one of these subdivisions he is warned, or at least on the application form it states, that The Department of Lands and Forests does not or will not undertake to build access roads to these subdivisions. The fact that this particular provision is on the application form I submit, Mr. Chairman, is no indication that the person in question recognizes the fact that he might have to use water access or might even have to walk in to these camp areas. I suggest that the department do one of two things. Either build access roads to these subdivision areas, or make it fully plain to the individual buyer in some form or another that he is not going to get these access roads into the land that he has bought.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say to the hon. member that this vote provides for the construction of summer cottage roads to be built where costs can be recovered through the additional charges on summer resort lots to

be sold. It is expected that this programme will be initiated in the Lake of the Woods area where several summer resort subdivisions are presently being planned.

It is estimated these roads will cost about \$2,500 per mile, thus the vote should provide for some 40 miles of summer roads. Maintenance of the roads will be on a summer time basis, with the cost of maintenance levied against the cottage owners.

Now if my hon. friend wants to get some much more remote area, if he is looking for solitude, I think we could find him a spot out in some remote area that would be quite acceptable to us as well as to him if that is what he wants. But we will not build him an access road. We do allow for cases, isolated cases, in areas that are not built about. But obviously, if we are going to be realistic about this, we have to have subdivisions and have to have some justification for building access roads. The policy is to try to have the area concerned bear the cost, eventually, of the road.

Mr. Gibson: I am not suggesting for one minute, Mr. Chairman, that the government should build roads to every camp in the country. That is the risk, I appreciate, of this. That is one of the arguments used by the department against the selling of land in almost any area to these individuals who do want solitude.

What I suggest is that you can make it plain enough to the citizen buying that he is not going to get a road. And I know a good many of them do not want a road. I do not want a road to my summer camp, I never will want a road. But the thing that I am trying to impress upon the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, is I think greater use should be made of these regional zoning committees. I think that by using them we can get away from some of this building in areas which I think should be left the way they are, left the way they are indefinitely, so that we will have something natural 10, 20, 30 years from now.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would like to make it clear though, that the general purpose in the frontage, generally speaking, is that we are trying to have 100 to 200 ft. lots and not the 50 to 60 ft. lots that have been referred to.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, in view of the great interest in this debate, I would suggest that we adjourn. I note by quick count that we have far more hon. members here than the

government has and therefore I suggest that in view of the lack of interest that the House adjourn and we resume at some other time when there is more interest. I think the formal motion, sir, is that the committee rise and report progress.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): We will have a standing vote on that!

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): We certainly will have a standing vote.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I think perhaps it might be worthwhile following the procedure of the House in allowing the chairman first to rule.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the motion. Order!

You have heard the question. All those in favour of the motion please say "aye".

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, call in the members and we will—

Mr. Whicher: No, sir!

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, call in the members!

Mr. Wintermeyer: We have been through this many times and I think the rule is quite clear that you have to make your determination now.

Mr. Chairman: I put the question and declare the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, with deference to you, I suggest that there is no need to call in the members at all. Sir, I expect of you that you make—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Do not have us go through all this again. We have done this before, and the ruling is that when five members stand to ask for a standing vote we call in the members. So that is it.

An hon. member: You cannot call them if they are not here.

Mr. Whicher: If you call them you had better call them down at the hotel. I hope you know the phone number.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

All those opposed to the motion, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the yeas are 20; the nays are 19.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion carried.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay moves that the House do now resolve itself into committee of supply.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, Mr. Speaker, I must ask for a little bit of direction. Obviously I intend to move a counter vote and, Mr. Speaker, I would move that this House do now adjourn.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there is one motion before the House and one order at a time. If necessary the order is to vote on the motion after the Speaker has had an opportunity of ruling.

Mr. Wintermeyer: A motion to adjourn is not debatable. It is always in order.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Not when it follows another order then before the House, which there is now.

Mr. Speaker: Would you repeat the motion?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I have moved that the House do now resolve itself into committee of supply and that we take up the 9th order on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour, please say "aye". All those opposed, please say "nay".

I declare the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

The motion was carried on the following division:

YEAS

Brunelle
Bryden
Carruthers
Cass
Cecile
Cowling

NAYS

Belanger
Bukator
Chapple
Edwards
(Wentworth)
Gaunt

YEAS

Dymond
 Edwards (Perth)
 Gisborn
 Gomme
 Guindon
 Haskett
 Johnston (Carleton)
 Macaulay
 Morningstar
 Noden
 Reilly
 Roberts
 Rollins
 Root
 Rowntree
 Simonett
 Spooner
 Stewart—24

NAYS

Gibson
 Gordon
 Manley
 Newman
 Quilty
 Reaume
 Singer
 Sopha
 Spence
 Trotter
 Troy
 Whicher
 Wintermeyer
 Worton—19

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 24, the "nays" 19.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

House in committee of supply; Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton) in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1114:

Vote 1114 agreed to.

On vote 1115:

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Under vote 1115, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have an explanation of this. Do I understand that the department builds roads into areas where you are going to cut trees? Also I see here that it is recovered. I would like to know how much was recovered, last year and the year before from the amount spent.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The policy this year in the construction of logging roads through—no I am sorry it is not new policy. The actual position is that in the fiscal year 1955-1956 the department commenced a programme of construction of logging access roads in order to open up areas of mature and overmature timber for harvesting under economic conditions. The programme is financed through the capital account and is being repaid annually from increased revenue applicable to the newly constructed access roads. Does this show what has been recovered? There has been expended over the period, including the estimate for this present year, some \$1,014,864, which is made up of: \$828,530, cost of construction; \$186,334, repairs; and there has been recovered over the period since this started, for 1956 through to 1963, or estimated with

regard to the present year, a total of \$878,479.

Mr. Belanger: Are you recovering more than you are spending? That is what I want to know.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The expenditure is \$1,000,014; the recovery, \$878,000 to date.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, does the federal government participate in this programme of those logging roads and—

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell me who controls these roads when they are built? I understand these are roads into the logging areas. And are these roads built on lands that are subsequently leased to a company who controls the roads?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We run the roads, and we control the roads throughout.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: So that the logging company is not permitted to control access and, what do you call it, egress or digress from these roads?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Not in this particular type of road we are talking about in this vote.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): May I ask the hon. Minister if a different policy will obtain in respect of these roads to the one that obtains in respect of the roads built by—I see you are getting considerable static from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. Do you want me to repeat my question? Mr. Chairman, I want to ask whether a different policy will obtain in respect of these roads built entirely from public money, than obtains in respect of the roads built by private companies, in reference to the right of the public to use it. You know what I mean by that.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Where the road is built by the company, unless it is taken over by some arrangement, they do control their own roads? They have the say over the use of the roads, generally speaking, except in some emergency or something like that, where we would perhaps insist on certain rights.

In the case of roads built by ourselves in this way, again using our own judgment as to the use of them, the general practice is to allow them to be used for the public. There might be some reservations under certain circumstances, but that is the general position.

Mr. Sopha: I am fully aware, of course, of the dangers of fire hazard that are increased in these areas; but in my own mind I have had a slight reservation about these signs that one sees on roads built by private companies.

I remember one, last fall, when I was hunting moose. Incidentally, I have never got angry enough at a moose to actually shoot one. But up in Sutton, and I think you will correct me if I am wrong, I think there is something called Anglo-Huronian Forest Products, or something close to that. They have a great sign emblazoned at the entrance to the road and the sign says: "No hunting beyond this point by order of Anglo-Huronian Forest Products Ltd." With respect to the right to hunt, I have often wondered where that company got its legislative powers to put up such a sign as that.

Secondly, I have had some small reservation about these private empires over Crown land because that is in effect what they amount to. When they put up signs like that they assert almost the right of a feudal serfdom in controlling egress, ingress, and the use of the roads.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think I will answer the question this way. Where we are dealing with Crown lands, the animals and the wildlife are the property of the Crown; hunting under a licence granted by the Crown would give the person concerned the prior right. There is no right to any holder of getting a licence to stop people hunting over the area, as long as they are not hunting in their kitchens or something of that sort. That is the situation.

We do have a different situation however in relation to where the title is to the land—as the hon. member probably knows, the Algoma Central situation is a different one and that is not without some problem. But where the Crown owns the area I would imagine those sort of signs—I do not know of any Anglo-Huronian, there is an Anglo-Newfoundland and there is a Huronian Woods Products—

Mr. Sopha: That is the one.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It maybe the Huronian Woods Products. They may put signs up but I doubt, with any good defence, that they would get very far in any prosecution.

Mr. Sopha: I wonder if we can do it this way: Supposing The Department of Lands and Forests put up a sign which said in effect, "Pulpwood cutting is going on in this

township; no hunting is permitted in this area by order of The Department of Lands and Forests." I think that would make a much better impact.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That could be done if we felt that we should do it under those circumstances.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I hope you feel that you should.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1115 agreed to.

On vote 1116:

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, one of the weaknesses of our system of buying land for parks is the fact that where we really need parks in large cities and towns, the land is not bought. Mind you, I agree with the policy of the government in that they buy up as much land as possible, but most of the new parks that we acquire are up in the northern areas and certainly now is the time to buy it before these areas become heavily populated. But under this estimate I think the government should give consideration to assisting large municipalities to acquire lands within their own city limits.

I had in mind a situation in my own riding. A large factory ceased to exist, and there is in my riding now from six to eight acres of vacant land. That land is worth about half a million dollars. The city of Toronto cannot afford to buy it and yet it is in an area where a park is needed because there are a large number of rooming houses and flats. The only way land like this can be purchased at today's prices in large cities is with the help of the provincial government and this is a situation I think the province should do something about. Unless the province has some programme to assist the larger municipalities to purchase land in crowded areas, we are not going to have parks where they are really needed, where small children can use the park day by day.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has given any consideration, or has the government given any consideration in assisting municipalities in this way?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, Mr. Chairman, up until this new policy of acquisition—in the manner which has been outlined and which this vote indicates—the policy has been that where provincial parks are established, they are established in areas other than in urban municipal areas. I think the hon. member will understand that, without me going into details. It is a matter of expense, a matter

of what would be involved if we got into that before we got through with it, if it would be possible to do it. The municipalities are expected to look after their own requirements within their own boundaries for day use or hourly use of parks. When I recall the beautiful High Park in the neighbourhood of Parkdale—Parkdale has a name that sounds as if it was established on parks too, perhaps—but in that particular part of Toronto there is one at least beautiful park in the High Park area and a number, I am sure, of small parks.

We could not I am sure, launch a programme that would pick up small four, five or six-acre areas in highly valuable urban centres. However, we will do our best to pick up areas where they are available on the outskirts and I would make this clear, that the bulk of this money, I expect, will be spent in southern Ontario. For one thing, in the north we do not have to acquire the land; we have the land; it is Crown-owned in most cases anyway. It is a matter of putting the money into the improvements in most cases. But here the policy will be to acquire land in southern Ontario for the most part and with that in mind a great deal of study has already been made and I hope that we will be able to do this on a basis that perhaps it will be in the form of optioning because some of these areas may not be necessary for development for some little time.

Perhaps on some instalment basis we can work out a much larger area to get under our control in a shorter period of time than would be the case if we just took them, paid for them in full and developed them and went along on that basis. So I am hoping that the policy will be applied that will give us the largest possible number of good sites and then the gradual development of them as the population grows and as requirements indicate giving proper priorities. I think, perhaps, that answers the question.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, just one short comment on that. I think if the provincial government had some scheme where, if a city wanted to buy land or had the opportunity to buy land in some of these urban areas, for example, the opportunity does not come along very often. A factory existed in this area for 12 years, and now that the factory has shut down it will probably become an area for high-rise apartments so that land will be gone. But if the provincial government had a policy whereby, say, they advanced a dollar for every dollar the city would put up, or make it possible for the city to borrow funds to buy this land, it would be

of help. Despite the fact that my constituency is called Parkdale, in this particular area of Parkdale that I speak of, there is less area of park per person than any other place in metropolitan Toronto. So there is a real need there, and I fear that that need will not be solved under present policies, and it is a shame that this government would not give some leadership in this field.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Oh, I think we are giving leadership. For instance, The Park Assistance Act permits assistance up to \$50,000, but the greater assistance in these types of areas comes under the conservation authority position, and we have—I think it is something like 51 conservation authority parks in the province at the present time, 3,000 acres. Some of those—Boyd comes to my mind, and there is one down in the east end of the city and the Boyd one out around Maple—are definitely Metro Toronto park areas, and very fine ones they are.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, this \$5 million set aside—has the hon. Minister lined up a certain number of parks; has he set the amount for these parks that he intends to pay? In other words, how much of this \$5 million has been allocated for parks to be spent this year? Or is this just a \$5 million figure set in here to cover possibilities?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, until we get the vote, of course, we would not earmark anything. The position at the present time is that as a result of these surveys—and if we carry out the policy I indicated and were successful at all in getting the proper prices and getting options and instalments—I can see where with this figure we should be able to acquire a very large number of suitable sites. In fact, I would go so far as to say that I would hope that, placed geographically, we would have them in most, if not all, of our counties—some areas in all the counties of southern Ontario.

Mr. Chapple: Mr. Chairman, on this again. Does the hon. Minister have plans that are set for this? In other words, why set aside \$5 million if you have not got plans lined up to spend this money?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I thought I just made it clear that we have books of areas that we can go to work on, and we will not have any trouble in getting. I do not think we will have any trouble, if we can get the proper valuations on them, in getting properties to a total of \$5 million tied up in this first year of operation. That is what we expect.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, in the speech from the Throne we were told there were going to be \$200 million spent in—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Over a 20-year period.

Mr. Whicher: A 20-year period. Now, using very rough arithmetic, that would mean \$10 million per year. Well, it would seem to me to be a very good year to start on a \$10 million acquisition; why only \$5 million?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, if the policy I have in mind is successful, we will have under control for this amount of money, more areas and land than would represent \$10 million by a considerable amount, but it will not all have been paid for this year. It would be under control and available and that is the main thing and we do not need them all at once.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Will this be on a priority basis, and how is this priority basis established?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Oh, yes. This committee and this group that will be set up will be selective on the basis of distribution needs, and distribution. As I said a moment ago I am hoping that it will be widespread across the whole province—in the south particularly.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out from the hon. Minister whether, in these plans that they have for the future, he is considering the type of park that I consider would attract a large number of tourists. For instance, I have in mind La Fontaine Park in the city of Montreal. I know that they have a certain area there designed so that it will attract the children to a great extent. I am also thinking of Disneyland out in California. I do not mean to elaborate to that extent, but I am wondering whether the department is doing any planning in that respect because to me this would be something that would be well received.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say that we expect to have great diversity that will enable the choice over the province of almost anything sensible and conceivable in park work. We have been studying the California plan quite thoroughly of late and we will study others, and I am sure that we will have—Has my hon. friend got any good suggestions from his travels? Let us have them because we want this to be the best available anywhere.

Mr. Whicher: I accepted the explanation a minute ago of the hon. Minister when he

said that they were only going to spend \$5 million this year, but the facts are that this government promised \$200 million to be spent in the next 20 years for the acquisition of park lands. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to impress on everyone here that it is far cheaper to buy this year than next year and when this government promised the people of Ontario that it would spend in round figures \$10 million a year over the next 20 years, then I say there should be \$10 million set aside for the acquisition of parks. I do not care whether you have it on option or what you have, but, inasmuch as this promise was made, I feel that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) has let this department down in not providing \$10 million for the acquisition of parks in this province. We are sick and tired of these promises with no action.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We are spending quite a bit of money in other accounts also. I think the total for parks, being voted here, is \$7.5 million.

Mr. Whicher: For the acquisition of parks?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Including improvements,

Mr. Whicher: Well, that was not the way that it was given to us in the speech from the Throne. It definitely said in plain words that \$200 million would be spent in the next 20 years for the acquisition of parks. I remember it very well.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is right.

Mr. Whicher: I just want to know where the \$10 million is.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Next year I think I will be able to show him that for \$5 million we got \$20 million to \$25 million worth of property either bought or under option.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to have something a little more definite in regard to the acquisition of park properties. I do not think we can let it go too lightly. I would direct a question—apparently the metropolitan areas such as Hamilton and Toronto, based on the direction of this government in the last two or three sessions in some regional planning and development. The direction has been very wise, but it appears to me that the municipalities at this particular time are planning only for more industry. They are buying up properties, they are establishing industrial commissions, and their whole effort seems to be in the direction of getting industry into their areas. Well, industry is needed

but I think, in the last three sessions, we talked about decentralization and the need for industrializing the northern part of this province. The question is: What liaison is there with The Department of Lands and Forests and The Department of Municipal Affairs, and the Cabinet in general, in looking at this whole picture, in planning on a regional basis, with regards to parks and recreation? It cannot be done by one department, and I wonder if anything has been started in this direction. Is there any basic plan for regional development and planning, so that we do have some parks of the nature we are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes, I would say that that has been proceeding for some time now under the parks integration board supervision. Under that method, when the parks branch has proposals that have been studied and ready for submission, they then bring them to the parks integration board which in turn looks it over on a planning basis, and studies it. I have in my hand here the southeastern regional parks planning report, which is one of those plans and quite extensively set out. There is a lot of planning going on, and it is the intention to get, as I said, the best locations possible, and always on the basis of considerations not being out of hand entirely. I can assure my hon. friend that in all our districts, in all the 22 districts, there is definite study proceeding at the level of the Lands and Forests district offices; we are also studying and setting up technical groups at the lands branch and the parks branch. We have the advantage also of technical advice in the structure of the parks integration board. I think we are heading in the right direction; I hope my hon. friend accepts that assurance. I would not want to say anything to him tonight that would in any way ruffle him, for I think he has shown very good judgment himself during the evening.

Mr. Gisborn: Well I thought, Mr. Chairman, under the basic organization that that was the place to raise it. I am glad the hon. Minister referred to what happened a moment or two ago. We felt that we wanted to get an answer to this question. I am pleased to get that type of an answer; we had no desire to let the business of this province stop tonight for political reasons. We were a little guilty of absence of members ourselves, and we will always try to keep the business going.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister of this department considering the establishment of another village similar to

the Upper Canada Village? When you go along the great lakes you have Upper Canada Village at the extreme east; you have the Niagara Parks Commission and its complement in the central part of Ontario; but how about the far west, along the great lakes; are they considering anything similar to the Upper Canada Village?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say in some parts there are museums. For instance the new park at Elliot Lake; in connection with the work at Elliot Lake a museum is being contemplated. Algonquin Park has a museum; Rondeau Park has a museum; the Pioneer Village, which is a Metro conservation authority project, gets assistance. And we are very interested in that particular one up north of Keele Street; I think it is in the outskirts of this area, something that perhaps my hon. friend would be interested in seeing if he has not been there because it is really quite an interesting pioneer village. They carry on quite a lot of cultural activities there, from time to time, especially on Saturday nights.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, every time I mention something to the west you get as far as the Toronto area and then you go north. Beyond Toronto, farther west, there is still part of the province of Ontario. I am referring to an area that follows the great lakes, but extends right into the heartland of the USA.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): I thought it might be interesting to hear something that is positive along this line tonight; I am glad to see you are still interested in something along that line.

You see, Mr. Chairman, you almost get the impression that these people do not want this parks programme to proceed. Here we have the hon. member for Fort William standing in his place and asking about what we are going to do with money that you have not already voted us yet. Have we spent it? How can we spend it until it is voted in the Legislature? That is not why I rose, Mr. Chairman. I want to recount what can be done.

Mr. Whicher: What vote is this on now, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is on the same vote. When this programme was announced in the speech from the Throne, Mr. Chairman, I say to you and I say to the hon. members that the people in the riding I represent were interested enough to make

representations to the hon. Minister who has just spoken. They have had a number of visits with him already; they are having one with departmental people tomorrow and they had been virtually assured that a number of suitable locations in the county of Huron will be shortly taken under option, and from these a park or parks will be developed.

It simply proves, Mr. Chairman, that anybody in this House who is interested in working with the hon. Minister and his department, can and will have parks; instead of this type of criticism here today. I would ask the hon. member for Bruce: Would he say that the voting of an estimate amounting to \$5 million, properly employed in judicious options, could not acquire sufficient land for parks purposes that might result in an expenditure of \$20 million next year, and take this thing to where you want it?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Yes. I would say, as a good financier, you are out in left field.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not out in left field at all. This is, Mr. Chairman, a brand new programme. It has been widely acclaimed by the people of this province.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Why should you know so much about this programme?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why should I? Because I have made it my business to find out about it since the announcement was made in the Throne speech. And a great many people across this province are very much interested in it. May I say this, Mr. Chairman, through you to these people over there. If they were interested in this programme proceeding, and would allow the hon. Minister to explain his programme, they would find out just what is being done for the jurisdiction I represent, that can be considered for other jurisdictions.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has not made any explanation of the type that you have suggested. I suggest to you that if you had been here all evening, as you were not incidentally—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: There is no point of privilege here at all.

I made an observation that is factually correct. Mr. Chairman, who has the floor? Mr. Chairman, he has the privilege of stating his privilege but, sir, you know very well that it is your responsibility to determine whether or not he has in fact stated a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will state it now, Mr. Chairman. I was absent from my place tonight because I was down at the Royal York Hotel in my capacity as the Minister of The Department of Highways where the Ontario Good Roads Association is meeting.

Mr. Wintermeyer: No. The point I want to direct to the hon. Minister, sir, is simply this: As this programme evolves it would appear, sir, that you are going to acquire lands under options and agreements and such, and thus commit this province to great sums of money at some time in the future that will not be repaid—I am sorry, that will not be required to be paid on an actuarially sound basis. For example, you are going to use \$5 million this year to acquire what may prove to be a commitment to bind the province to the expenditure of many times \$5 million next year or the year after. I would think it would be much sounder, fiscally speaking, to commit this province to an equal instalment of \$10 million each—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister without Portfolio): That is utter nonsense.

Mr. Wintermeyer: No. It is not utter nonsense.

Mr. Chairman, sir, these men who call themselves great businessmen—the hon. Minister without Portfolio—I have had as much business experience as he will ever have.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Yes, it is all right. A lot of people around here are blowing their horns about business, and if they actually got into a real business deal they would not know whether they were coming or going.

Sir, the point that we are making is elementary. This government announced a programme for the acquisition of \$200 million worth of park lands over the next 20 years; and certainly the inference, and certainly the logical deduction, was that that \$200 million would be financed equally over the period of 20 years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Of course it was.

Then the question I ask of the hon. Minister is this: As of this moment, how many contracts have actually been executed for the acquisition of lands under this particular programme?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The answer is that in relation to this vote there are none, because

we are awaiting the authority of the House; but there has been a building-up programme, as the hon. leader of the Opposition knows. Last year we spent \$500,000 on land acquisition; and of those particular proceedings, some of them are at a stage of completion, some are in the course of being proceeded with. As far as this \$5 million is concerned, we have the whole amount available for this coming year.

The hon. leader of the Opposition says he would do it differently; perhaps he would, and I am not saying that that would not be all right, too, but I do say this: I think we are going to get it, if this province is going to grow in the way that we think it is, much more land under some sort of control for the future, adopting the policy that I have mentioned rather than simply taking this 20 years, dividing it into 20 equal parts and only spending that amount each year.

Mr. Wintermeyer: May I ask the hon. Minister what commitments were made as a result of the expenditure of half a million dollars last year? How many contracts were negotiated, and what was the total amount to which the government committed itself to spend in the future?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That would appear either here or in public works information that is available to the House. I cannot give you the answer offhand; I am simply giving you the round figures of what was voted and what has been spent.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think under this vote we certainly—I can understand that the hon. Minister who has been in charge of this department for a limited time may not have the personal knowledge, but surely this is the type of information that he can accumulate and get very quickly from his advisers?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: All spent through the public works funds.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, what I wondered was this: Did he commit the government to more than \$500,000 as a result of those contracts?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No. The answer is no.

Mr. Wintermeyer: In other words, the hon. Minister did not pursue the course that he has now enunciated?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No. This is a new policy and a new plan. This is a plan to get as many areas as possible, as quickly as

possible, for as small an amount as possible, having in mind that if you only take a small portion of them now and then go for a small portion next year, you may find yourself paying a great deal more than if you adopt the policy I have enumerated.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned, among other parks, the one at Elliot Lake, just a few minutes ago before we got into a little uproar. I know that I myself was very interested last year to know that Elliot Lake, a municipality that has had many industrial difficulties over the past couple of years, was going to have a park—as was promised by numerous hon. members of the government—that would do a great deal towards the easing of the unemployment problem there. Would the hon. Minister tell me how many people are employed in the provincial park at Elliot Lake?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I will say this—I have not got the exact figures there. This is winter work at the moment that is going on, but I have a letter in my file, which I will be glad to get and send him a copy of, if he wants it, Mr. Chairman, from the gentleman up there who was referred to by the hon. member for Sudbury last year as being far from content, a gentleman by the name of Gauthier. He is a very active citizen, and his letter thanks me for my visit up there and for the discussions I had with the very representative body of citizens who met me there a few weeks ago. He states that he had noted that I had hardly got back before action was indicated in several different directions, and that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Haskett) had also instituted some additional action, all of which was greatly appreciated.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1116 agreed to.

That concludes the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 219:

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there is any possibility of having a chief coroner appointed for the city of Toronto. Dr. Smirle Lawson was the former coroner and it is some time now since he retired; in the meantime the position has gone vacant. The rumour has it that there is a great deal of behind-the-scenes politics going on as to whom the

government should appoint. I understand that the top candidate for the job made the mistake of supporting the now hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) at a convention and he has probably had some difficulty finding a job, or at least obtaining the job. But in the meantime the city of Toronto goes without a chief coroner.

This is a very important position here in the city. I think it is time the government did something about it and quit playing politics with it. Could the hon. Minister give me some indication as to when Toronto will have a chief coroner?

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in all the news which the hon. member has given to us here with respect to that matter.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): We keep up to date.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, I am glad. At the present time, and since the resignation of Dr. Lawson, there has been an acting chief coroner for the city of Toronto. He is the supervising coroner, Dr. Cotnam—Dr. H. B. Cotnam. So far as I know, and I have had contact with the officials of the city, Dr. Cotnam is very ably and well fulfilling that particular position. If it is deemed advisable to relieve him of that double task and to appoint someone else as chief coroner for the city of Toronto, I am sure that in due course my department and the government, in turn, will take the necessary action.

Mr. Trotter: Well, why should the city of Toronto go without a chief coroner? This has gone on for months, and I do not think it is fair to the city. I have nothing against the other gentleman concerned but that is not the job he was hired for, and he is now doing two jobs. I would say that one of the two jobs is not being done in a proper manner and it is obvious that it is the chief coroner's job in the city of Toronto that is suffering. I think it is a shame that this government is neglecting to fulfil the duties it should be doing.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, this certainly is not my department so I ask the indulgence of the hon. Minister. Would other coroners come under this vote?

It has been brought to my attention that in my own county of Bruce there is a coroner in the town of Port Elgin, that is 90 miles from Tobermory. Very often this gentleman is not there, I have been told this on good authority; which makes the nearest coroner

to Wiarton in Kincardine which means 110 miles from Tobermory. It has been suggested to me by people in your department, whom I will tell you about privately, that we should have another coroner in Bruce county. It was suggested that one should be appointed in the village of Lion's Head, which would be about the half-way mark between Tobermory and Port Elgin.

It is just a suggestion and I pass it on.

Hon. Mr. Cass: That is a good suggestion and I will be glad to pursue the matter further and deal also privately with the hon. member.

One of the things, Mr. Chairman, that the supervising coroner has been trying to do during the short time that he has had that position has been to, shall I say, sharpen up the coroners in Ontario. He has been running courses for them out of his office, and I understand from those who attended the courses that they were exceedingly good and brought the doctors who were acting as coroners into a realization of the duties and responsibilities of their office.

The other thing which he has been trying to do, and with some success to date, impinges on the matter the hon. member for Bruce has raised, Mr. Chairman; that is, try to have coroners scattered throughout Ontario where they will be readily accessible. I would not be happy about this situation either, Mr. Chairman; I can assure the hon. member I will look at it personally.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, when I was speaking on the debate on the speech from the Throne, I read into the record an editorial from the *Daily Nugget* of North Bay concerning provincial police and highgrading. At that time the propriety of my statement was questioned by the hon. Attorney-General and he was going to give me a personal and confidential report.

Since then the supervising coroner held an inquest, I understand, on February 8 at Cobalt in connection with the death of one—I forget the man's name. I read the report of that inquest in the newspaper but because of the fact that the hon. Minister had already told me I should not take things from newspapers, will you be putting into the record the supervising coroner's report of that inquest, and any action that might be taken about the activity, in that particular case, of the federal member for Timiskaming?

Hon. Mr. Cass: First of all may I say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, that the reason he has not received

the report which I promised him during the first part of this session is that I, myself, have not received the report. When I do I still give my undertaking that the hon. member will have the opportunity of perusing it and seeing what the situation is, and what is being done. I say this, Mr. Chairman: it will be done privately because there will be matters in it which should not be either tabled or made public.

I have no objection whatsoever, if the hon. member wishes it, to tabling the findings of the inquest on one Garceau to which the hon. member refers, and we will see that it is done.

Mr. Troy: Is there any further action contemplated by your department as a result of that inquest?

Hon. Mr. Cass: There would not appear to be any further action indicated in view of the verdict of suicide which was given and the evidence which was adduced.

Mr. Troy: Sometimes I notice in certain cases that people are charged with public mischief. I believe there was a certain reference in that regard by the supervising coroner at that time.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 219 agreed to.

Vote 220 agreed to.

On vote 221.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, there are just a couple of questions I would like to ask with respect to vote 221 that have to do with the actions of the Public Trustee in relation to a matter which has been brought to my attention.

It seems to me that sometimes this particular office does not use the most wisdom in its dealings. I am told of a situation which was brought to my attention, concerning the wife of a young man was voluntarily committed to the Ontario Hospital for treatment. At that time, apparently under authority of the statutes, the Public Trustee took custody of her estate. A letter was forwarded to the husband pointing out this fact and asking to have a financial statement completed, which was to give the entire details of their estate.

It so happened that they had a joint bank account in which they had a few dollars—which was used for such purposes as paying the mortgage payment, paying for the oil for heating and some other matters—amounting to some \$300. Subsequently the next thing the husband knew was that the manager

of the bank, or trust company, where they kept their funds, advised him that he could no longer write cheques on this account because the Public Trustee had advised the trust company that the account was to be held and that the Public Trustee was taking custody of this money.

I can realize that this Act is set up for a purpose; I can realize that it is necessary to protect people who are incapable of looking after their own affairs; but surely here is a situation where a little bit of compassion could have been used. This gentleman phoned me and he was quite concerned; because while it was only a small amount, it was quite a major problem to this person since it represented the mortgage payment and other necessary expenses which were necessary for the maintenance of the home during the time that the wife was in the hospital.

Is there no way in which the Public Trustee can show a little bit more consideration? Is it necessary for them to move in this very arbitrary and, what seems to me, most unreasonable manner?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the difficulties of the office of the Public Trustee is the fact that all patients committed, not voluntary patients, but all patients committed to Ontario hospitals are *ipso facto*—by that fact—wards of the Public Trustee who assumes responsibility for all their effects and property. When one realizes that there are some 18,000 of these estates and trusts being administered by the Public Trustee's office at the present time, and the number is going up, it is quite conceivable that first of all many things are not done as quickly as one might expect. But they are done as expeditiously as possible. Secondly, it is very necessary because the Public Trustee is actually a court official, official of this government also, that it must be done in a manner so that there may be no dereliction of duty or fault to be found on the part of the Public Trustee if matters, as they most often are, should be examined later in court. And so before any matters, which would cause a wastage or a usage of the patient's property can be dealt with they must go through the appropriate courses of law.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member has touched on a point with which those of us who are in the legal profession and perhaps many others are fully aware; that is at the present time, it is rather a cumbersome procedure and sometimes the Public Trustee's office is not able to respond as the hearts of the officers there would like to in cases such

as the one that was mentioned. All I can say to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, through you, is that I am not unaware, neither are the senior officials nor the Public Trustee himself, of the difficulties.

I should hope, and this is not a promise—I am not making a promise because you people on the other side of the House, Mr. Chairman, do not like them—but I just hope that there would be some improvement, if improvement is necessary, in these procedures, without either affecting the duty or the responsibility of the Public Trustee as such, or without affecting any wastage in the assets and property of the patients in the hospital who are under his control. It is a very difficult situation, and if one would place himself in the position of the Trust Officer in the Public Trustee's office he would realize that anything he does must be supported not only by the facts and by common sense, but by the law; otherwise they are likely to be attacked in the courts.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. I think this was a callous approach because, subsequent to this taking place, this particular individual got in touch with me and also in touch with his lawyer; and after his lawyer negotiated with the Public Trustee's office it was possible to release these funds within a reasonable period of time. I would point out I do not know whether there was a charge to him for legal services. Certainly the lawyer would be entitled to do so, but the fact of the matter is that had they used a little bit more compassion or been just a little bit more careful with the husband who was living, and where he was capable of handling the affairs, it need not have happened. It was possible to get the matter corrected after he went to his lawyer, but this took a considerable period of time. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that where situations like this do take place, there is already enough stress on the party who is trying to make ends meet and keep the family together. I am pleased to hear that it will receive consideration in any event.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. Attorney-General, in the few months remaining to him, I believe has a real and sincere desire to probe the procedures in the department. Perhaps it can be safely said—I did not mean, sir, I hasten to assure the hon. gentleman, I did not mean by saying the few months remaining that it had anything to do with his longevity, I mean his political future.

Hon. Mr. Cass: The government will look after that.

Mr. Sopha: You never know, they might need a judge down in Chesterville. That time has almost gone, too.

Perhaps it can be safely said there is no department of the government, sir, where the procedures can appear to be more harsh and oppressive than those adopted by The Attorney-General's Department because of the laymen's unfamiliarity with the law. The hon. Attorney-General has said that some of the procedures are very difficult. I would find that too, on this, sir, where the Public Trustee, acting under a statute of this province takes possession of the assets of a person who is committed to one of the Ontario hospitals.

Let me give this illustration of what I mean.

A couple came to see me one night, sir, and the husband informed me that his wife had been in the Ontario hospital, one of our Ontario hospitals. At the time of her entry into the Ontario hospital they were the owners of a joint bank account. The Public Trustee, acting on the authority of the powers granted to him under that statute, took control of the bank account. He does this, I understand, merely by a letter to the bank manager.

Subsequently, the woman was released. She is released, as I understand it, under a term of probation. She had been released for several months when they both came to see me.

The husband said: I have made inquiries at the bank to see if we might use the funds that are to the credit of our joint account.

Now, mark you, as long as she was in the Ontario hospital, he was unable to have access to the monies in the account. They were frozen, so to speak. He said, now that she is back home, why can I not control the bank account, you see, which is a perfectly reasonable request.

He contacted the Public Trustee. We got the matter ironed out very quickly.

My suggestion is simply this: when the Public Trustee acts under the powers invested in him under the statute, why is it not a simple procedure for him to write to the other party, to write to the husband or the person's relatives, and say to them: acting under this Act I have done such and such. I will continue to exercise authority over these assets so long as so-and-so is a ward of mine, so to speak, while she is under the care of the Ontario hospital.

Now that brings government, in my estimation, into close and sympathetic contact with

people upon whom are imposed certain duties and upon whom are exacted certain obligations. When the hon. Attorney-General says it is a complicated procedure, then my reply to him is that some of these matters are just good public relations, that is all they are. All it requires is a little bit of communication from some of the people responsible to those affected.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 221 agreed to.

On vote 222:

Hon. Mr. Cass: Before proceeding to discuss the estimates of the Ontario Provincial Police—indeed of the Ontario Police Commission and the Ontario Police College, for all of them appear inclined to be interrelated in some aspects—I propose to make certain observations with regard to the organization and development of the Ontario Provincial Police and the important position occupied by it in the law enforcement system in the province.

The very considerable responsibility of the provincial force in all rural parts of the province, as well as in certain urban parts, is generally recognized by all of our citizens to whom the cruiser with the white markings and the designation "OPP" are familiar. Most of us know, in a general way at least, that this force is not only responsible for the policing, in a traffic law enforcement sense, of the many miles of King's highway as well as many additional miles of county and township roads, but is responsible also for the enforcement of the criminal laws throughout the province except where a municipal force is maintained.

I believe that most of us are aware of the criminal investigation branch of the Ontario Provincial Police, where highly trained senior officers are available to assist local and municipal officers in the investigation of major crimes.

Before I depart from this brief sketch of the activities of the Ontario Provincial Police, I should refer to the ever-increasing activities of the force conducted with the aid of its fleet of launches and skiffs throughout the inland waters of the province. The purpose of the fleet, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, is primarily to assist our officers in their regular police functions. Nevertheless, as we have this equipment it is not unnatural to find that it has proven useful in enforcing what I may describe as the water offence sections recently introduced into the criminal code, as well as in the performance of certain water safety functions, even though,

strictly speaking, these are to be regarded as federal responsibility.

It will be apparent from this brief review that this force has now attained proportions that compel its recognition as one of the major police forces of Canada. Though not the oldest force in the country, it is one of proud tradition and of considerable accomplishment in both its criminal law and its traffic aspects.

Mr. Chairman, there comes a time in the life of every noble institution when a review of its operations is in order to ensure that the development of the body is proceeding along good lines and that the available facilities are being efficiently utilized to accomplish the best results. This is a principle that is recognized in industry and government alike. I need not elaborate either by providing examples or promoting the desirability of the practice. It is universally accepted.

The Ontario Provincial Police is no exception and many of you know of the study and review which my hon. predecessor caused to be made by officials of the traffic institute of Northwestern University, one of the recognized authorities in this field on this continent. While the name of the organization suggests that its attention was directed principally at the traffic functions of the force, those of you who are familiar with the work of the institute will know of its reputation in the matter of the organization and administration of police forces generally. I may tell you at this point that arrangements have also been made for a review of certain of the criminal facets of the force's responsibilities by specialists in that field.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain that the studies to which I have referred were made at the instance and upon the direction of the Attorney-General and the report received is a report to the Attorney-General and for the purposes of the Attorney-General and his senior officials in assisting them to appraise the functioning of the force in the light of expert opinion.

I will refer now to the establishment of the Ontario Police Commission by an amendment to The Police Act, just a year ago. At this point I would pay tribute to the chairman of the commission, His Honour Judge Bruce Macdonald and his colleagues General Sparling and Mr. Thomas Graham, for the manner in which they have advanced so many matters relative to police during the comparatively short period of time that they have comprised the commission.

Their interestes have been as diversified as they have been beneficial to the police

picture, for you will recall that, during this transitional period in the development of the Ontario police system, the function of the commission was calculated to be not too closely prescribed. The activities of the commission, in the general prescription of its responsibilities and functions, extended to both the municipal police and the Ontario Provincial Police areas. It has, in the limited time at its disposal, neglected neither. There are many occupying municipal office who will pay tribute to the Ontario Police Commission for the excellent advice and assistance it has provided in helping them out of difficulties of various kinds—personnel, territorial, etc.—that have arisen in some of the municipal forces.

Nor, Mr. Chairman, has the commission devoted all its efforts to matters of municipal policing to the exclusion of reviewing from its position of advantage, the operations of the Ontario Provincial Police. Not the least of its useful tools in that regard has been the report of the traffic institute of Northwestern University, referred to before. You will perhaps understand that better if I remind you that that report represents not only the views of highly qualified experts, but if I assure you also that it is based upon first-hand knowledge acquired by the experts who made studies in the field throughout the province.

Mr. Chairman, I would here pay my tribute to the aggressive and constructive action taken by the members of the Ontario Police Commission in relation to the report. Following careful study of the report the commission not only went on record as favouring all the main recommendations of the report, but did in fact take prompt steps to implement a considerable number of them in the Ontario Provincial Police. The force was also strengthened by other improvements effected by the commission. It is this type of prompt action that marks efficient administration in our government service and I congratulate Judge Macdonald, General Sparling and Mr. Graham for their exemplary action.

Nor has the commission been alone in its study of the organization and present functioning of the Ontario Provincial Police. In my main office are senior officials who have dedicated their professional lives to matters of the function of government. Some of them at least, by their work over the years, their background of training and, Mr. Chairman, their keenness of mind and God-given common sense, are ideally equipped to review and appraise the police picture, particularly in the light of the Northwestern report.

It is accurate to say that we have con-

ferred upon the very important matter of what I may for convenience refer to as "the force." It is also accurate to say that we have found ready agreement upon most points, certainly all important ones. I think I may describe these matters of agreement somewhat as follows:

The Ontario Provincial Police force has reached a stage of development where, in the interests of its efficient operation, certain cardinal principles must be recognized and strong implementing action taken. The force must be recognized as an autonomous body with recognized responsibilities for which it must be responsible to this Legislature. It is essential that a plan of organization be laid down and followed to the end that every phase of the force's responsibility will be that of a particular branch and that chains of command and lines of responsibility will be understood and recognized by every member of the force beyond peradventure. There must be a head of the force who alone will bear final responsibility for its administration and operation and who will be responsible to this House as directly as constitutional amenities will permit. To that end, he must have the rank and status of a deputy Minister.

The day has come, Mr. Chairman, when we must recognize that the efficient operation of a great police force that must be responsible constitutionally to this House must be made the responsibility—and a very great responsibility it is indeed—of one senior official, carefully chosen not for his policing accomplishments but for his proven administrative ability and that his liaison with this House must be fraught with as few intermediate levels as is constitutionally feasible.

Now having outlined the situation generally and brought you up to date with the government's thinking on Ontario Provincial Police matters, what may I tell you further before resuming my seat? There will likely, it would seem, be legislation introduced affecting both the Ontario Provincial Police and the Ontario Police Commission. The experience of a year under the police commission legislation has been of great value to all of us who are responsible for police matters in the province. As is so often the case with legislation in a new field, it has permitted us better to comprehend a situation that has developed over the years.

In view of the situation relating to the Roach report, which I need not explain beyond mentioning it, it is not surprising that the government is not at this time in a position to announce what legislation will, in fact, be introduced.

Beyond legislation, I have indicated certain principles to which the government subscribes with respect to the organization and administration of the Ontario Provincial Police force. I may develop that further to some degree.

The force will, as I have stated, have a strong head with deputy Minister's rank so that it may stand on its own feet. It will have a deputy commissioner who will be chosen for his proven policing and administrative ability. There will be five principal divisions of the force, each headed by a carefully selected senior officer having the rank of assistant commissioner. These will not be mere token divisions. They will be the logical divisions of a well-organized police force, establishing chains of command and lines of responsibility at all levels.

The five divisions of the force to which I have referred, each to be headed by an assistant commissioner, are: the administrative division; the staff services division; the special services division; the field division; and the traffic division.

The divisions, as I have stated, follow natural and logical breakdowns of police function and administration. For instance, one would find the staff inspection branch, the personnel branch and the accounting branch in the administration division. The staff services division would include, among others, the radio communications branch, the quartermaster branch and the transport branch. Such branches as the criminal investigation branch and the anti-frauds branch would be in the special services division. The field division and the traffic division, both of which operate largely in the field and have, to some extent, common personnel, will, of necessity, function in close liaison with each other.

May I, referring to the term "liaison" which I have just used, give assurance that it will be policy to maintain a strong system of liaison and constant supervision throughout the force.

Mr. Chairman, I propose at this time to table a copy of the Northwestern University report.

There are a limited number of copies of the Northwestern report available. I shall arrange for copies for the hon. leaders of the Opposition groups and for the press.

Lest there be misunderstanding regarding the adoption of recommendations contained in the report, I would assure the hon. members that the advice furnished in the report has not been followed either completely or

blindly. We respect the advisers and we propose to accept most of the advice given, but one would be in error to assume that the report is to be adopted *in toto*. Perhaps the principal departure from the report relates to the proposal that the province be split into three administrative areas. It is our considered view that this would unnecessarily complicate the administrative picture and that efficiency and good results can be attained with our present overall control of the 17 districts from the one central point. Nor do the Northwestern officials take strong issue with us in that regard, I may say.

It is our purpose, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that the Ontario Provincial Police is efficient in all its undertakings and responsibilities.

Mr. Singer: We rank in priority to the—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Oh, if the hon. member is going to put up that sort of a fight—Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was willing to concede it.

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Chairman, I rose at the same time as the hon. Minister. We are the Opposition, not the hon. member here; he is from a third group.

Mr. Chairman: I am ruling that the hon. member for York South rose first.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We, sir, are the official Opposition party. When a major pronouncement is made, such as the hon. Attorney-General has just made, I assert, sir, that is our parliamentary right to put our speaker up in priority. I want to observe for the record that during the course of this evening when a very important vote was taken in this House, a vote of historic significance, sir, the hon. member for York South was not even here, and he now graces the House with his presence and demands a pre-eminent right to be heard, and I say to you, sir, that is wrong.

Mr. Chairman: York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you very much. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I was about to sit down until the objection from the hon. member for York Centre was placed on the basis on which it was.

Mr. Chairman, the priority in this House, in terms of the official Opposition speaking, is in the introduction to the estimates and after that it is the person who gets up. This is not

the official Opposition party, this is the official obstruction party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not have to get up and beat my breast to let the government know that I am opposed to them, because they know I am opposed to them; they know I am opposed on fundamental things too.

An hon. member: You voted with them tonight.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, on a little technicality.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I might add, Mr. Chairman, since it is obvious that I cannot deal with the substance of this issue, that I was out for the first hour here tonight because we put a candidate in a new provincial riding who will be in this House after the next election.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: What riding?

Mr. MacDonald: Forest Hill riding.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): I am going to lose my member.

Mr. MacDonald: I have done my best to serve your interests for eight years; now somebody else can do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me come to grips with this situation by what might appear to be a somewhat circuitous approach. One of the most respected police reporters in this province is a gentleman by the name of Dick Hayward. I was rather interested to note that his position in the journalistic world was acknowledged to the point that he was the member of a panel at a recent convention of the Canadian Bar Association, or the Ontario Bar Association, down in the city of Windsor. Last week Mr. Hayward had an article carried in the February 21 issue of the *Toronto Telegram*, in which he drew attention to the—

An hon. member: I do not know what the hon. member for York South would do without the clippings.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I trust when I now make a comment as to the very appropriate laughs from the other side of the House, it will not be said that I have climbed into bed with them over there. I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, if there is anybody in this House who has no grounds now for accusing others of speaking too long on these estimates, it is the hon. member for Sudbury. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen in the last two or three weeks is the hon. member preaching for a call that will never come.

Mr. Hayward's comment was on the action with regard to Staff Sergeant John Anderson, concerning whom he said that the policemen in this province consider that he is one of the most competent in the field. Indeed, there is one paragraph:

There is no one around who can efficiently replace him on the anti-gambling squad. There is a popular opinion in police circles that Sergeant Anderson is probably the province's best informed policeman when it comes to illegal gambling matters.

And Mr. Hayward came to the conclusion—a conclusion that, I think, is based on a considerable amount of experience as a background—that the reason why Sergeant Anderson was switched to a recruiting position was a form of punishment meted out because of the sergeant's frank testimony at the time of the Royal commission.

Mr. Sopha: Does the hon. member agree with that?

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if I did not agree with it I would not be quoting it into the record.

Mr. Sopha: Well, why does the hon. member not give his own opinion?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may pursue it without the interruptions of this constant—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, I want you to know that I have a feeling of absolute unfairness about your calling on the hon. member for York South before my hon. friend from York Centre.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, you have ruled on this point of order and the hon. gentleman is now out of order.

Mr. Sopha: I want to make it a matter of record that I feel a sense of unfairness about it.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sure that after that outburst you should break into a rash, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: We defeated those people. We defeated them; without your help. It was the first time in the history of this government they have been defeated and you were not even here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious the little gentleman is cut to the quick tonight. If I may proceed with this now, I raise this because one of the interesting things about these estimates, that the hon. Minister is bringing before the House—and here I would join forces to a degree with the hon. leader of the Opposition in his original protests when the estimates were first brought before the House—I think this government is indulging in rather an old but a slick trick.

It is about to receive some rather damaging report on the basis of what came before the Roach commission. I do not know how the report can be anything else but damaging. What the government is now proceeding to do, both in terms of departmental reorganization and in terms of the OPP is to anticipate many of the recommendations of the Roach report, so when the Roach report comes down it can say, "Well, we have acted on most of these already," and presumably then the sting will be drawn from the criticism. We might as well recognize that this is what is happening and I add my word of protest that I think this piecemeal approach designed to provide political protection to the Conservative party in a very serious situation is one that should not go without some comment and criticism in this House.

As for the Michigan report, which I believe has been in the hands of the government now for a year, if not more than a year, I do not know why it could not have been made available a year ago so that we could have, for example, discussed it in last year's estimates. It is just possible that if it had been discussed in last year's estimates the Opposition would have assisted—though this is rather a vain hope—the then hon. Minister (Mr. Roberts) to have come to grips with the reorganization of the department. But the

fact of the matter is that they sat on this report for a whole year and nothing was happening because the genesis of this report was an effort by the hon. Minister's predecessor to try to get some way out of comings to grips with the chaos of his department and the OPP without holding a Royal commission and everything else that flowed from that investigation.

This was one of the many efforts on the part of his predecessor as he fought off the inevitable; and eventually he had to face the inevitable. This is purely an administrative report. It is long, it is detailed, it is impossible for us to make any intelligent comment when presented with such a tome at this stage, and I personally am not going to attempt to. I would say as far as this hon. Minister is concerned, I think he has built up rather an enviable record in trying to bring some order out of the chaos of a succession of departments at the administrative level, and I think one of the main reasons why he was put in was that this department had almost disintegrated, and in the process of disintegration it was almost going, if I may mix my metaphors, in about six different directions at once. And one of the main jobs of the hon. Minister is to try to bring some order out of that chaos and we will just have to see his decisions put into operation before we can assess them accurately.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to turn, in dealing with the OPP, to another issue. I want to deal with it in reference to this recent episode in the Kapuskasing area, but more particularly in broader terms. When the Kapuskasing tragedy was discussed in this House first, just before an adjournment hour—I think it was a week ago last Friday—it is almost impossible to believe that one department's estimates have been before the House for something like 10 days but I think that is the fact—the hon. member for York Centre made a few comments. His comment was to the effect that in his view what had happened up north proved that the hon. Attorney-General had miscalculated and that he had not sent in sufficient police in sufficient time and that this was the reason why we had the tragic development up there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be dogmatic about this, but I just want to present to the House for a few moments some ideas which are perhaps contrary to the suggestion that the problem we faced up north was the fact there were not enough police there soon enough. In fact, one of the problems that has bedevilled labour-management relationships throughout northern

Ontario, particularly in relation to the lumber and sawmill union, has been that any time there loomed on the horizon the prospect of an industrial dispute, even before the picket lines had formed, the police forces began to be augmented in that particular area.

Now, I have discussed this privately with the hon. Minister when the trouble began to develop up in the north. I want to discuss it now in this House here, because I will not speak for the hon. Minister. I will speak for myself. He perhaps might want to comment on it later. In my view, in an industrial dispute if there is even the appearance, let alone the reality—and in these instances there was the reality of premature enforcement of the police in the area—that what you are going to have in the minds, quite understandably and naturally, and quite inevitably, of the workers involved in this dispute, is that the whole force of the law is coming in on one side of the battle.

Just let me leave for a moment, the particular situation at Kapuskasing, to deal with a broader picture. If it is not going to throw the hon. member for Sudbury into a frenzy again, I have a further quotation to make. It will not be from the papers this time. But, as an illustration of the kind of problem that I want the House to consider for a moment, let me go back to an episode that the lumber and sawmill union had to contend with last summer in a strike in the Chapleau area. There were five pickets involved in this particular strike—I believe I am correct in saying that the number was never more than five—the department had 20 to 25 provincial police to watch four or five picketers on a 24-hour basis. During the course of the strike a picket tent was burned down. Pickets were beaten up; the police sought the culprits; they were brought into a police line and the police identified two or three of the people. Two of them were recognized, and yet nothing happened.

Perhaps I can make the case on behalf of the union in their own words—just let me correct myself, I want to make the case on behalf of the public, because though I have no objection in making it on behalf of the union—

Mr. Whicher: You are not thinking of the public at all.

Mr. MacDonald: I am thinking on behalf of the public, because the public have become involved in the situation up north there.

Here is a letter dated September 10, addressed to the hon. Kelso Roberts, signed

by J. G. Pesheau, secretary-treasurer. He said:

Dear Sir:

Our difficulties with the companies in the Chapleau area are becoming greater by the day. This letter is written as a complaint, once more, concerning a one-sided attitude of the Ontario Provincial Police in that area.

As reported to you previously, our picket tents are set up beside the road leading in to the Lafreniere Plywood Mill and are approximately one mile from Chapleau and a quarter of a mile from the nearest building of Lafreniere or anyone else. As reported previously, they are under 24-hour surveillance by the Ontario Provincial Police in a cruiser for some period of time.

To while away the hours the pickets had a guitar and a mouth organ and were playing music at night when a constable visited the tent and advised them to cease playing or he would lay charges of disturbing the peace against them. The only possible people the music could disturb was the pickets themselves and the OPP in the cruiser. He could not be heard by anyone else, being out in the bush.

We did not complain about this at the time, but did advise the picket to make less noise. We believed the OPP to be quite strict and we accepted it.

On August 29, 1962, at approximately 4.45 p.m. our organizer, John Carriere, was requested by Mr. Boivert of the Chapleau Lumber Company Limited to visit company offices as he—Boivert—wished a discussion with him.

Note the sequence here, Mr. Chairman. Here is the head of the local lumber company involved in a strike calling upon the police and saying he wants to have a discussion with him.

Mr. Carriere—this is the union organizer—attended at the company office with two of the pickets and when he went into the office Mr. A. Boivert, and Mr. Robitaille were in the office when Mr. Carriere arrived. Mr. A. Boivert opened three bottles of beer and the three, Mr. Carriere, Mr. Boivert, and Mr. Robitaille, sat around for about five minutes drinking beer.

Mr. G. Boivert then entered the office and told Mr. Carriere he was not to trespass on company property. He, Boivert, then made a long distance telephone call to Mr. LaBelle, our union president in Sudbury himself, and told him the same thing. He

advised Mr. LaBelle that he had two witnesses coming and he would advise Mr. Carriere in front of these witnesses and that he would call LaBelle back shortly.

Two Ontario Provincial Police then walked in and G. Boivert told them he had called for witnesses as to what he was going to tell Mr. Carriere. He then told Mr. Carriere once more what he had told him previously.

One of the OPP stated that Boivert did not need the OPP as witnesses as he already has two witnesses. The beer was not all gone at that time. Mr. Carriere then left.

On September 6, 1962, while holding an organizational meeting in room 1 of the Hublet Hotel, an OPP constable entered with summonses for Court appearance for trespassing under The Petty Trespass Act for five of the people in the room. I myself and the other full-time organizers, questioned his right to act as a witness for anyone in the civil peace. He admitted he was present as a witness in the Chapleau lumber office.

Now, Mr. Attorney-General, I have a number of questions I wish answered.

Threats of arrest for disturbing the peace were issued by the Ontario Provincial Police to men on our picket line when there was no breach of the peace. I would like to know why?

OPP were used by a company as witnesses to a threat of civil action in a case of trespass. I want to know why?

OPP viewed three men drinking liquor in a public place—the Chapleau lumber office—and took no action against either the supplier or the consumer. I want to know why?

I feel quite sure that if beer were present in our tent in the picket line that an arrest would have been made, and rightly so. Could I please have your reply on these matters, as soon as possible.

The only point which I think is rather significant in this, Mr. Chairman, is that the union has yet to receive an acknowledgment, let alone a reply for this letter.

What you have here Mr. Chairman, is a case similar to many occasions in northern Ontario, where a town is to a considerable degree dominated by a lumber industry, the owner of the lumber industry is a very influential person. Just as in another context I was discussing this afternoon, where civil servants in various fashion are terrorized with regard to action by a lumber man in the

Quetico Park cutting operations, so you have in this instance people, including police in the area, who are threatened, who are "persuaded", in various ways by people who are top industrialists in the area.

Let me come back to the Kapuskasing area, having sketched the broader picture. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, contrary to the suggestion of the hon. member for York Centre, while it may appear at this stage, after the events, that the problem in the Kapuskasing tragedy was not that there were insufficient police. If you will pause for one moment, Mr. Chairman, and consider it, the tragedy at Kapuskasing arose not because there were not enough police, but because the police who were there were not disarming people that everybody knew were armed. Indeed, I want to say in this House, and I think it is the responsibility of the hon. Attorney-General to make certain, that there is an opportunity for the presentation of evidence in this connection. People have taken affidavits and are willing to testify that the police themselves knew that the settlers—who shot and killed three people—they, the police, knew that the settlers were armed but did not think they were going to use them.

In other words, you had a situation in which the police, for whatever reason—and I am not going to attempt to suggest as to whether they did it under orders, whether they did it under a mistaken assessment of the situation locally, or whether they did it because this is a common pattern that the police force is used against the striking union—but they simply did not disarm people who had weapons and who subsequently fired on the advancing strikers. In this instance with the result that today you have 19 people who are charged with non-capital murder and between 200 and 300 others who have been herded into jail because of the fact that they were allegedly involved in some riot.

Mr. Chairman, lest the hon. gentlemen in this House think that I am exaggerating the situation, I want to put on the record of this House one of the most quiet toned and yet firm editorial comments that has been made on this situation up north. Indeed, it appeared in a northern paper. It appeared in the February 13 issue of the *Northern Daily News* in Kirkland Lake. It was entitled "Kapuskasing Tragedy, A Reproach to All." It reads as follows:

A time of sorrow and vain regrets.

This is the atmosphere in Ontario today in the wake of the Kapuskasing tragedy

in which unarmed strikers were shot down by armed and desperate settlers.

So senseless was the slaughter, a man can only experience a terrifying sensation of being back in the dark ages. He has trouble believing it actually occurred in this supposedly enlightened day.

Out of a shocked reaction there is certain to come a tide of criticism of the provincial government and the Ontario Provincial Police charged with preventing violence and bloodshed in the situation that has daily threatened to burst into flame in the past month.

That it could have been prevented seems obvious. Everyone in the province, including Premier Robarts unless he had his ears stopped with pulpwood, knew the settlers were armed and ready to shoot in defence of their rights to transport pulpwood to the mills. Yet an OPP on duty when the outbreak finally came was quoted afterwards as saying that he did not know that the settlers had guns.

If he did not know, then he must have been the only adult in the province who was unaware of the fact.

People 500 miles from the scene could have told him about the guns.

The most dreadful feature about the case, apart from the government and police action that permitted the bloodshed to occur, is lack of reasoning behind the settlers' action. That they would shoot down their fellows working for rights that could only redound eventually to the benefit of the settlers themselves, and the children of those settlers, is sheer insanity. Despite their very real fear they would be deprived of the money from their annual woodcutting allotments, it is very difficult to understand how they could fail to realize that the value of that wood cut is based on the wages and working conditions negotiated by the very men they killed.

As we said, a senseless slaughter that leaves one with a deep feeling of sadness and frustration. There will be the outcry that these gunmen should be hanged or sent to prison for life, and perhaps a louder cry that they should not be prosecuted because they were acting in self-defence even though the strikers on whom they fired were unarmed. Neither alternative makes sense because the whole bloody affair does not make sense. We do not know what could be done about these killings. Perhaps the whole province should go on trial for them, because there are some villains in this piece who are going

to escape justice no matter what happens to the fearful and ignorant men who fired the shots.

The only poor miserable grain of comfort in the sorry situation lies in the fact that it was not the strikers who did the shooting. Had that been the case, the whole province would be aflame with headlines about their viciousness. We would be lucky if killings were not followed by lynchings.

Now that it is too late, we presume the settlers will be disarmed.

A very important point, Mr. Chairman:

Now that it is too late, we will presume the settlers will be disarmed, police reinforcements will be rushed in by the hundreds and a tight lid clapped on the region. But if the whole grisly affair does not rock the government and prompt an overhaul of the Attorney-General's department and the Ontario Provincial Police, then the whole lot of us can be prejudged guilty of setting the stage for the next act of violence.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to say no more about this except to reiterate what I have said already. That there are people who have made affidavits to the effect that the policemen involved knew that the settlers had arms, and therefore I submit to you that the problem and the source of the difficulty, the origin of the tragedy of people being shot, was not the fact that there were not enough police in there soon enough, but for whatever reason, the police did not disarm people whom everybody knew to be armed.

There had been stories in the paper, there had been pictures of the arms that were being used, and the question I want to put to the hon. Attorney-General, in comments that I hope he will make in the House on this matter, is this: I am curious to know what opportunity there is going to be for a full reevaluation of what exactly happened up north. We have had efforts in this House, by the hon. leader of the Opposition, by this group—we have had many groups on the outside, up north, and the union involved and the Ontario council of the carpenters and the lumber and saw unions that there should be an investigation, a Royal commission, call it what you will, to get to the bottom of this, because it involves four or five government departments. One would judge that, from the reaction we have got since from the government, nothing is going to happen on this.

My information is that there will be no coroner's inquest. The coroner's inquests are

not held in cases which involve murder, non-capital murder or any other, and therefore I am wondering as to what opportunity there is going to be for a presentation of evidence, or whether, in the preliminary hearing which will provide—and the trial subsequently—the only opportunity, but which will very understandably be circumscribed to the particular charges. Whether there is going to be an opportunity for some of the very relevant evidence as to other factors in the picture that contributed to this tragedy and, indeed, laid the groundwork for the fact that 19 of these people are now going to be before the courts charged with non-capital murder and another 200 to 300 on other charges.

I hope that the hon. Minister, since the government appears to be quite adamant in not considering the proposition of a Royal commission and a full investigation, will inform the House clearly as to what extent the preliminary hearing, or any other inquiry that the government is contemplating up there, will provide an opportunity for evidence along the lines that I have suggested here and which I understand is available and ready to be submitted.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do wish to have something to say about the matters raised by the hon. member and in order that we may keep in order, I would like to start at the first of his remarks where he made certain observations with respect to a valued and, we think, very important member of the Ontario Provincial Police, Sergeant Anderson.

One of the things it is absolutely necessary to do if the Ontario Provincial Police force is to continue to be, and ever increasingly be, the type of police force which we require in Ontario, is to have a recruiting service or programme which will bring the right type of young man into the force and then properly train him thereafter. Mr. Silk, who is presently acting as commissioner of the force, was given the task of starting something new in the way of a proper and up-to-date recruiting service, and cast about for the right man to have charge. And after a good deal of consideration, Sergeant Anderson was apparently the best man available. I am advised—I was not present, but I am advised—that Sergeant Anderson was asked if he wished to take this particular job—which could or could not be a promotion in the days to come, but at least it was a sideways move into a position of very considerable responsibility—that he discussed the matter fully and was quite willing and in fact pleased to undertake this responsibility. So

I would like to disabuse the minds of the hon. members of this House or the public that Sergeant Anderson has been in any way moved because of anything that he may have said or done with respect to either the former Royal commission or otherwise.

Now, the matter of the Northwestern University Traffic Institute report is an intriguing one, and I have tonight made available to have any particularly intelligent view Chairman, copies of the report. I did not anticipate that they would read them or be able to have any particular intelligent view of them now—a perusal which would take place while the estimates were underway—because I do not propose to discuss in detail and I cannot tonight, the organization of the force following this particular report. But I would draw to the attention of the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, as I said in my opening statement at the beginning of the estimates for this branch of government service, that this was a report commissioned by the Attorney-General and for the Attorney-General. It was not a report to the hon. members of this House or to the public. It was for the use and advice of the Minister and his advisors and it was so used.

However, it was my view when I became Minister, and had the opportunity of looking into this whole question, that it contained a very great deal of interesting information and a very great deal of good advice which need not be confined to the senior officials of the Attorney-General's department. Therefore I decided that it should be made available to those who, like us on the government side, are interested in a good police force, proper law enforcement, and good administration. And so, Mr. Chairman, tonight I made that available and I will have copies for the press because there is nothing in it that we do not wish anyone to see, and there is a great deal in it that the private citizen and the ordinary official and other persons with responsibilities in this province can read with interest and great advantage.

With respect to the very tragic and unfortunate affair which we had in Kapuskasing, I would like to say a bit. But before I do, I would like to correct the impression which has been left with the House by the hon. member for York South with respect to happenings at Chapeau. While he may have read letters from one Pesheau, while he may have read newspaper reports, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, the reports which I have from the Ontario Provincial Police, which are reports of actual facts, indicate first of all that a total of seven officers was the highest total of Ontario Provincial Police at any time

taken into the Chapleau area during this strike.

That the facts contained in Mr. Pesheau's letter are completely untrue, that the circumstances as reported were fully investigated by the Ontario Provincial Police, reported to the Attorney-General—I have them here—and they indicate that the letter was so untrue and so far from the facts that it did not even deserve the courtesy of a reply, although I might have thought differently myself.

Mr. Chairman, such is the situation with respect to that.

We have the same gentleman, Mr. Pesheau, sending me letters and telegrams arising out of the Kapuskasing event; and for the benefit of the House and the hon. member for York South who has been reading into the record a great many interesting things, I have some interesting things that I would like to read into the record and also have the hon. members of this House understand.

First of all, the hon. member for York South, Mr. Chairman, is quite correct when he says that he and I were in private discussion with respect to the matters in the Kapuskasing area, because he, as a good citizen, and I as one too, I hope, were very concerned with what was going on there, and what might happen. We realized, as I am sure all of those people, responsible people, who had some interest in the matter and some responsibility, realized that it was a tinder box.

I was prepared, and events indicate that I was not only prepared to take but that I did take the course that no more police from the Ontario Provincial Police should be sent into the area than were necessary to deal with the immediate circumstances at any given time. I was impelled to do that, Mr. Chairman, for several reasons. One was because we had the pleasure of entertaining a delegation, we members of government, from the senior union of the union which was on strike. I, as Attorney-General, was there and I discussed the matters with them concerning law enforcement and I said to them, Mr. Chairman, that I was quite prepared—as I had told the hon. member for York South and I am telling this House now—to rely on the good faith and the common sense of both parties and not send any more of the force in there if the unions on their part would refrain from illegal actions of intimidation and trespass and all the other annoying things which occurred there.

I was assured that if the police who were there were either withdrawn, or no more were sent, the officials would do their best to

see that these particular things ceased and there would be no difficulty. And under date of January 16, I received a wire from Mr. J. G. Pesheau, signed J. G. Pesheau, secretary-treasurer, Northern Ontario District Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union. It is addressed to me as Attorney-General—this was the time we had 22 provincial police in the area—and it says:

OUR UNION MOST STRENUOUSLY OBJECTS TO THE UNNECESSARY BUILDUP OF AN ARMY OF OPP IN THE KAPUSKASING AREA WHERE WE HAVE A STRIKE PRESENTLY IN EFFECT. THERE HAS BEEN NO VIOLENCE, THREATS OF VIOLENCE OR INTIMIDATION. AND WE OBJECT TO THE USE OF OUR TAXPAYERS' MONEY TO SUPPORT THIS NUMBER OF PROVINCIAL POLICE AT THE REQUEST OF AN AMERICAN COMPANY. IT WOULD SEEM TO US THAT IF YOUR DEPARTMENT CAN AFFORD THIS NUMBER OF COPS IN THIS AREA FOR NO GOOD REASON, THAT YOU HAVE TOO MANY EMPLOYEES AND IT IS TIME YOU COMMENCED TO THINK OF OUR TAX DOLLARS. WE REQUEST A WITHDRAWAL OF THESE COPS IMMEDIATELY.

And, as I say, signed J. G. Pesheau.

Then I received on January 23 a letter signed by this same gentleman, dated January 21, and written on the letterhead of his union, addressed to me, and I read:

Honourable Sir:

As a follow-up to my wire to you of recent date—

which I have just read, Mr. Chairman, to the House.

—concerning a buildup of extra Ontario Provincial Police in the Kapuskasing area, I write this letter in the hope that you will take some action to remove this unnecessary force from the area.

I am advised by Mr. MacDonald, leader of the New Democratic Party, that you sent in ten extra provincial police. Either your orders were misunderstood or someone else ordered some more in, but at the present time there are 22 extra OPPs registered at the Kapuskasing Inn, in Kapuskasing.

And that is a correct statement, about the only correct statement in this mass of words.

Mr. Sopha: Well, it is correct to say he was given advice from the hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not true.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Indeed, yes.

I continue:

Surely, when you receive a phone call for a buildup of this nature you must check to ascertain if the request is legitimate or if the extra force is needed. Or do you have a special squad that goes into an area immediately a strike takes place? The reason for this question is that we see so many of the same OPP and the same sergeant almost every time we have a strike.

We reaffirm our position set forth in our wire. This buildup of OPPs, housed in a company-owned hotel—which, by the way, is the only hotel in the area—is unnecessary and is a waste of the taxpayers' money, and we request their immediate removal.

Yours very truly,
J. G. PESHEAU
Secretary-Treasurer.

With a copy sent to Mr. MacDonald.

I do like to acknowledge mail which I receive and I sent this letter as follows to Mr. Pesheau, with a copy to the hon. member for York South.

Mr. Sopha: That is not entirely accurate, that the hon. Minister acknowledges all letters.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I did not say that, I said I like to acknowledge my mail. This is a letter addressed to Mr. Pesheau dated January 24—I received his letter on January 23—and it says:

Dear Mr. Pesheau:

This will acknowledge your letter of January 21 which, as you state, is "as a follow-up to my wire to you of recent date, concerning a buildup of extra Ontario Provincial Police in the Kapuskasing area."

With regard to your inquiry as to what check is made to ascertain the needs for additional police in any area, you may be assured that this department makes the fullest and most comprehensive type of check before any action is taken. I am confident that if you will make inquiries as to occurrences in the area involved, you will agree with me that the government has not taken any unnecessary steps nor strengthened its local police detachment to a degree that might be regarded by anyone with full knowledge of the facts as being unnecessary.

This is signed by myself.

Then I received, Mr. Chairman, another very interesting wire, and this wire is from the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and

Joiners of America, Ontario Provincial Council, which is the mother union or father union, whichever sex we use in labour matters, I am not sure, of the union which was on strike at Kapuskasing. It was addressed to me dated January 16, and it says:

LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS STRIKING
SPRUCE FALLS AT KAPUSKASING STOP OUR
AFFILIATED UNION MEMBERS HAVE NOT BEEN
INVOLVED IN ANY VIOLENCE OR OTHER ACT
TO BE INTERPRETED AS VIOLATION OF CRIMINAL CODE.

This is a little different now. This is not intimidation, this is violation of the Criminal Code:

IN FACT THERE IS NO PICKETING OF COMPANY LIMITS STOP WHY THEN THE DISPATCH OF MORE THAN TWENTY PROVINCIAL OFFICERS TO WATCH OVER STRUCK OPERATION OF SPRUCE FALLS CO STOP WHY HAS THIS POLICY BEEN ADOPTED IN CASES OF SAWMILL AND LUMBER WORKERS STRIKES [ref. Chapleau strike] STOP—

And the hon. members will remember the facts as I stated them with respect to the police there.

WORKMEN IN THIS INDUSTRY HAVE RESPECT FOR LAW AND ORDER AND RESENT THE IMPLICATION THAT STRIKE MEANS VIOLENCE AND DISORDER AS REFLECTED IN FLOOD OF POLICE WHERE STOPPAGES OCCUR STOP INFUX OF POLICE REINFORCEMENTS CAUSES RESENTMENT AND SERVES TO BRING EVEN GREATER IRRITATION BETWEEN PARTIES STOP THIS ALSO REPRESENTS INSULT TO OUR ENTIRE ORGANIZATION STOP WHY ARE REINFORCEMENTS SENT IN THIS CASE STOP IS THIS THE POLICY ADOPTED BY YOUR DEPARTMENT IN ALL ONTARIO WORK STOPPAGES. SIGNED G. F. MCCURDY, ONTARIO PROVINCIAL COUNCIL, UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in accordance with my own best judgment and that supported by my senior advisors, I perhaps improperly, perhaps not, decided that it was not expedient at this time, despite the very obvious acts of intimidation and other matters arising out of this so-called illegal strike at that time to send in any large number of police.

Twenty-four men were all that went in, in addition to the normal complement in that area, and they were policemen who were well experienced in these matters and could be relied upon to preserve order if necessary under any reasonable circumstances. There were not a sufficient number, if I may say so in answer to a later question of the hon. member, to search the thousand settlers

who ranged in an area of 700 by 300 miles east and west, shall I say—200 at least by maybe 80 miles north and south.

It was quite inconceivable that these officers could have searched all the people that the hon. member has been talking about. Here I was being implored by the unions and the people connected with them not to send any more police, so all this talk about having people searched and arms gathered up is from the mouth of the hon. member and does not sit very well, sir, when I have from his friends and his supporters these words "to keep more police out of the area, and take out the ones we have in."

In any event, that is in passing; what happened, of course, is history now. Acts of intimidation and trespass did occur, or the clash which happened at the time in question would not have occurred and our provincial police who were there did their very best to control the roads, to picket—not to picket but keep an eye on the pickets, although maybe it could be termed that—to keep an eye on those pickets. The picketing was orderly but they had to watch the settlers and preserve order.

They did this on the basis that it was not the intention of this government—and these were their instructions—either to be or seem to be on either side of an industrial dispute, but law and order had to be observed. Law and order was not observed with very tragic circumstances.

I say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members of this House that on another occasion I shall certainly not be fortified in the decision which I made this time, by the results of the affair in Kapuskasing and the Reesor Siding area.

Now to answer the next question of the hon. member: inquests are not held when certain charges are laid in court. As the hon. member has said, there are a great many charges. I think it has been demonstrated, Mr. Chairman, by the number of charges laid and by the fact that it would appear that members of both sides of the unfortunate occurrence have been charged with the appropriate offences that this government and the Ontario Provincial Police as its law enforcement are determined that those who have broken the law, when tried in court, will be dealt with in accordance with the law. I think it will also indicate to those on both sides of these disputes that in the future they may expect this type of law enforcement from the Ontario Provincial Police and all the forces under the command of this government; certainly so far as I am concerned in The Department of the Attorney-General.

I should hope that the sobering effect of the unfortunate and tragic occurrence would last through many a long day and through many a threatened strike and actual strike. That our people in Ontario, those of them who are in these affairs and come from Ontario, that are people of Ontario in Ontario, will carry out their labour negotiations and their peaceful strikes—to which they are entitled when legally set up—plus conciliatory proceedings properly gone through, which was not done in this case prior to the strike.

When that has been done I am sure that there will still be disputes, there will still be negotiations, but our labour front will be peaceful and the people concerned in it will act in accordance with the tenets of British justice and will respect the rights of others and will then themselves keep out of difficult trouble.

As the hon. member has said, there are several charges pending against those who are accused of using firearms. There are many charges pending against those who are accused of having created a disturbance, which amounted to a riot according to the charge laid. These things will be dealt with in the courts.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, most hon. members, and I am sure the general public, would agree with the common sense as well as the legality of the decision of my department in advising the government that at the present time it is not proper nor fair to those who are in custody, or out on bail, that there should be any widespread or other investigation, inquiry or commission or what have you, at this time. I do not see any need myself for one at any time. But certainly this is no time, when the lives and liberty of many of our fellow subjects are in jeopardy and who are to have, I hope, the opportunity of having British justice, Canadian justice, without being prejudged either by inquiries, commissions or news media.

Mr. Chairman, I say in answer to the final question of the hon. member that it is not the intention of my department to have, nor to recommend to the government that it have, at this time any further inquiry into these proceedings. Any further consideration of the matter must await the outcome of the matters now before the courts.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I make a very brief comment?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor this time.

Mr. Sopha: Do you want to talk all night?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You should talk!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I am sure the hon. member for York Centre is going to speak on the same subject. You can join him later.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not going to accept what the hon. Minister says—

Mr. Chairman: I am recognizing the member for York Centre.

An hon. member: You will have to be here earlier in future.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the gratuitous remarks of the hon. member for York South about my comments the other evening in connection with this matter I do not accept. The interesting correspondence and telegrams that the hon. Attorney-General has read to us tonight confirm me in my view that he did too little, too late. I recognized that he was being buffeted from both sides and it is easier to be wise after the event than while the event is going on.

Nevertheless, I think that in view of what must have been known to the hon. Attorney-General and his advisers of the very explosive nature of the persons involved, in view of the indications of violence that took place there, that my hon. friend from York South must have known too. I still say as I did the other evening, too little was done too late. Enough for that!

Mr. Bryden: You are a righteous fellow!

Mr. Singer: My halo is not quite so tight as yours, nor do I—

Mr. Bryden: Your halo has slipped down to your waist. You need a big one for that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: He usually speaks nicely of you.

Mr. Singer: If this group of five mumbling, grumbling—

All right! I will, if you can keep your rear bench quiet. The things that they add to what is going on in the House really are not of that much importance that we should take up time.

Mr. Bryden: We realize that you are a great genius, we all know that—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Disregard it all.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, these interruptions are very disquieting.

An hon. member: They are trying to disquiet you away. You are easily disquieted, we realize that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, there really is not any point trying to parry words with people whose words mean nothing, so we will just let them go.

The Dick Hayward report, Mr. Chairman, I think is of some significance to the House. On Thursday, February 25, this article to which the hon. member for York South referred appeared in the paper and the tone of it, I would have thought, would have brought some violent reply from the hon. Attorney-General, because up to the point—

Hon. Mr. Cass: I have not given a violent reply.

Mr. Singer: All right! Some reply on a point of privilege or some other sort of reply.

Because up to the point that this article appeared in the press and the comments were made in it, it had been the attitude of many hon. members of the government that anything approaching a mention of the Roach commission was entirely taboo and should not be dealt with at all. Yet here in one of our large Metropolitan newspapers and written by a writer of some substantial reputation, was as direct a comment on the Roach commission as has appeared since that commission started and was a criticism, really, of the attitude of the government insofar as matters concerning the Roach commission were concerned.

We did not hear a word. We did not hear a word from the government. We did not hear a word from the hon. Attorney-General until the matter was raised in the House tonight.

Here is a direct charge by a responsible writer in a responsible newspaper that the government had acted and punished a senior police officer because of what action he had taken in giving evidence before the Roach commission. It is strange that until tonight, when the matter was first raised, we heard nothing about it. Enough on that point, Mr. Chairman.

Now I want to talk for a while on the role of the police commission. I was most interested in listening to the hon. Attorney-General. Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney-General rose first and made remarks in which he coupled these three votes together. So the usual pettifogging objection that is made by the self-righteous hon. member for York South really is not of any importance.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Attorney-General said he was introducing these three. But surely it is elementary that in dealing with them we deal one at a time and the police commission is two estimates ahead.

Mr. Singer: It is a pity that the tempers of the fearsome two, all that are left now, are so ruffled at this point. But I can stand it just as long as they mumble and when they finally keep quiet I will continue speaking.

He voted to keep the government in power this evening.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member could not be elected to the executive of the party. They defeated him.

Mr. Bryden: You really have nothing to say, so you might as well sit down.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to talk above the hubbub, let them mumble on. I will stand here as long as he mumbles.

Mr. Sopha: I promise not to say anything more.

Mr. Bryden: That's something! At least we have made progress. The hon. member for York Centre has nothing to say, so why can we not get back to the estimates under consideration?

Mr. Singer: The remarks, Mr. Chairman, of the hon. Minister were very interesting. He described the OPP as one of the major police forces in Canada. He told us of the great role that the commission is playing in connection with this force and the other forces in the province. I thought it would be most appropriate to look at some of the things that have happened since the commission has been set up. I suppose one of the most startling things that happened was the resignation of Police Commissioner Clark. I think the reference to some of the newspaper reports in connection with that, bear repetition.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, on January 3, the London *Free Press* said this:

SHAKEUP OF OPP IN MAKING

Attorney-General Fred Cass, said today that he is planning changes in the OPP which will give the younger members of the force a chance to gain promotion. Mr. Cass said he had not received a written resignation by Wilfred Clark, head of the OPP. He did admit, however, that Commissioner Clark had wanted to resign because of the embarrassment by reputed gamblers. It was also reported that Mr. Cass is presenting to the Cabinet the findings of the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach, in his Royal commission investigation. Eric Silk, assistant to the deputy Attorney-General is mentioned as the probable new commissioner of the OPP.

In the Oshawa *Times* the same day: "OPP's Clark wants to quit," and there are some remarks attributed to the hon. Attorney-General.

The Toronto *Daily Star*, January 3, the head on the story is

NOT QUITTING OPP

Commissioner Clark flatly denied that he ever considered leaving and said his wife was all right. "Commissioner Clark suggested I might want a free hand as the new Attorney-General, especially in view of the crime commission and he wrote out his resignation," said Mr. Cass.

Through the long series of clippings, this is the only reference to any member of the police commission or the chairman of the police commission.

"Judge MacDonald, Chairman of the Police Commission, said that Commissioner Clark had never tendered his resignation formally to the commission. The commissioner insisted he never thought of quitting. 'I am still in, and I am going to stay in'—Commissioner Clark on January 5.

In the Hamilton *Spectator*, January 3—

Attorney-General Cass said today that he would not allow any top-ranking police officers to resign until the Royal commission on crime had made its report. He was commenting on the rumours that Commissioner Clark was quitting. "Commissioner Clark informed me a few weeks ago that he wished to resign, but I would not accept his resignation." Mr. Cass said the commissioner was only about one year before retirement, and he wanted to quit because his wife had suffered a heart attack.

The London *Free Press* on January 4—

Clark contradicts his earlier statement over the resignation. In an earlier statement, Commissioner Clark said he had no intention of resigning. "I am still in and I am going to say in," was his comment. A series of conflicting reports began Wednesday with the unofficial word that Commissioner Clark was resigning to be replaced by Deputy Attorney-General Silk. Mr. Cass also said he planned to complete reorganization of the force. At first, Commissioner Clark said he was astonished at the reports that he was resigning. He said he had never tendered his resignation. "If I did, my wife's health would have nothing to do with it. We agreed," that is Mr. Cass and Commissioner Clark, "that I should take no action until the report of Mr. Justice Roach has been received."

Then the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) gets into the act. Well, the hon. Prime Minister said he had not seen any resignation of Commissioner Clark, that the matter had been under discussion for some time.

On January 4 in the *Toronto Star*: "Provincial chief's status is a mystery."

The *Toronto Star* on January 5: "Why Clark May Quit; His Job Downgraded." I think this one is of particular interest, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister without Portfolio): We read that one in the *Star*.

Mr. Singer: Well, just to refresh your memory, even though it is reasonably obvious that you cannot read, I am going to read it again.

One sentence in last year's amendment to The Police Act, which set up the Ontario Police Commission, could explain the reason Commissioner Clark has expressed the possibility of his retirement from the OPP. The Act formerly said the Commissioner, appointed by the Cabinet, shall direct the force. Now, it reads, subject to the direction of the police commission, the commissioner has general control and administration of the force.

Mr. Chairman, the *Toronto Telegram* on January 4: "Still a Mystery Why Clark is Quitting the OPP."

And on January 7 in the *Globe and Mail*: "Clark Agrees to Stay Until the Crime Report is Filed."

Well, there are—we could go on. The hon. Minister from St. Andrew (Mr. Grossman) has the sequence as well as anyone, but

finally, February 5: "Clark Retires as OPP Chief, and Silk Takes Over."

No, Mr. Chairman, this is not really a funny story. There is nothing humorous about it at all. What has happened is that one of the senior civil servants, one of the most important civil servants in the province, resigned after a long series of newspaper reports about what he said, what the hon. Attorney-General said, about what the hon. Prime Minister said. Never once did we get any clarification as to why this had happened, what really had happened, or who made all of the final decisions. Did Clark resign because the police commission was appointed? Did he resign because of the wording in the Act? Did he resign because there was undue interference? Can the hon. Attorney-General tell us? Is there somebody here who can tell us? You have a duty to tell us. It is recognized that you do not know, and you do not care, but the people of Ontario want to know and are concerned about it. You are quite content to sit there, along with the rest of your hon. colleagues, and just parrot. If the government says it, it is good enough. This is not good enough for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Somebody had to wake them up.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the people of Ontario deserve an explanation for this series of fantastic events that have taken place in the OPP. In the face of the investigation, in the face of the Roach commission and before the report, in the face of statements, repeated statements, attributed to the hon. Attorney-General—and I presume he was correctly quoted, if he was not correctly quoted he can tell us about it—the commissioner of police resigned and there was no explanation forthcoming.

Then we have a civilian, a senior civil servant on the civilian side of The Attorney-General's department, being given an acting appointment.

Why has this happened? Is there no decision in the mind of the hon. Attorney-General, who is, after all, the man responsible? Is the hon. Attorney-General unable to determine which direction the force is going to go? Is the police commission charged with this sort of responsibility or is the hon. Attorney-General charged with the responsibility? Who in fact makes decisions and what in fact are those decisions going to be?

How long does this matter drag on, Mr. Chairman, and how long before the people of Ontario get a reasonable and proper explanation for what has happened?

It is very difficult, Mr. Chairman, completely impossible, to figure out reading through the debates last year. I am going to read it notwithstanding the mumbling that is going on over there from the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman, it is completely impossible to try to understand the role this police commission is playing. If, as I believe is correct, the commission so hampered and hamstrung the commissioner that he resigned, then what was the purpose of these speeches? What was the purpose of those speeches that were made in the assembly a year ago?

The then hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts) at page 68, when he gave the bill first reading, said it is the intention to make the commission as strong, as impartial and as qualified for its work as possible. And then he takes three Tories, puts them on to the commission and says that this is a strong and impartial commission.

There has been a very considerable and large growth in the OPP, both in personnel and in duties, in recent years, and the end is certainly not yet in sight. The imposition at the top of our police organization in the province, of the police commission, such as is contemplated by the bill I am sure will constantly improve the ways and means of dealing with the problems of law enforcement and the suppression of crime.

Well, the imposition at the top of the OPP of this police commission certainly did one thing: It got rid of Commissioner Clark in fast order, and caused great dissatisfaction throughout the force.

Then we have the hon. Prime Minister. The hon. Prime Minister on December 11, page 283, describes the intention of bringing in this Bill No. 24 which is the Act to amend The Police Act.

It is to introduce a new body into the administration of justice to be known as the Ontario Police Commission. I do not intend to debate the principles of the bill; I would like to refer to the broad aspects of what we intend to achieve and how the body will affect the broad pattern of law enforcement in this province.

Then, Mr. Chairman, at page 243 on the second reading, the Attorney-General says much of what he said on the first reading and repeats much of what the hon. Prime Minister said earlier on. He says:

The matters that I mentioned on the first reading, including powers of direction, overseeing, leading of the OPP, will be directly under the commissioner of the

OPP, Commissioner Clark, a man with the highest integrity and sincerity of purpose, I am convinced. It is my view that the commission, if it lives up to the expectation I have for it, and I am confident that it will exceed them, will be a very fine senior body which will be of considerable help.

And so on.

He makes one point, Mr. Chairman, that I think is of particular significance. It is this:

It should be particularly noted that the bill provides and authorizes and requires the police commission to advise the Legislature of the problems it has faced. What it has done during the preceding year. The mechanics of presenting the report follow the recommendations made in the 1959 report on government agencies.

I would point out that under section 48, subsection 6, the commissioners are given power to inquire; it could, of course, report and comment in the same manner in its report to the Legislature.

Then we have the Act, and the Act reflects many of these things. It reflects, particularly in subsection 7 of section 39A, that the commission shall after the close of each calendar year file with the Attorney-General an annual report upon the affairs of the commission, and the Attorney-General shall submit the report to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and shall later report before the Assembly if it is in session or, if not, at the next ensuing session.

Well, the commission was created in December of 1961. It was in long enough so that, some 13 months after its appointment, it sufficiently upset Commissioner Clark that he resigned. It has been in long enough to have made a report in accordance with the provisions of the Act. It has been in long enough so that the report should have been given to the Attorney-General. It has been in long enough so that the Attorney-General could have and should have given it to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. And it has been in long enough so that the report could have and should have been tabled here in this House. Mr. Chairman, we have seen no report from the police commission, we have seen no report at all from the police commission, and one of the things that the present—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Too bad, too bad.

Mr. Singer: Too bad, yes, too bad. Mr. Chairman, this is the very thing of which

the people of the province of Ontario are getting thoroughly sick and tired. The government deliberately, by design, avoids its own statutes, breaks the law, defies the Legislature, and defies the people of the province; and the hon. Minister of Mines sits with a grin on his face and says, "Too bad, too bad." Well, he has been in power too long, too long; and the people are going to do something about it soon, soon.

Mr. Chairman, in an Act in which the ringing tones of the former Attorney-General must be in the mind even of the hon. Minister of Mines, if he has one, surely one would think that in the first full year of operation we would have seen this report of the police commission. There is no such report.

And I will tell you why there is no such report, Mr. Chairman—because the police commission has become somewhat of a public embarrassment to the hon. Attorney-General. It has forced the resignation of the commissioner, and it is destroying, slowly but surely, the morale of the Ontario Provincial Police. This is why we have not seen a report.

We used to hear every now and then, Mr. Chairman, great pronouncements from the head of the police commission about what he was going to do. Those have stopped. But he has moved in next to the acting head of the police commission. We have had a look through the statutes and we have not been able to find any authority to appoint an acting police commissioner, but we have one in any event. Even though there is no authority to have an acting police commissioner we have one. He has moved in his office right next door and the confusion that he and his fellow commissioners have caused is quite obvious; as I say it focuses on the resignation of Commissioner Clark.

Mr. Chairman, on the various announcements that we have had—if the police commission is supposedly doing the role that it was set up to do, the new promotion system that the hon. Attorney-General was talking about, is it the hon. Attorney-General who is making these decisions? Or is it the police commission, or is it the acting commissioner?

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister of Mines.

Mr. Singer: Yes, the hon. Minister of Mines; perhaps he is telling them what to do. The shuffling of Sergeant Anderson.

Now, finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this generally about the OPP. The salaries have lagged behind the salaries of those

policemen in Metropolitan Toronto. They are substantially behind the salaries of the police here; and if this force is to be, as the hon. Attorney-General says it is to be, the best force in the province, surely its salary level should keep on a par with the salaries of the Metropolitan Toronto police force?

The rents of the quarters owned by the province and rented to these policemen have been increased, notwithstanding the failure to keep pace with salary. The morale in the force is not good. There is no "definiteness" in direction or in policy. One does not know, in the force, whether he is going to be in one town today or another town tomorrow, or whether he is going to be able to make a home in a reasonable way. Policemen, too, are reasonable people, and they are entitled to be treated as human beings whether they are going to be transferred overnight without any warning or not. The morale is terrible and the police commission, Mr. Chairman, has been responsible for this.

With the removal of Mr. Clark, with the confusion surrounding his resignation, there should have been some answers forthcoming. The least we could have expected tonight was some explanation for Commissioner Clark's resignation. The least we could have expected tonight was that the government would obey the law, would obey its own statutes, would obey this recent amendment to The Police Act and would have brought forward the report of the police commission as it said just a year ago it was going to do. We have had none of these things, Mr. Chairman. We ask why, and we want the answer tonight.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am very interested to hear the remarks of the hon. member. There is one comment with which I am sure I can agree sincerely, and it is that policemen, particularly provincial policemen, are reasonable men and are entitled to be treated as such. I agree with him entirely; and so far as it lies within the power of this government, that is being done and will continue to be done.

With respect to the resignation of the former commissioner, Clark, I merely say this: The newspaper clippings and press releases which have been read by the hon. member would indicate that a very loyal and good public servant had been approached by many persons of the fourth estate who are adept at asking questions, and he obviously became quite bewildered; anyone who listened to what was read tonight would understand that.

I would point out with respect to the Ontario Provincial Police force, and section 42 of The Police Act, says this:

The Ontario Provincial Police force shall consist of the commissioner and such other police officers and constables as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council appoints.

For reasons, which are best known to Commissioner Clark, he did submit his resignation, through myself as the responsible Minister, to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and it was accepted. I would hope that a good and honourable public servant such as Commissioner Clark was, would no longer be badgered by those who wished to make something out of his position.

With respect to the Ontario Police Commission, I can say no more than this: if the hon. member and all of us in this House would read carefully, when it appears in *Hansard*, as it will, the statement which I made at the beginning of these estimates, he will find good evidence—if he has not seen it elsewhere as most of us have—of what has been done by the Ontario Police Commission during its first year of existence. He will also find that I said, and I repeat it here, that the commission has operated for a year or thereabouts and has done a great many good things, it has shown us a great many good things which should be done, either the same way or differently from that in the past.

In co-operation with the commission, my officials and myself are prepared to see that, as I have outlined earlier tonight, they take the necessary action to ensure that the Ontario Provincial Police force is responsible to this House, through the appropriate channels of the Minister and a very senior non-policeman as head of the force. We will, therefore, we will never have that type of a police state where the police are under the control of somebody not responsible to the people elected to govern them and to run their affairs.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to wages and salaries and the levels of those in the Ontario Provincial Police force compared with the Metropolitan Police, I may say this: In many areas of our economic life there are great variations in wages between those who are employed and have to live in the very high cost areas, if we wish, of Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, and Metro Toronto; and the same thing goes with respect to the provincial police. We have provincial police in small places and large places throughout this whole province, as well as some in Metro Toronto. We also have the situation that the members

of the Ontario Provincial Police force are public servants; they are a particular and very special kind of public servant. They are public servants, and their scale of wages and salaries must bear some relation not only to other police force salaries and to the living conditions generally throughout the whole province, but to the wages and salaries which are paid to those in the Ontario public service, who are doing somewhat comparable work.

One of the accomplishments of the Ontario Police Commission, in which my department fully co-operated, and the government likewise, was to bring about a very interesting and considerable increase in pay and also a start on a reduction of the work week. So, Mr. Chairman, I have no apology to make, either for what happened during my time as Attorney-General responsible for the Ontario Provincial Police, nor for the Ontario Police Commission. Their record and their accomplishments speak for themselves.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): I think that it is an important thing, and I think we should speak about it quite honestly and frankly.

First of all, I think that the people ought to understand that it was not until after the institution of a probe into the matter of crime in the province, that you—I do not mean the hon. Attorney-General, but the man who occupied that office prior to him—appointed a commission. If it had been a group of men who were independent of party affairs, politics I mean, I think that would have been one thing. It is pretty well known now, by every OPP member on the force and I think indeed by every honourable person in the House, that the appointments were made—I am not saying that they were not good, I am not saying that the people who were appointed were not good men—but it is rather strange, sir, and it is rather odd that whenever any appointment is made here in the province of any importance, one of the important things that has to happen is that the appointee must carry a card in his pocket as a paid-up person in the party in power at the present time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reaume: Well now, just check it. I have made a statement, and it is perfectly all right; you can smile at it, I do not mind. I have made a statement that every member appointed on that commission is a member of the party which is now in power in the province.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Well, that should be.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition: I thought you said it was to be an independent body.

Mr. Reaume: All right. This is supposed to have been, I thought, a commission of men who were free of any party affairs, who were men independent of politics.

An hon. member: They are.

Mr. Reaume: They are not! I say that they are not free of party affairs, and that can very easily be proven—I think I could very easily bring evidence to bear and prove that point without any argument at all. I do not know of any other party in the country—in the whole of the country, any province—that has a commission of this sort.

I will explain it to the hon. member after a while—but I will tell you something. In Windsor, or any other city in Canada which has ever made any changes at all, they do not pick out a man who has not had any experience, as an officer of the law, as a policeman, and put him at the head of the department. The hon. member was speaking of Windsor; he will find in Windsor that when they changed the head of the department they searched all over the province and found a man who had had experience. And I want to say now, inasmuch as my hon. friend has inquired about it, that in Windsor they have a very high-class force. One of the reasons for it is that the force in Windsor is not implicated in the field of politics at all; and I think it is pretty near time that if you are going to appoint a commissioner one of the important things that you ought to have in mind is to find a person who has had years of experience in that field.

Without having arguments about it, it appears as though, in a hurried-up way, after the head of our party on the floor of the House here had brought out certain pertinent aspects of crime, in order that you might in some form try to prove that you were doing something about it, you appointed a commission; but you made absolutely certain that each and everyone on that board was an active person in the party which is in power in this province now.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. members of this House would like me to reply to a certain portion of the remarks of the hon. member. I do not propose to reply to any others, but I think, Mr. Chairman, it is a very unfortunate thing that an hon. member of this House should rise in this House and use the words and terms which

he has used, not only in connection with those who cannot defend themselves on the floor of this House—and I must do it for them—but with respect to a member of the judiciary of this province, a man who has served as Crown attorney in Windsor since 1951, who had been on the police commission and provided the wonderful policing that we hear about in Windsor, a man whose political affiliations for the last ten years may have been known to be what they were in the past but which certainly were not active. A man in his position, as a member of the county judiciary, is certainly removed from politics. I have never heard any word anywhere else, and I am sure none of the hon. members have, of such a thing as this. Mr. Chairman, I must protest indeed after this unfortunate speech by the hon. member for Essex North.

Mr. Reaume: I want to make it quite clear. I will make one or two more, too, if you do not mind. I have a right, a perfect right. I am always going to, at every opportunity when I think that there is something wrong, stand on the floor of this House and explain it. And whether you be a member in power or not, and one who ought to hold a high influence in the party, does not make any difference. I do not care what you say.

Now I was not personal at all; there was no question about it that the man at the head of the commission was made a judge only because, following that, you had something in mind. There were plenty of judges in the province at that time. You did not have to have it arranged that there would be a special one. Yes, this is true. And what you, the people in power, have done is that you have actually handpicked the commission as you handpick everything else.

It does not look good when you appoint a man, for instance, who, as a member of this House stood in a riding and was beaten, and then appoint him to an important job. We do not find fault, and it happens every day, when you appoint fellows to this odd job here and there, small jobs; but this job, sir, is an important job and I think that what you have done is to play politics in the dirtiest, lowest possible form. You have appointed, on the commission, a man of whom the people of a riding have openly said, "We don't want any part of him."

Mr. Letherby: They said that about the hon. member.

Mr. Reaume: I am not asking for any appointments.

Mr. Letherby: We are giving it to you.

Mr. Reaume: I do not want any of your appointments.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reaume: Well, I will be back, so do not worry about that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Let us get back on the votes.

Mr. Reaume: Well, I just want to say again that it might be time for the hon. Attorney-General to sit down and think it over. If he thinks that the appointments which were made were proper appointments, well then, fine. I do not.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, what I wanted to comment on has now become lost some hour back, about 10 or 15 pages, but I still want to try to comment on it. I want to say to the hon. Attorney-General, as unprovocatively as possible, that, in his observations with regard to my comments on the police in relation to the settlers, he confused and evaded the key point in a very skillful way. Indeed the sly look in his eye suggests to me that it was a calculated confusion and evasion.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney-General said that it was impossible for the policemen to search the hundreds of settlers scattered over a 300-mile area. I was not talking about the hundreds of settlers over a 300-mile area. The tragedy up north happened because certain men were armed and fired; and they were armed because the police did not disarm them. That group of 19 men had policemen around them surveying the area for some days—some hours at least if not days, in advance of it—so the observation with regard to hundreds of settlers over a 300-mile area has absolutely no relevance at all.

The tragedy up north took place because the police did not disarm settlers and my information is that there is evidence to document the fact that they knew these settlers had arms. I leave it there, Mr. Chairman. I leave it because the hon. Attorney-General has said this is now before the courts and it is going to be settled at least to some extent. But I must say, in leaving it, that I was a little regretful of the hon. Minister's tone in the concluding part of his comment, because his tone was something to the effect of a vague suggestion that he had learned a lesson and the next time he would do it differently.

If the problem we had up there was that the few police did not disarm the settlers and this set the stage for the tragedy, then 200 more police would not have made any difference. Indeed it might have provoked the violence even more quickly. I suggest, for the hon. Attorney-General's reading and cogitation the final sentence in the editorial from the *Northern Daily News* when they said that if we do a number of things—including the get-tough policy implied in the hon. Minister's concluding comments—then the editorial's warning might be an accurate one, we will be setting the stage for the next act of violence. You are not going to solve this kind of a problem in that way.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet and since we are dealing with three estimates including the commission, I want to throw another question at the hon. Minister. When Judge Macdonald returned from his visit to England last year he made some observations with regard to the appropriate size of the police force. He said, for example, that in his view no police force should be smaller than 250 men, and he drew attention to the fact that three out of every four of Ontario's 296 police forces have less than ten members, and 78 of them have only one member. He suggested that there should be an amalgamation or a merger of those forces which circumstances would permit; and where there was not a possibility of merging them and presumably coming up with a force of a minimum of 250 men, that the OPP should take over. May I ask the hon. Attorney-General whether or not these are views that his department is considering and whether this is the pattern for the future of the police forces across the province of Ontario? Or has this suggestion been discarded?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, the views which the hon. member has quoted to this House are views which are and were views of the Ontario Police Commission chairman and I presume of the members of the Ontario Police Commission at that time. Whether or not they hold those same views I do not know. I can say to this House that I do not.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, in rising—

Mr. Reaume: There is a fine answer.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, in rising to enter upon a discussion of the important matters that have occupied the attention—

Mr. Reaume: He did not answer it.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, he said he does not agree with it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon the interruption, sir.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, if I may play the tape back from where it began, as I enter upon a discussion of these weighty matters I do so, sir, with more than my usual trepidation. For one thing, I look at the hour of the clock; and the second thing, as I count the numbers of our hon. colleagues across the way I observe there are now 33. That is 15 more than the 18 we defeated earlier in the evening, so we must be in some way interfering with other recreations for at least 15 of them.

In one comment which the hon. member for York South made, Mr. Chairman, I agree with him wholeheartedly. That ought to get him in a good frame of mind for the rest of my remarks. He said that the Attorney-General is a skillful man. I would add to that, sir, that he is a man of ingenuity and agility.

I remember as if it were but yesterday, when he was the Minister of The Department of Highways my hon. friend from Wentworth and the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Chapple), both of them very successful businessmen, were practically beside themselves because of the practice he conducted in introducing the estimates of The Department of Highways that offended their good business principles.

Now I recall, sir, that when I first came to this House, when the great eminence of Victoria (Hon. Mr. Frost) was in charge of things—he used to run matters in an unequalled way—that it was he, sir, who suggested that in introducing the estimates of the various departments, the Minister would make his general and detailed observations all at once. For a year or so that was the practice. The Minister would make quite a long dissertation. He would go into each vote separately and if any changes were contemplated in the administration of the department he would at that time refer to them, in fact in great detail. Now, sir, that had the advantage that between the time that the Minister made his explanation and the time that the estimates came under review, we might have had the opportunity to consider what were often very significant changes in policy.

I draw attention to that, Mr. Chairman, because tonight the hon. Attorney-General, with great agility, made quite a lengthy ref-

erence to contemplated changes in the administration of the Ontario Provincial Police force. The other night, last Thursday night, the hon. Attorney-General made quite a lengthy dissertation in regard to changes to be contemplated in regard to the Ontario Securities Commission. So I would plead, Mr. Chairman, that we get back to the earlier practice and hear from the Minister at the outset of his estimates. Then maybe we will be able to read in *Hansard* about these things and make a mature judgment about their beneficial effect on the welfare of this province.

Now, sir, some reference has been made by my hon. friends to the left about my intervention in the estimates of this department. In fact, it has been hinted that I have been lengthy. Mr. Chairman, I make no apologies. In regard to these estimates I say that I earn my living in the courts of justice. These estimates require some specialized knowledge. If the people of my constituency think that I speak too lengthily here, then they have the remedy at hand the next time I offer myself as their steward. Unlike a lot of politicians, I am not of the belief that the sun would refuse to rise if I were defeated, you see.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Do not tempt them!

Mr. Sopha: I do tempt them. I put my conduct here on the line and let them judge it.

In regard to labour troubles, I would like to say a word about the experience in our community; it might be of some assistance.

We had two sets of labour troubles: One of them was a strike which was of unhappy duration, of some 90 days or so. It was in my conception the most orderly strike that ever took place in the history of Canada. As far as I can recall, there were absolutely no incidents of any nature and certainly no physical violence directed toward any other person or destruction of property.

That strike, however, had the significant difference with the one in Kapuskasing in that the company involved in that one got its raw material from only one unit, one unit of workers. The one at Kapuskasing gets its raw material from what are in effect two competing units, and that is the significant difference. The Kapuskasing thing, of course, by the very nature of the dispute, the irritations were there that could culminate in untoward incidents of violence and destruction. Of that the hon. Attorney-General was aware, or ought to have been aware.

Now the other period of labour unrest we had in my community, of course, was the struggle between the two competing unions. Here I want to commend the officer in charge of the Ontario Provincial Police. He acted in exemplary fashion.

We had thousands of people, of course, who were involved. There was one night from when dusk fell and the sun rose again which was a very harrowing experience. At no time throughout that—and this rather bolsters the action of the hon. Attorney-General—at no time did the Ontario Provincial Police intervene in any way. They were kept in a state of readiness, ready for intervention.

Subsequently during the pattern of events the provincial police were always at the ready, but I can recall of only one instance when the provincial police intervened and then only to a very limited extent. So there is something to be said in this psychology of police work.

That is the point I want to make, that the officer in charge must make his judgment and evaluation of the circumstances on the spot. The hon. Attorney-General—and I do not hesitate to pay compliments when compliments are due, I always hope I will do that—the hon. Attorney-General, or someone, very wisely and sagely directed to the Kapuskasing area Inspector Crozier, a man who is very experienced, a man of great ability and who was familiar with this type of situation. He is to be commended. Everyone is aware who takes an interest in these things of his experience gained in other periods of labour unrest.

The next thing I wanted to turn to—and if I may be permitted, I am not going to be very lengthy, Mr. Chairman, I have my eye on the clock and I apologize to the hon. members—but if you will permit me, sir, to refer to a clipping. I am not actually going to read it, I am just going to refer to it.

If the hon. Attorney-General says, and the expression he used in reference to the move of Sergeant Anderson was that it was a sideways move, what I fail to understand is that in respect of these two senior officers—no, that is not correct; in respect of the senior officer, Commissioner Clark, and the sergeant, Sergeant Anderson—is why the hon. Attorney-General before the Roach report is handed down, would in any way want to convey to the public, in any way! No, put it another way: why the hon. Attorney-General would risk that the public would draw a wrong inference from what he was doing. If he wanted to make it absolutely clear in respect of Sergeant Anderson that

it was in no way censure, disciplinary action or a demotion, then why did not the hon. Attorney-General, when he moved Sergeant Anderson to a position formerly occupied by an inspector, promote the sergeant to inspector to fill that? That would unequivocally, as far as the public were concerned, demonstrate that the hon. Attorney-General has complete confidence in him.

But he did not do that. He makes a move that looks like it is a demotion, he makes a move that looks like it is an anticipation of something that Mr. Justice Roach is going to say.

Third, most important, he makes a move with respect to a man whose evidence could be typified by the word "critical" of the hon. Attorney-General's department. Now when he could have swept away that criticism and suspicion by one act, the hon. Attorney-General refused to do it.

Second, in respect of the commissioner, the hon. Attorney-General, it is quite clear, did not know what he was doing. He demonstrated that from the news reports that were made. Just listen to this one:

Attorney-General Cass said today he would not allow any top-ranking Ontario Provincial Police officers to resign until Ontario's Royal commission on crime has made its report.

And he says that on the third day of January. He is quoted as saying that. I have not heard him deny it. I do not see in any of these clippings any place where he denied it or corrected it.

There is the spot in which the hon. Attorney-General allows himself to be put. It is an unsalutary and very unenviable position. It makes me think, or makes me suspect—ought I to say this, Mr. Chairman? I will say it—that the hon. Attorney-General this minute is privy to information about the Roach report. And I have an idea how he gets it. We will leave it at this: They employed a lawyer and paid him a vast sum of public monies of this province. I leave it at that.

In respect to the commissioner of the provincial police, I see nothing in the statute that permits the hon. Attorney-General to appoint an acting commissioner; there is no authority in the statute. For all I know, maybe there is a statute somewhere in the books of the Acts of Ontario that says that when an appointed position is vacant the government may appoint someone to act in the place instead. But, as we look over the situation, they now have an acting chairman of the ONR, they have an acting chairman of the securities commission, they have an

acting commissioner of police. They act like a government that is going out of office next week, or a government that does not expect its life to last very long. Is there such a dearth of talent in Ontario? Is there such a paucity—is that the word—of ability?

Some hon. members: "Paukity"! "Paukity"!

Mr. Sopha: Paucity. I will never use that word again.

Are we so denuded of people of ability in this province that they cannot find someone to fill these positions? I say again that nothing in the statutes permits them to appoint anyone in an acting capacity.

I do not know the nature, or what led to the remarks of the hon. member for Essex North. He has justification for what he says, I suppose; he gets up and says it is as a responsible and honourable member; but I want to add a word of criticism of a much milder nature. I wish we would come to a state of affairs in this province where people would stop going to England for the purpose of studying things in England of a similar nature to us, and then coming back from England and saying, "Here is what we saw there, and here is what we must implement immediately in this country."

The English are a homogeneous race, homogeneous of culture. There is a far different relationship between the Englishman and his policeman than there is between the native Canadian and his. Who in this country, when he left his laundry behind him in Staffordshire or Cardiff, would write to the police, would think of writing to the police, and saying, "Will you go down to the laundry and see what has happened to it, and have them send it along to me?"

Mr. Letherby: I would.

Mr. Sopha: I did not know the hon. member had any laundry.

An hon. member: A lot of dirty linen anyway.

Mr. Sopha: In England I say that the relationship and the respect for the policeman—and I must say this unhappily—is of a much different order than it is in Canada, which is a mixture of various ethnic groups and racial origins. But we have the chairman of the police commission taking a junket to England—I hope he does not think that is too inflammatory a word to use; and recently we had Magistrate Bick, chairman of the police commission of Toronto, the board of police commissioners, taking a junket to England.

He came back and said, "Here are the things that I discovered and presumably we should adopt them." Where do they learn this from; is it from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay)? Because he makes junkets all over the world? The next thing we know these people will be going to Japan.

I just want to make one other point and then I will resume my seat to the resounding applause of everybody, no doubt. We on this side of the House do not believe that there should be anything in the way of control over the Ontario Provincial Police by the police commission. That is what we believe.

If I may make a reference to England. Having said what I said about England, may I make this reference, Mr. Chairman? In England, historically and I cannot tell you for how long, the police force has not been under the control of the Attorney-General at all. The police force, that is the national police force, the criminal investigation bureau, reports to the Home Secretary. And it is the Home Secretary who answers in the Parliament at Westminster for their conduct. I hope that I never live to see the day in this province that the political head of a powerful organization, quasi-military in its character, is under the control of any independent commission so that the political head can stand in this Parliament when they are criticized and even dare to make the answer: "Do not criticize me, it is an independent commission that answers for them."

The police are so significant and so inherently awesome in their power that we must never allow a situation to develop where a police action is not accountable for, day by day and hour by hour as long as this Parliament sits, by the political head and none other. That is what we believe. If it is a fact that this police commission has daily been interfering in the administrative details of the Ontario Provincial Police then, Mr. Chairman, I unhesitatingly say that that is wrong and pernicious. I underline those words: Wrong and pernicious.

The purpose of the Ontario Police Commission, as I understood it when that Act was amended in this Legislature, was to maintain a relationship between all municipal police forces in this province and to supervise the provincial police in the same way it supervises every other police force in the province, and treat the police force no differently. To illustrate it in physical terms, if the office of the police commission is next door to the commissioner, the administrative head,

and if the commissioner has to run in to the chairman's office to ask him if it is all right that he do a certain thing, then I say that is a violation of that principle. It is wrong, because the police chief of Windsor, Chester-ville if they have one, Duntroon, Lambeth—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Cheer up! The offices are being moved downstairs.

Mr. Sopha: Ah, that is nice; I am glad to hear that. I go further, sir: Take them out of the same building. Put one at one end of the city and put the other at the other end. And have the commissioner report to the Attorney-General, about administrative changes. If he needs advice about administrative changes, have him get on the phone to affable, genial Freddie and ask him about it; but for heaven's sakes do not allow it to develop to where the commissioner of police has to phone Judge Macdonald or General Sparling or Mr. Graham to ask him what he thinks. Do not allow that, I implore the hon. Attorney-General, to develop in this province.

Finally, it was wrong, I submit, for the hon. Attorney-General to permit a situation to develop whereby Commissioner Clark left the force under any form of a cloud at all, any suspicion of criticism of him. Commissioner Clark was a very fine officer. Commissioner Clark was the victim of the circumstances which enveloped and trapped him. I said the other night, and these are my final words, it is opportune for me to remind the House of this: It is a pity that the former Attorney-General, who never really understood that department, is not here to make that charge. He never really understood what was going on in that department, not in the way that this man of ability who replaced him understands. The former Attorney-General does not spend the long hours working in his department that this Attorney-General spends.

The former Attorney-General, and here is where Commissioner Clark got trapped, came into office like a veritable St. George of the Highways. I remember it; I was not in active politics then. The papers for days were emblazoned across their headlines about how the great Kelso, "Kelso the Magnificent" he came to be known as, was going to wipe out deaths on highways. In fact, my hon. friends and, Mr. Chairman—now I think I am speaking on the federal election campaign—in fact, Mr. Chairman, deaths on highways have increased. I say that just in the interests, I do not say it with any satisfaction.

But he emphasized in that department that the most important thing, the only thing

in that department of course, was the motor vehicle problem. In the meantime, the other departments of that department, the sub-departments, vegetated and decayed and they led to the Roach report. The Roach Commission was the culmination of his failure; that is what it was. Commissioner Clark was a traffic policeman, as I understand it; he was a traffic policeman promoted to be commissioner, because of the emphasis by the Attorney-General, his political boss, on the traffic problem—having a man who was familiar most with traffic at the head. Then the mesh of circumstances encompassed Commissioner Clark and he was not the author of his own misfortune at all. The pity of it was, you see, that when they got into trouble, when Mr. Justice Roach made his examination, then they had to toss the good man out in the scrap heap. That is the pity of it and that is the thing we will not forget.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is bound to be anti-climax.

Mr. Troy: Well, it may be for you; anything would be anti-climax in certain particulars. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Attorney-General: Communication is always a problem in northern Ontario between the police and the public. I have two questions. In the Kapuskasing area during the situation there, how many of the policemen were able to speak the French language to the people there?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, that is a question I am afraid none of us could anticipate and I do not have a nominal roll of those who were there. If I had, that would not tell me whether they spoke French or not, because many of our English-named people speak good French and many with French names do not speak it very well. But I will be delighted to ascertain that and let the hon. member know. I would not have any way of finding it out just now. I have been reminded that in Timmins now we have the first French-speaking district inspector, Inspector Chartrand. So we are not unmindful of the situation as far as the language problem is concerned in northern Ontario.

Mr. Troy: I am glad the hon. Attorney-General is not unmindful of it because, as he knows, in all that section of northeastern Ontario there is a great number of French Canadians.

A final question, getting down to mundane things: In what schedule is the responsibility of the new provincial police headquarters

in the inspectorate of North Bay? The former Attorney-General, two years ago, had it on the bottom of the list; how far up has it got now? There are two new OPP buildings projected, one at Powassan and one at Kapuskasing; but North Bay is the headquarters of the inspectorate from the Parry Sound area right north to Kirkland Lake and there is not what you could call a proper OPP headquarters for them.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I seem to have great difficulty in my official position, with the capital city of the district and riding represented by the hon. member, because I can remember in the days gone by, having difficulty over a proposed Department of Highways district office. I am in the same position, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Ontario Provincial Police building, proposed district headquarters for North Bay. I would say that it now appears to be on the list which is in my possession, and which appears to the best of my knowledge to be the latest list; it is sixth on the list of district headquarters to be constructed.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, in case of a motor accident on the highways where the Ontario Provincial Police arrive on the scene, how is it decided that a certain ambulance firm is to arrive on the scene and not another one to be called? Apparently in our area in the past it has always been that only one ambulance company seemed to be called by the Ontario Provincial Police. The other companies were never called.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, there could be reasons for that because of the service rendered and other items. Those things do happen and now that the hon. member has drawn it to my attention, if he will let me know the service which was being called, I certainly will have a report on it and ensure that if there was such a practice and no good reason for it, that it is discontinued.

Mr. Newman: I will supply the hon. Attorney-General with that information.

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora): Mr. Chairman, in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Nipissing, the hon. Attorney-General stated that the new police headquarters at North Bay was sixth on the list of headquarters to be built; I believe that was what he said. I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would give us the names of the first five.

Hon. Mr. Cass: The one the hon. member is looking for is Kenora and it ranks two above North Bay, according to the list I have.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I think I can safely say that the hassle I got into last year with the previous Attorney-General, with respect to the conditions at the Kenora courthouse, will be familiar to this hon. Attorney-General and he will accept the fact that conditions are not good in this courthouse. For this reason I have not harangued or made a long speech about the subject. I would be grateful if the hon. Attorney-General could assure me that something will be done to ease the situation as it now stands in the Kenora courthouse.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, of that situation.

Mr. Gibson: And will the hon. Attorney-General assure me that something will be done?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I will assure the hon. member that everything that can be done will be done.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have one small point I would like the hon. Attorney-General to comment on. In an article last week Ron Haggart made the observation, which I think is an unchallengeable one, that the neutrality of a policeman in sorting out the rights of various citizens is usually ensured by the fact that a policeman is paid for by all of the citizens. And then he raised the question of the exact legal status of policemen who are hired in off-duty hours by Loblaw's, Canadian Tire and various other business institutions, to cope with the traffic problem that is created in coming into their place of business. Mr. Chairman, I am not complaining about this practice because I think there are many places of business in this city where the traffic problem created by them is such that there needs to be a policeman there. But I am curious as to what is the legal status of a policeman in that kind of a position?

Hon. Mr. Cass: That is rather a hard one to field, Mr. Chairman, because it would depend on a great many circumstances, because he is a peace officer. Whether he is on duty or off duty he has certain rights and certain duties.

I would strongly suspect—and that is the advice that I have received—that the position of the off-duty policeman is that he still is a peace officer and still has those more serious

and more important duties and responsibilities that such a peace officer has compared to the ordinary citizen. I do not know whether that answer is exactly what the hon. member wishes. If he wishes to clarify it, or speak to it later, I will—

Mr. MacDonald: It did not quite meet the point that the police officer at that time is being paid by private interests. How do you reconcile this with the fact that—and I think the hon. Attorney-General is quite correct, a police officer is on duty really 24-hours a day—but if he is being paid by private interests for that period, there is something of a conflict of interest arises and I was just curious to discover what is the legal position. I do not want to endanger this practice because, I repeat, I could cite a few places of business in this town where I think they create a traffic problem that they should be obligated to do something about it. It has been whispered by one of my hon. colleagues maybe it should be paid to the city and the city should pay the policeman.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, that is always the problem when a member of a well established force or union is doing something in off-hours. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I can give no better answer to it, nor can my advisors.

But I would suggest this: that if the hon. member would furnish me with a specific instance of the duty that the off-duty policeman was performing or for whom he was performing it or where he was performing it, I would be delighted and pleased to have the very competent law officers at my disposal and his disposal and hon. members of this House, provide him with an opinion on that.

Mr. MacDonald: The February 21 issue of the *Toronto Daily Star*; in Ron Haggart's column, page 17.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could give me some explanation for the recent raise in rental rates paid by Ontario Provincial Police personnel who are living in departmental houses?

Hon. Mr. Cass: That is, I was going to say an elementary situation. Over a number of years certain members of the Ontario Provincial Police were allowed, at very reasonable rentals and very often not in accord with going rates for similar accommodation in the area, to occupy government property as a prerequisite of their position.

Recently, there was a readjustment in provincial police pay rates and at that time it

was felt there should also be some readjustment as between members of the force, those who had to pay the going rental rate outside and those who were getting this particularly favourable rate in government housing. There was an adjustment made which took effect at the same time as the increase in pay, the last increase in pay. Undoubtedly it has had the effect in some cases in reducing to a very small minimum the amount of extra take-home pay of certain officers who received a raise in pay and also had a rise in their rent.

I think it was a fair adjustment. I assure the hon. member that the great majority of the police who do not have the opportunity to live in low-rental housing see nothing wrong with their colleagues paying a reasonable rent.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister give me some information on the radio communication system? This \$235,000, is this a totally new system or is it an overhaul?

Hon. Mr. Cass: This is the same figure as last year, and we hope we can continue to give the same service with our communications as last year. It is the same figure.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, there are two points that I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister. The first is this: I would like to know on how many instances in the course of the last two years incidents of violence in connection with the Great Lakes shipping dispute have been called to the attention of the hon. Attorney-General? Does the hon. Minister have any idea of the number of occasions on which complaints have been made to his department?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, of my own knowledge I have no information, no knowledge of any. Of course there probably would not be any because the shipping season was nearly over when I took over.

I am advised by my advisors here, that offhand no one has any knowledge as to that, but that is something which can be ascertained and I will be glad to furnish the hon. leader of the Opposition with it, either in the House at a later time or by letter.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member to my left says it is a federal matter. I wish to take this opportunity to demonstrate that there can be differences of opinion on this side of the House. I think, sir, that in this instance there are three or four or five instances that have attracted widespread newspaper coverage.

I recall a case in St. Catharines and another at the Lakehead where individual workers were badly beaten and to the best of my knowledge there were no charges made or arrests made in conjunction with it. It is about those that I wish to inquire. It may well be that the hon. Attorney-General has no personal knowledge, but I would ask that he advise the House at some later date about these several matters.

The other matter to which I want to make reference, sir, is the matter of the Ontario Police Commission and the resignation of Chief Clark.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): How long does the hon. leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Wintermeyer: It will go on a few moments. If the hon. Minister wishes to adjourn, it is quite all right.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, does this have to do with the police commission only? If so then we can complete this vote and go on to the police commission, which is two votes further on.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Cass: We are on vote 222, as I understand it.

Mr. Wintermeyer: We are at 222.

Hon. Mr. Cass: The police commission is vote 224.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I see. Well, I would think that in conjunction with 224, which is certainly the vote relating to the police commission, if the hon. Attorney-General would extend me the courtesy of making some comments with respect to Chief Clark at that time I will be quite prepared to wait.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: If we could carry 222 and 223, then if the House would be agreeable I would move that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have only a few small questions concerning vote 222 and one is: what is the department's policy

concerning the purchase of automotive equipment for the police department?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, that is simple to answer. They are bought on the fleet basis by quotations from the three large manufacturers: GMC, Chrysler and Ford.

Mr. Newman: Are they bought directly from the manufacturer or the dealers?

Hon. Mr. Cass: They are bought directly from the manufacturer, whose fleet manager makes arrangement with the dealers to supply them.

Mr. Newman: Are all of the vehicles Canadian made or are some of them imported?

Hon. Mr. Cass: They are as Canadian made as those large manufacturers of Canadian vehicles in Canada can make them.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 222 agreed to.

Vote 223 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay moves that the committee of supply rise and report it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, just to remind the hon. members, the House will sit at three rather than two, there will be no night session. The House will sit at two on Wednesday and Thursday and there will be a night session Thursday.

We will finish tomorrow, I hope, with the estimates of the Attorney-General and move to The Department of Health. There are a number of bills on the order paper that we can do in committee.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.00 of the clock, midnight.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Report, commissioners of estate bills	1111
Sixth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Morrow	1112
Research Foundation Act, 1944, bill to amend, Mr. Macaulay, first reading	1112
Execution Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	1112
Mechanics Lien Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	1112
Notaries Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, first reading	1112
Estimates, Department of the Attorney-General, Mr. Cass, concluded	1113
Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond	1123
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts	1140

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery students from St. Michael's Separate School, Toronto, and Bramalea Separate School, Brampton. We are also glad to have, I notice in the various galleries, some members who are attending the good roads convention.

I beg to inform the House that the clerk has received, from the commissioners of estate bills, their report in the following cases: Bill No. Pr17, An Act respecting the township of Eramosa school area, and Bill No. Pr28, An Act respecting the township school area No. 2 of the township of Erin.

Clerk of the House: The report reads:

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE SCHROEDER
THE HON. MR. JUSTICE KELLY

Osgoode Hall,
Toronto 1
February 22, 1963

RODERICK LEWIS, ESQ., Q.C.,
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
TORONTO,
ONTARIO

DEAR SIR,

*Re: Bill No. Pr17, 1962-63, An Act
respecting the township of Eramosa
school area*

The undersigned, as commissioners of estate bills, as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act, RSO (1960) Ch. 208, section 67, having had the above noted bill referred to us as such commissioners now beg to report thereon.

We have examined the petition and the draft bill; we have also heard the submissions made by R. B. Hungerford, Q.C., on behalf of the petitioner.

As the lands in question are no longer used or required for school purposes it is reasonable that the board should have conferred upon it full power and authority to sell the said lands and to devote the proceeds thereof to the purposes hereinafter mentioned.

We recommend that the preamble to the said bill be varied by inserting before the words at the end of the preamble "and whereas it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition" the words "and whereas the said lands are no longer used or required for school purposes."

In our respectful opinion it is unnecessary to provide in section 2 of the bill that the purchases shall receive a full and absolute title to the lands and

premises and we suggest that that section be amended to read as follows:

2. A deed executed by the chairman and secretary of the board for the time being under the corporate seal vests in the purchaser all the right, title and interest of the said board in, to, or out of, the lands and premises conveyed by the deed free from all trusts whatsoever contained or set out in the above recited deeds.

We further recommend that section 3 of the bill be amended so as to provide that the board shall use the net proceeds of the sale of such lands to defray the cost of the acquisition of school sites, so that the said section shall read as follows:

3. After payment of the expense of obtaining this Act and all proper and reasonable costs, charges and expenses of effecting and carrying out such sale or sales, the board shall use the net proceeds thereof to defray the cost of the acquisition of school sites.

With the additions and amendments set out above we are of the opinion that the provisions of the bill are proper for carrying into effect its purposes and that it is reasonable that the said bill should pass into law.

The bill duly signed by the commissioners and the copy of the petition for the same are accordingly returned herewith.

Yours very truly,

WALTER F. SCHROEDER
ARTHUR KELLY
Commissioners of Estate Bills

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE SCHROEDER
THE HON. MR. JUSTICE KELLY

Osgoode Hall,
Toronto 1
February 22, 1963

RODERICK LEWIS, ESQ., Q.C.,
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
TORONTO,
ONTARIO

DEAR SIR,

*Re: Bill No. Pr28, 1962-63, An Act
respecting the township school area
No. 2 of the township of Erin*

The undersigned, as commissioners of estate bills, as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act, RSO (1960) Ch. 208, section 67, having had the above noted bill referred to us as such commissioners now beg to report thereon.

We have examined the petition and the draft bill; we have also heard the submissions of Mr. R. B. Hungerford, Q.C., made on behalf of the petitioner.

As the lands and premises in question are no longer required for school purposes it is reasonable that the board should have conferred upon it full power and authority to sell the same.

On the 1st January, 1963, the whole of the township of Erin was converted into a township school area; therefore as of the date of the introduction of the bill, the operating board will be The Public School Board of the township school area of the township of Erin. We therefore recommend that the

preamble to the said bill be varied by deleting the words and figures "No. 2" in lines 2 and 18 thereof and substituting for the word "in" in line 18 thereof the word "of", so that line 18 shall now read:

. . . now forms part of the Township School Area of the . . .

We further recommend that the preamble of the said bill be amended by inserting before the words "and whereas it is expedient to grant the petition", appearing at the end of the preamble, the following words:

. . . and whereas the whole of the said lands have been used for the school purposes of said school section No. 3 in the said township of Erin and are no longer required for school purposes.

In our opinion it is unnecessary to provide in section 2 that the purchaser of the lands shall have a full and absolute title to the said lands, it being sufficient to provide that the deed executed by the chairman and secretary of the board shall vest in the purchaser all the right, title and interest of the board in to or out of the lands and premises conveyed by the deed, free from all trusts whatsoever contained or set out in such deed to the predecessors of the board so that the section as so amended will read as follows:

2. A deed executed by the chairman and secretary of the board for the time being under the corporate seal vests in the purchaser all the right, title and interest of the board in, to, or out of, the lands and premises conveyed by the deed, free from all trusts whatsoever contained or set out in the above recited deeds.

We further recommend that section 3 be amended to provide for the use of the net proceeds by the board to defray the cost of the acquisition of school sites so that the section as amended shall read:

3. After payment of the expense of obtaining this Act and all proper and reasonable costs, charges and expenses of effecting and carrying out such sale or sales, the board shall use the net proceeds thereof to defray the cost of the acquisition of school sites.

With the additions and amendments set out above we are of the opinion that the provisions of the bill will be proper for carrying into effect its purposes and it is reasonable that the said bill should pass into law.

The bill duly signed by the commissioners and the copy of the petition for the same are accordingly returned herewith.

Yours very truly,
WALTER F. SCHROEDER
ARTHUR KELLY
Commissioners of Estate Bills

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West) from the standing committee on private bills presented the committee's sixth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr13, An Act respecting the township of Innisfil.

Bill No. Pr14, An Act respecting the Guelph General Hospital.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr22, An Act respecting the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association of Guelph.

Bill No. Pr40, An Act respecting the Institute of Professional Librarians of Ontario.

Bill No. Pr55, An Act respecting the township of York.

Bill No. Pr57, An Act respecting the township of York.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. Pr22, An Act respecting the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association of Guelph.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE RESEARCH FOUNDATION ACT, 1944

Hon. W. R. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Research Foundation Act, 1944.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, this is a procedural bill and simply deals with the length of period during which a member of the board of the Ontario Research Foundation serves the foundation.

THE EXECUTION ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Execution Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, that Act together with the Act which I shall now introduce is for the purpose of removing into the schedule of fees under The Registry Act the fees to be charged on filing within the Registry Office under The Execution Act and The Mechanics Lien Act.

THE MECHANICS LIEN ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mechanics Lien Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE NOTARIES ACT, 1962-63

Hon. Mr. Cass moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Notaries Act, 1962-63.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, this is a general revision of the present Act, which has not been revised since 1909. There are two types of notary public in Ontario, those who are also lawyers and those who are not. Each applicant of the latter group must be examined by a county judge and satisfy the judge that he is qualified for the office of notary public and that a notary public is needed for the public convenience in the place where he resides and intends to carry on business. In order to bring about better control of this group of non-professional notaries, this bill provides for a re-examination and reappointment every three years. All other principles of the present Act are retained.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): What standards will the county court judge apply?

Hon. Mr. Cass: That will be discussed in due course.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to tell the House that the swearing-in ceremony we had scheduled for next Friday has been postponed due to the illness of the Honourable Mr. Rowe. Until such time as he obtains clearance from his doctor and is able to leave his house, the matter will stand in abeyance.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to advise the hon. members of the House and also the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) of the very expeditious action which is always taken by my department and this government with respect to matters of importance raised by the Opposition.

In the debate yesterday the hon. member inquired about the coroner system and the desirability and the necessity of a coroner being appointed, perhaps in Lion's Head, to serve the northern part of the county of Bruce. I have now a copy of an order-in-council which was approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on February 21, 1963, which reads as follows:

Upon the recommendation of the Honourable the Attorney-General, the committee of council advise that pursuant to the provisions of The Coroners Act, RSO 1960, Chapter 69, Dr. Mervin Alexander Hopkinson of Lion's Head, Ontario, be appointed as the coroner for the county of Bruce.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): What about a chief coroner for Toronto?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton) in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 224:

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, this I recall to be the vote on the police commission and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) last night suggested that we would have the opportunity to talk about the commission and the resignation of Chief Clark.

Sir, the point that I would like to make at the outset is that it is my recollection that prior to the introduction of The Police Commission Act, the chief of the Ontario provincial police had two titles. He was at once the chief constable of the Ontario provincial police and second, he was the commissioner of police for all the police forces in Ontario.

Now, sir, it is my recollection that what was intelligible about the efforts of the government to bring some order into this situation was a desire on their part to intelligibly divorce the responsibilities of the then commissioner. I think the intent was to identify him at once as the chief of the Ontario provincial police and make that his sole responsibility. It was desired, I think, that his responsibility as such should be divorced from his responsibility as the chief commissioner of police for all the police forces in Ontario.

In that particular objective I think the government had some intelligible ground for bringing in an amendment to the existing statutes. We on this side of the House at the time said that we felt that it was premature to move in that direction, a direction that actually had been known to exist for a long period of time, until such time as the Royal commission on crime had concluded its hearings and made its report.

Now, sir, instead of acceding to the advice from this side of the House, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said that in effect the new commission would be set up and it would be a supervisory body responsible to supervise the OPP and the police forces in general. This we accepted, although we pointed out that we felt the move was premature.

What has happened in the interval is something that surely we on this side could never anticipate and that is simply that instead of proceeding as had been suggested by

the hon. Prime Minister, the provincial police commission did in fact walk in and take over the operation of the OPP, lock, stock and barrel.

Now, sir, to compound the difficulty, you can appreciate the position, the untenable position, of the chief of Ontario provincial police, Mr. Clark. His original position was that he desired that we divorce his two positions, and that was understandable. But when the new police commission was formed in order to effect that divorce, it effected nothing of the sort but simply took over the total responsibility that was originally Mr. Clark's, that is the responsibility for all the police forces in the province and day-to-day supervision of the Ontario provincial police. Sir, this was an untenable position and it was brought to dramatic conclusion by the resignation of Mr. Clark.

I cannot help but express the opinion that the government should have refused to accept the resignation until the Royal commission report on crime was in, because by accepting the resignation prematurely I think they compounded the problem even further.

A cloud has been put over the honourable police commissioner, a cloud that should not have been put over him at all. I think in courtesy he should have been permitted to wait until after the report was in before the government determined to move in respect to his resignation.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Hear, hear! That is what the hon. Attorney-General said he was going to do.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now sir, the essence of this point is simply this: the police commission, instead of carrying out what we were told to be the purposes of the commission has acted in an entirely different fashion. They had actually gone in and supervised the day-to-day operation of the Ontario provincial police.

I think this is unfortunate. It may well be that the present hon. Attorney-General is quite cognizant of this fact, I do not know, but certainly the government at large must bear the responsibility of permitting a situation to arise that never should have arisen. The commission was never designed or intended for that role by this Legislature, if we are to accept the undertaking that was given this Legislature by the hon. Prime Minister of the province that it would act as a supervisory board only. Instead it acted as an administrative facility. Instead it has to a large extent interfered with the day-to-day operations.

Now, sir, we complained a year ago that this commission was premature, that it would have been best to wait until after the Roach commission reported so that we could put things in proper perspective. My complaint this afternoon is that instead of acceding to what I think was a very intelligible observation a year ago, the government has compounded the difficulty and upset the routine of the Ontario provincial police in the interval.

Sir, I think I would be lax in my duty if I did not point out to you that in that intervening year we have brought certain disrepute to an otherwise excellent force by interfering unnecessarily in its operation. What the position of the hon. Attorney-General is at the present time I cannot say. I think those of us who have spoken on this estimate have advised the hon. Attorney-General that our personal opinion is that he is more cognizant of the danger in this particular move than was the previous Attorney-General (Mr. Roberts).

I would say, sir, that more than politics is involved here. Here we require a degree of statesmanship and leadership. I think that the time is now appropriate when you, sir, must enunciate to this House in clear and unequivocal language the policy of the government in respect to the commission from here on.

On this side of the House we would expect an unequivocal undertaking that the provincial police commission will not be permitted, and in fact will not interfere, with the day-to-day operation.

Second, we would expect from you, sir, a more detailed explanation about the resignation of Commissioner Clark? About the myriad of personal reasons I do not want to probe. But I do think that we have the right to ask you, sir whether or not you at any time directly or indirectly requested the resignation of Commissioner Clark? Third, whether or not in your opinion the resignation of the commissioner was prompted by what he felt to be the usurpation of his authority by the police commission for the province.

I think this is a matter of great concern to all of us. It is a matter of delicacy I realize, but on this side of the House we have the right to probe this problem, and that we do. Therefore, my questions to you are these: first, will you give the House your assurance that the police commission will not from here on interfere with the administrative day-to-day operation of the Ontario provincial police; second, will you give us your assurance that neither yourself

nor any hon. member of the government requested the, what I would term premature, resignation of Commissioner Clark?

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, to begin with I might say to the hon. gentleman, the situation with respect of the police commission and the Ontario provincial police force and The Department of the Attorney-General is as I tried to state it last evening: that is, at the present time we are all in accord with the action which is about to be taken in line with the announcement that I read at the beginning of the estimates on the provincial police last evening. The year of experiment and of advance under the Ontario Police Commission has been one which, like the exercises which were referred to by the hon. member for York Centre when we were discussing emergency measures operations, an exercise which has given us much food for thought and has taught us some lessons. That generally, sir, I say to the hon. leader of the Opposition.

With respect to his specific questions, I would point out to the hon. leader of the Opposition that presently the government of the Ontario provincial police is founded upon section 40, subsections 1 and 2, and I refer particularly to subsection 2, of The Police Act as it was amended last year. I will read it to refresh all our memories. Subsection 1 reads as follows:

There shall be a commissioner of the Ontario Provincial Police force who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Subsection 2:

Subject to the direction of the Ontario Police Commission the commissioner has the general control and administration of the Ontario Provincial Police force and the employees connected therewith.

I would say this to the hon. leader of the Opposition, through you, sir: at the present time and under the present state of the law I cannot give the undertaking, of course, which he has requested. But I will say this: for the past number of weeks I have had the entire co-operation of the chairman and members of the Ontario police commission in extracting the commission from the day-to-day operations of the Ontario provincial police force. As I mentioned in the House last evening, I propose to introduce legislation at a later date which will do many things including, I believe, the giving of the authority to allow me then to give the undertaking for which the hon. leader of the

Opposition is asking me now to give, but which I cannot give because of the state of the law at the present time.

Second, with respect to the resignation of the commissioner. Last evening we had many newspaper reports read to us here in the House, Mr. Chairman. Newspaper reports from various newspapers written by various newsmen, some of whom had interviewed me, some of whom had interviewed my officials and almost all of whom had interviewed the immediate past commissioner of the Ontario provincial police, Commissioner Clark. There was a variety of stories and there was a variety of statements attributed both to myself and to the commissioner.

This is not unusual in such instances, and I say now to the House as I said to the newspapers at that time: first of all, that when I assumed the office of Attorney-General last fall Commissioner Clark, as he then was, suggested to me that as a new Minister and in view of the turmoil which surrounded the Ontario provincial police, I might like to be free to choose a new commissioner and that he would give me his resignation. In fact, he did give me one which I returned to him and told him that I did not wish to accept it, that I had at that time no intention of making any changes in the top echelon of the Ontario provincial police force pending an examination of the whole situation by myself and the receipt of the Roach report, which at that time we anticipated would be in by the end of the year.

The end of the year came. Commissioner Clark went on his normal leave of absence. The leave of absence expired and Commissioner Clark came back. There was no Roach report and, Mr. Chairman, there still is no Roach report.

I say again to the hon. members, as I said last night, that I have not been in touch with the hon. justice. I do not think that is part of my duties, nor would it be well on my part to do so. So I have no idea when the report may be received. But as I said last evening, each week I hear that it is due in at the end of that week and that presently is my full knowledge of the matter.

The situation came to this point, Mr. Chairman, that there was a reorganization of the force indicated and this government felt that the time had come that it should be carried out and that the necessary action should be taken. I outlined to the House last evening in broad terms the organization. In due course, when legislation is introduced, I will be most pleased to elaborate and to

discuss fully any of the aspects of this organization arising out of the legislation which will be introduced to authorize such changes as we may make.

At that time, Commissioner Clark, having been on leave and knowing that the reorganization was underway, again tendered me his resignation. I do not know what impelled him. There were no reasons in the resignation, there was no discussion as to whether he would resign because of the Ontario police commission or because of the new Attorney-General, as there had been originally because he wished to co-operate with the new Attorney-General, sir. That was not discussed. I certainly had no discussion with him at that time, or prior or subsequent with respect to the position of the Ontario police commission, although I did understand that there might have been some cause for friction between the commissioner and the Ontario police commission. That would be natural. These matters were not mentioned.

The resignation was given to me and on this occasion, having decided as I felt it was my duty to decide, that action was necessary, I accepted the resignation of the commissioner and he retired. I will say this, and I have said it to the newspapers, Mr. Chairman, I have said it in this House when I made the statement about his retirement: Commissioner Clark was a very faithful public servant; he served the Ontario provincial police and the people of our province exceedingly well for two score years. He was a good policeman, he was an exceedingly loyal head of the police force, loyal both to his superiors and to those who worked with and under him.

He was due for retirement this year and so his actual resignation and retirement antedates by very few months the time at which he would have retired in any event by the operation of the normal retiring age in the police force.

I am sorry to say, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot elaborate any more. The commissioner did not confide in me as to the reasons for this resignation. This I can understand because of the time he had with the press and with the Minister, if you wish, and everyone else when he had previously put in his resignation, and the matters got into the newspapers. So I respected his desire to put in a resignation, no questions asked, and accepted it. It is a *fait accompli*. We miss him. But I am sure the Ontario provincial police force is quite capable of turning up another top policeman to be the deputy commissioner of the force and to be the top policeman in the force.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, sir, I would not expect that you would elaborate or speculate about personal reasons but certainly one question becomes very apparent. That is: Why did you accept the second resignation, when you had determined in your own mind to refuse the first? And why was action necessary on the second occasion when it was not necessary on the first occasion?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I thought I made that perfectly plain. The first occasion was within ten days of my becoming Attorney-General in this province; and I must say that even though I have had many compliments paid to me by my hon. friends on the other side I am not yet smart enough to be able in ten days to decide what I thought should be done with the organization of the Ontario provincial police, and persuade the government it should be done. However, after three months I felt I was in that position.

I produced, and gave some details of it last time, a plan for the reorganization of the police force. It could not be effective unless we could work from the top right down to the newest recruit being taken in by Sergeant Anderson. At that time, I was pleased to receive, and did receive and did accept, the resignation of the commissioner. That, mark you, was at the end of last month, which was three months after I took office.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, sir, are we to infer from what has been said that the office of the commissioner of the Ontario provincial police will be discontinued; that there will be no such office hereafter?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Oh no. I think I made it perfectly plain in the statement I read last evening that the commissioner will be a man of deputy Minister rank; and that he will be not necessarily a policeman but a man who is capable of determining policy and dealing, through the appropriate Minister, with this House and with all jurisdictions with which he has to deal. We will have, as the second-in-command, the deputy commissioner, a top policeman who I am sure we will find in the Ontario provincial police force right now.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, to get to the hon. Minister's remarks in proper context, as I understood it he said that he was sure that a top policeman would be turned up to take the job of commissioner of police—a policeman would be turned up to take the job as commissioner of police?

Hon. Mr. Cass: No. As deputy, I said.

Mr. Singer: Oh, as deputy. I see. And is he prepared to say whether the commissioner of police will be a policeman or perhaps somebody else?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I said he would not be a policeman.

Mr. Singer: He would not be a policeman. Do I further understand that the police commission has consented, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 2 of section 40 of The Police Act, to do what is prescribed there, at the present time, and that the acting commissioner and the hon. Attorney-General are in fact doing what subsection 2 of section 40 says? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is this: In essence what the hon. member has said is true, but is not true in quite the same manner. I have had very friendly relations with the chairman and members of the police commission. We have been able, with Mr. Silk who is acting in the commissioner's place and with the assistance of His Honour, to produce the plan which I read yesterday. In due course we will produce legislation which will have the effect which I think the hon. member mentioned.

Mr. Singer: All right. The other section of the statute, that was inserted last year, deals with the annual report of the police commission. I had hoped the hon. Attorney-General previously would have told us whether or not we can expect a report, as the legislation sets out, that his predecessor talked about. Can he tell us now?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was informed by the police commission yesterday, and I am sorry but I should have mentioned it last night when the matter was raised, that there is a report in the process of preparation. It is not ready yet, and I have no firm date on it, so it was impossible to consider that we would have it in before we went on with the estimates, even if the estimates did not go on for another month. I had no firm date from the police commission, except I know there is an inspector or someone working on it very hard, I understand.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Attorney-General a complaint in regard to police protection in Timagami. The president of the Timagami Association writes as follows:

Our police protection on Timagami Lake proper has been sadly neglected—approx-

mately 40 break-ins of private cottages in 1962 and no convictions. We pay plenty of taxes, but there does not seem to be any police available to be stationed in the centre of this tourist area to protect the properties. This situation is very discouraging to summer residents.

I do not know if I should direct this to the hon. Attorney-General, and then on to the police commission. Through which chain of command it would go—but that is the complaint of the president of that association.

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a complaint which, from the viewpoint of those who own summer cottages and occupy them three months of the year, is entitled to be made.

Unfortunately, throughout the whole of this province, due to the high economic level of our province and the high income that our people have, comparatively speaking, we have summer cottages stretched along lakes and rivers. It is quite impossible, even if we had ten times the police we have now, to control and protect. The only thing that is possible is that we do whatever patrolling is possible with the people we have; and when break-ins are discovered or reported, we do our best, or the police—I am speaking for them now—do their best to track down the miscreants and bring them to justice and recover what, if anything, that can be recovered.

I am advised by my police advisers—Inspector Crozier is familiar with this particular case—and I have seen a copy of the letter that the hon. member has read, and Inspector Crozier is working on it. We can only hope that in due course the culprits will be apprehended; but this is a problem, Mr. Chairman, that I would point out is quite unsolvable as far as this police force and any other police force is concerned.

It is quite impossible to patrol the many thousands of miles of lakes and rivers where there are summer cottages which are occupied by their owners for a very small portion of the year, and which often lie scores of miles from any other habitation. This is the thing. It is a risk, I think, that those of us who have summer cottages, and I am one of them, must accept and we must protect ourselves against it by insurance. We must accept the risk of having these break-ins take place.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It is barely a little more than a year since we demonstrated our right to oppose the amendment to The Police Act, which founded the Ontario police

commission. Many hon. members of the House will recall, when the amendment was tendered by the former Attorney-General, that not only did we speak against it, we backed up our words by voting against it. The amendment to The Police Act, the new section 40, became the law of this province over our opposition, which is recorded in the journals of the House, when we stood for division.

At that time one of the main protests that we made a number of times—sometimes the Opposition is inclined to be repetitious; it has to be repetitions in order to attempt to get the message through. However, in a precipitate haste which is quite out of character with the new hon. Attorney-General, a haste that compares unfavourably with his inability to make appointments, important appointments, in this province and the service of this province, that amendment was shoved through in the face of our opposition.

We said at that time, "Why don't you wait for the report of the Honourable Mr. Justice Roach in order to ascertain what he is going to say by way of recommendation for reform of the administration of the Ontario provincial police?"

"No," said the government, if I may paraphrase, "this has to be done immediately."

So a little more than a twelve-month later, let it be observed, they have to admit that the reforms they instituted were wrong. They were wrong. Now the hon. Attorney-General is still not waiting, he is still unwilling to wait, for the Roach report. He tells us he does not know when it is coming in.

I said last night that I think he has a little pipeline that gives him a little information that we do not have, a political pipeline; political mental telepathy. He says "No." He pays no attention, be it noted in his remarks, to anything the honourable justice might say. He says that somebody in the provincial police organization, or somebody in the commission, is figuring something out and we will introduce legislation again to correct the evil which we created in the amendment of section 40. My friend, the hon. member for York Centre who is always very helpful, says he must be complimented for that. Yes, he is entitled to a compliment.

He says, "We made a mistake and now if you will just bide with us a little while, we will present some fresh legislation to you in order to demonstrate what needs to be done now to rectify the error"—and we are going to have another little go at it, you see.

Well, presumably they will never have to make that decision again. They may make a

false step, and again botch it up, and somebody else will have to come along and finally correct the thing once and for all. I think we said—I recall, and I want to be fair about it—at the time—and one would have to search the journals of *Hansard*, which I shall do at some time when I have a little more opportunity and freedom—we said that one thing you must do is forever divorce control of the administrative tribunal from the daily activities of the provincial police.

Now the legislation is not going to say—I hope it would—we are going to physically remove them one from another. But we had the confession last night—and there are quite a few in the House now, I should repeat these things, because there are quite a few in the House now who were not here last night to see the exciting things. The hon. Prime Minister, for example, was not here last night to see the fall of the government, the defeat of the government, and if I get the opportunity tonight I am going to tell the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. Mackay) about it. And maybe as his last act before he goes out of office, he will dissolve the House, if he hears what happened last night. Now I would not say too much if I were the hon. member because he was not here.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Is the hon. member suggesting that he has a perfect attendance record?

Mr. Sopha: Not at all. But when crucial things happen, I am here. That was a crucial thing. That was very crucial.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Well, as a matter of fact, now that it has been raised, I had to go to the Toronto General Hospital for emergency treatment on a perionychia that I was suffering on one of the fingers of my left hand. That is where I was. The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) would tell you what perionychia is. A perionychia on that finger; and that is where I was at that time. If the hon. members want to discuss medical things, Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared, with the assistance of the hon. Minister of Health, to do it.

If any point is to come out of this discussion of the hon. Attorney-General—and the hon. Attorney-General, let it be said, is extremely clever in his ability to fend off the thrusts that come from this side—if anything comes out of it perhaps it would be most effective and most reasonable to say to him finally, once again, "Why don't you wait

until the Honourable Mr. Justice Roach finally makes his report before contemplating any further changes in the administration of the Ontario provincial police?" I submit that as a perfectly reasonable and legitimate request.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 224 agreed to.

On vote 225:

Mr. Sopha: Well, it is a pity, Mr. Chairman, I have to get up again so soon, but here we have an opportunity to save the people of the province \$18,000. The co-ordinator of justice administration; as I understand it, the creation of that post was to institute an office whereby an official shuffles judges—if that is the proper verb to use—around the province where judicial service is needed. The person who first occupied this position is now the inspector of legal offices.

Earlier, under vote 202, Mr. Chairman, we voted the sum of \$37,000 to the chief judge of the county and district court, whose responsibility it is to provide judges and rotate them about the province where the pressure of judicial business is such that they are needed. Surely, in view of that fact, the reason for the existence of the co-ordinator of justice administration has expired, I would hesitate to think and invite the hon. Attorney-General to comment that because a sinecure has been established, in the words of Parkinson's law it is necessary to continue the existence of the post merely because it has come into being.

I may be wrong. There may be some other things which the co-ordinator of the administration of justice does, but I assert that was the initial reason for the creation of the post as I have cited it. That job has been taken over by the chief of the county and district courts. Surely out of the interests of economy we should eliminate this post?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Chairman, a little knowledge is a very dangerous thing and it also provokes great quantities of words.

Mr. Sopha: I usually say some nice things about the hon. Attorney-General.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I am about to say some nice things now about the hon. member. The hon. member for Sudbury is quite correct when he says that one of the duties of the co-ordinator of justice administration was the juggling, if you wish to say that, of county court judges, because of the former very large backlog of cases and great overload in some areas and a rather slack time in other areas. This, so far as the county bench

is concerned, is being very satisfactorily handled as the hon. member has suggested by the chief judge, His Honour Judge Wilcott. I think, and perhaps I said it when we were considering the estimates of that office, that in a year or two—because it will take that long still to get the system working—the combination of the chief judge plus the roving judges plus the new appointments to districts rather than to particular county towns of many judges will solve this problem and will certainly do a great deal to improve the speed, if not the efficiency, of our county courts.

The other knowledge, which was not within the area of the hon. member's information, is that the co-ordinator of justice administration has certain other duties which he still performs. I will go so far as to agree with him, that when we have solved the problem of how to deal with these other matters we will certainly not continue further this particular office. It is to be hoped that certain matters which are under way now with respect to the high courts, through the office of the chief justice of the High Court and through certain projected changes with respect to the magistrates' courts will render this particular office obsolete, and that in another year or two years it will not be necessary to have this item in the estimates.

The co-ordinator of justice administration, of course, has two other very important duties or now two duties. One is that it is his job to receive the monthly reports from the various Supreme Court offices and, in liaison with the chief justice of the High Court, arrange likewise there for the more expeditious dispatch of Supreme Court business. The other thing, and this is what causes him a good deal more difficulty, is the problem of arranging our magistrates' courts.

As everybody knows, Mr. Chairman, the magistrates' court is the court of first instance in all criminal matters, and in many quasi-criminal matters, and the case load and the work in magistrates' court is very heavy everywhere. I am sure it is in Sudbury, I know it is in Toronto, and I know it is in the eastern part of Ontario, but not in Chesterville.

The magistrates are many in Ontario. There are magistrates with local jurisdiction; and there are magistrates with province-wide jurisdiction; there are magistrates who are centred, like county judges, in certain areas; and there are magistrates like the roving judges on the county bench who go from place to place as occasion requires, and as

they are directed by the inspector of legal offices upon the advice of the co-ordinator of justice administration.

One of the big headaches of that branch, and of the co-ordinator, is the problem of magistrates' courts work loads, holidays, vacations, illness, and all the rest of it. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, we are endeavouring to solve this problem. When we do, then this particular office will be unnecessary; but, until we do, it is either done by this man, or this person, under this vote, or it has to be done by someone else under some other vote. I am sure that the hon. members of this House will prefer that it be kept under this separate vote rather than buried in the accounts of the inspector of legal offices. I hope that the hon. member for Sudbury will realize that I do agree with him so far as the county bench is concerned, but I do say with respect to the other two matters, particularly the magistrates' bench, there is still this big problem, still this job which the man is doing. We are not any happier about having to manage this way than are the magistrates who are asked to go from place to place. We think there is some other solution for it and we are trying to find it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I cannot quite follow the hon. Minister when he says he thinks that hon. members of the House would be happier that it was shown in this vote than in other votes. The same man who wears a hat one day as inspector of legal offices, Mr. A. A. Russell, wears a hat another day as co-ordinator of justice administration. Is that wrong?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Burger is now the co-ordinator of justice administration.

Mr. Sopha: Former police chief of Sudbury and a splendid fellow.

Mr. Singer: Then at least for the fiscal year that ended March 31, 1962, Mr. Russell at one time wore the hat of inspector of legal offices and at another time wore the hat of co-ordinator of justice administration. Was he being moved from day to day or was he being—

Hon. Mr. Cass: He was being promoted from co-ordinator of justice to the other, so he held on to the duties in the co-ordinator's office.

Mr. Singer: He never did both jobs at the same time, is that it?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Oh, yes!

Mr. Singer: He did do both jobs at the same time! For a considerable period of time, for several months, all right?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Until we got an assistant inspector of legal offices.

Mr. Singer: In any event, Mr. Chairman, it is rather interesting to follow through the costs of the co-ordinator of justice administration in these accounts that we have here ending March 31, 1962. The costs of that office were only \$13,127.66. Now the hon. Attorney-General with less work, and he admits there will be less work, is asking for an additional \$5,000.

If there is going to be less work, why does the cost go up almost 50 per cent, say 40 per cent? Mr. Russell, when he was doing both jobs charged \$5,700 to this co-ordinator's job, this vote 225. The balance of his salary came under the inspector of legal offices. But now we are going to have \$13,000 in salaries where we only had \$9,000 in salaries. Presumably the co-ordinator is going to get more and there are going to be other salaries more.

In any event the salaries are going to go from \$9,229.98 to \$13,000. Travelling expenses, which are not shown in these accounts, are now going to amount to \$2,000 and maintenance, which was here at \$3,897.68, is going to be \$3,000. We have also got maintenance in the office of the inspector of legal offices and maintenance over there is some \$9,000. So if my report is accurate, Mr. Chairman, there is going to be less, why does the budget increase by almost 40 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the hon. member to the estimates for the current year 1962-63 and vote 220 which provided for \$21,000 for the co-ordinator of justice administration. He will find from that, of course, that the estimates for the ensuing year are down from \$21,000 to \$18,000, which indicates an adjustment in the duties and in the staff.

With respect to the figures which he has read from the public accounts, those are the actual expenditures for two years ago, the year before this. They were what was actually expended. I do not have the estimates for that year here, but I would think we will find the estimates for that year were much higher than the actual expenditures, because this is rather a peculiar office and the matter of travelling expenses and the help that is necessary in the way of salaries has to be

estimated in the hope that we do manage to fit the right amount of people and the right amount of dollars per mile into the vote.

If there are great backlogs of work and if there is a great deal of travelling to be done and a great deal of work to be done in the office, then there will be more money used. Obviously two years ago there was not. Obviously, last year we thought there would be less so the estimates for this year are only \$18,000.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is a particularly new suggestion, but I would like to see the hon. Attorney-General put into his department a Classco type investigation to see if some of the many things could not be brought together. Certainly here it is obvious, for a period of months at least, we have Mr. Russell doing the two jobs without any great harm being done to the province. Now they are apart, the costs are going up. Clearly, with some investigation these things could be brought back together again and the costs of administration cut down.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 225 agreed to.

On vote 226:

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a few questions on 226.

We have raised this matter in these estimates before. I think that this is a nice little slush fund that is nicely buried in the hon. Attorney-General's department. We have a Department of Transport which is charged with the responsibility, generally speaking, of traffic safety. Each year we see the same amount tucked away in the hon. Attorney-General's estimates.

I have in front of me the last copy of the public accounts. I just want to see where this money was spent and I find for instance, \$7,500 was given to Northwestern University. Would the hon. Attorney-General advise us what that was for?

Hon. Mr. Cass: I gave a copy of the results of that \$7,500 yesterday to the hon. members of the House by tabling it and a copy to the hon. leader of your party (Mr. Wintermeyer). It was for the Northwestern University Traffic Institute report which certainly has a great deal to do with traffic safety.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I understood. I took a quick look at that report particularly because I wondered if it was the report that the hon. Attorney-General sent

across to the hon. leader of the Opposition last night. Certainly there is a lot more in that report besides traffic safety.

I think this merely points out, Mr. Chairman, that this department should not be in this Attorney-General's department at all, this matter. The very fact that the hon. Attorney-General saw fit to use the funds from this department to do an investigation of police forces indicates to me that really it is not a budget at all, it is simply a little amount that is tucked in there.

I see there is \$10,000 for newspaper advertising. I would be interested to know just what type of advertising is done, what was the money spent on last year.

Hon. Mr. Cass: The \$10,000 of course is two years ago. I have no information at the moment with respect to that, I can obtain it for the hon. member, but if he wishes I will be delighted to tell him what is done by this particular traffic safety branch.

I would like to point out that traffic safety is more than advertising in newspapers, it is more than regulatory matters under The Department of Transport. The matter of enforcement of our laws can contribute much more, almost, than anything else to traffic safety. During last year the motion picture film that was produced some time ago under the aegis of this branch during the tenure of office of my hon. predecessor was shown throughout Canada and the United States. There were 28 occasions upon which Inspector Witts attended and spoke to various organizations on traffic safety, including various refresher courses for fire chiefs, for civil defence fire aid people, for the Canadian infantry training course at Borden, for several other courses at Borden. He spoke at Ontario Safety League courses for commercial driving instructors, for teachers preparation course for high school driver education, at the first school bus drivers' course at the Ontario Traffic Conference. He gave two lectures at the Pembroke municipal police force refresher course, the Quetico conference and training centre on two occasions. The head of this branch, who is the only technical person, Inspector Witts was present and gave lectures on general law enforcement and safety. The 292,943 booklets were distributed not last year, but were distributed by this branch since it was first set up.

Advice and encouragement was given throughout the year to the OPP personnel who are engaged with the rural school programme, which is very necessary. The traffic safety section was quite deeply involved with the CNE exhibit this year.

In addition this particular office has had a great deal to do with the setting up and carrying out of traffic court clinics during the year. There are now 31 of such clinics functioning. They are performing a very useful service. I might say that these are located in many of our smaller municipalities, as well as in the larger cities, Barrie, Belleville, Brantford, Chatham, Galt, Guelph, Hamilton, Hanover, Kirkland Lake, Kitchener, London, Newmarket, Niagara Falls, North Bay, Oakville, Orillia, Oshawa, Ottawa, Peterborough, Renfrew, all of these have traffic court clinics which are somewhat under the aegis of this particular section and with each of them Inspector Witts did considerable work during the year. So this is not wasted money.

I do not know how the hon. member defines the terms he used, and I quote "slush fund". This is money of the people of the province of Ontario which is being spent and has been spent in the past for very important matters; matters as important as life and death. And so far as I am concerned it is an exceedingly useful vote to the people of Ontario, one that is well expended.

In answer to the question about the newspaper advertising two years ago, I most certainly will be glad to send the hon. member a memorandum about it, because the information is not here.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: It has been there every year, Mr. Chairman. I have gone back through these and I find that this particular estimate does not vary. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is one more example of the sloppy type of administration that takes place in the government.

They set up a department, they charge it with a particular field of responsibility, and then they start duplicating it in the other estimates. The very classic example of how the money was misused from the purpose for which it was voted is the particular report which the hon. Attorney-General has suggested was a matter of traffic safety. Certainly it is covered in the report, but he knows as well as I do that this is not basically what was covered in the report. There were many aspects of police work that were covered in the report by Northwestern University; it was simply a convenient place to get the money.

I suggest that there is not really any programme here—that the long list which the hon. Attorney-General read to us was simply a matter of camouflaging the thing. This is something that properly belongs in a

department which is charged with the responsibility of safety. It indicates something that is a carry-over from years back, when the former Attorney-General took it upon himself—as was mentioned last night—that police work consisted principally of avoiding traffic fatalities on the highway.

It seems that once the government sets up a department, charges it with responsibility, it should leave it to that department. The very fact that the hon. Attorney-General does not know where the newspaper advertising went—in a small budget of \$35,000—indicates that it is not taken very seriously by the hon. Attorney-General himself.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, Mr. Chairman, may I just focus attention on one aspect of this? I am not going to dispute for the moment the hon. Minister's contention that all these dollars are being spent effectively and wisely but, surely, the question still remains: Why do you have the remainder, of what was going to be a little bit of empire-building by your predecessor, retained in this department, when the tidy handling of it obviously should be over in The Department of Transport since it has been established?

It is an open secret that there was one stage at which there was considerable conflict between the new Department of Transport and the empire-building of your predecessor in this field within The Department of the Attorney-General; and apparently the decision of the government was that you were going to build The Department of Transport and the job would be done here. Most of the work is being done there but why is this tag end still being continued in The Attorney-General's Department? And why, even if one accepts your answer that everything being done here is valid and effective and you are getting 100 cents' value for every dollar you are spending, is it not switched over to The Department of Transport so that we can deal with it there when those estimates come before us?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Chairman, all I can say with respect to that, apart from the fact that this does give the hon. members the opportunity of discussing traffic safety twice during the estimates of the various departments—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, that is bad business and you recognize it. You do not want to—

Hon. Mr. Cass: I think the hon. member should enjoy that particular privilege and opportunity but that is beside the point.

I tried to mention earlier, Mr. Chairman, and I say again, that while The Department of Transport is charged with certain responsibilities and duties with respect to traffic safety, they are only charged with certain responsibilities. The greatest responsibility with respect to traffic safety, and I say this advisedly without any fear of contradiction by the hon. members on the other side, lies with the police agencies in this province.

Law enforcement in a proper, educated manner is the greatest traffic safety factor we have. Therefore it is not unusual I would think, to find within the estimates of the department responsible for the Ontario provincial police some reference to traffic safety. I would suspect that another year, Mr. Chairman—since it was only because of my desire to leave it the way it was this year rather than move it into the provincial police estimates—any monies which are required for this more properly perhaps would appear in the provincial police estimates. Certainly law enforcement, with the proper publicity and with the proper traffic clinics and all the rest of it, are part of traffic safety, are part of law enforcement, and they therefore should be part of the estimates in this department.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 226 agreed to.

This completes the estimates of The Department of the Attorney-General.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Mr. Chairman: The estimates of The Department of Health as found on page 52.

On vote 701:

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the unique distinction today of being the only Minister who will be able to advise you that my budget this year is estimated to be a good deal less than it was last year. In the six years I have presented departmental estimates to the House, this is the first time I have been able to begin with such a statement and, so far as I can recall, I have never heard the statement made of any other department, in the time that I have been in this House. If I could add that the reduction came about as a result of our having solved many of the big health problems constantly facing us, I would be most happy and satisfied. However, the reduction is not the result of this—it comes about because of a number of reasons all related to the operation of the Hospital Services Commission.

The premium stabilization fund, set up two years ago, used \$12.2 million less than was estimated—hospitals required \$4.2 million less last year than was estimated. Administrative expenses of the commission were reduced by \$0.5 million and, as a result of a higher national per capita cost, we received an additional \$1 million from the federal government. Premiums yielded \$0.5 million more than a year ago. Apart from this, Mr. Chairman, the estimated spending of The Department of Health on the services it provides is increased, but I am quite certain that after the hon. members of this House have seen the estimates they will agree with me that the increases are all well justified.

As in former years, it is only possible to touch upon some of the highlights of the year's activities. This, coupled with what I presented to the House in the early days of this present sitting during the Throne debate, with what hon. members may wish to discuss during the individual votes—added to the annual report of the department, will, I hope, give every hon. member a reasonably clear insight into the work of The Department of Health.

I would like to touch on the work of every division of the department because each is part of the whole effort. If divisions are not mentioned, it is not to say they are of no importance, but rather that they may be passed over in the interest of putting the time of the House to the best use.

Looking first at the division of public health administration, since this historically was the *raison d'être* of The Department of Health, we note that its scope has broadened greatly from the original. No longer are its only concerns with communicable diseases, pure water and milk supplies and sewage disposal. Indeed, pure water and sewage disposal are no longer the responsibility of The Department of Health—and many health authorities greatly deplore this trend because the basic reason for concern with purity of our water supply and the proper and safe disposal of sewage waste is the health of our people. Nevertheless, public health embraces much more and we will look first at health units.

There are now 36 health units established in the province—two were added during 1962. These serve in excess of 2.6 million people, and when added to the population looked after where there is a well organized local health department, municipality governed, we find that in excess of 80 per cent of the total population now comes under well organized and adequately directed public health services.

In the department, we still believe the

health unit provides the best possible public health service, particularly in rural and smaller urban centres, and our educational efforts are constantly directed to the encouraging of those still outside this programme to come into it. One new county health unit, Grey county, is planning to begin operation soon.

Recognizing the ever-present need to provide adequate, well-trained staff for the public health service, bursaries and fellowships are still made available for training professional and technical people, and 85 such bursaries were awarded during 1962. No fully qualified applicant has ever been refused a bursary—and more are available if there are applicants.

The expanded northern health service, approved by this House last year, has spent the months since then organizing and ascertaining the needs. Its area of activity lies in the unorganized townships of Nipissing and Parry Sound districts. It will be readily understood that such a service as this is a difficult undertaking because of the vast areas involved and the very sparse population. As far as we can ascertain, only 7,000 people live in the area under consideration at the present time. It is now intended on the basis of our experience, to expand our operation to comparable areas and during the ensuing year additional offices will be opened in Sault Ste. Marie and Moosonee.

Epidemiology is a branch of the department seldom in the limelight, and this, of course, is as it should be. During the year, however, we were rather tragically reminded that only through the continuing vigilance of this division is the standard of public health maintained as high as it is. The diseases which in other days brought forth this branch are little heard of nowadays, but they are only controlled by constant care and education in the use of the protective measures we use against them. To most of us, it was unthinkable that a case of smallpox should be found in Ontario in 1962, yet this happened; a case coming into our country from a foreign land. That no others developed was due, in large measure, to the prompt and effective action taken by the staff of the division of epidemiology.

Diphtheria cases numbered nine in the province and one death was reported. That this should happen is almost inexcusable since effective protection is available against both smallpox and diphtheria. Education programmes have been stimulated in the hope that parents will ensure the immunization of their children. Similar efforts are being made to urge adults to get protection for themselves.

Only nineteen cases of paralytic poliomyelitis were reported and no deaths. Ten of the 19 had had no vaccine, one had had only a single dose, four had had three doses and no information was available concerning the other four. From this it becomes increasingly evident that Salk and Sabin vaccine used together, complemented one to the other, provide a large measure of protection against this crippling and killing disease. For the polio vaccine alone the provincial government provided nearly \$800,000 during the year.

There is still much concern in our department about the increase in reported cases of rabies in animals. The number of household animals—dogs and cats—affected is particularly disturbing and points up the need to have all such animals vaccinated because of the danger of their infecting humans. Vaccination of humans, after exposure, is costly, painful and not without danger. The department provided 991 courses of anti-rabies vaccine free of charge for humans exposed to this disease.

Members of staff have believed for some time that bats were somehow or other involved in the spread of rabies. During 1961 and 1962, five cases of rabies-infected bats were confirmed, and a research project supported by The Department of Health is now under way in the city of Kingston to study this problem.

The encouraging decline in the problem of tuberculosis, which has been in progress over the past several years, continued in 1962.

For the third successive year, Ontario had the lowest tuberculosis death rate of any of the Canadian provinces and I am led to believe that we now have the lowest mortality rate in the world—2.14 cases per 100,000 population, for a total of 137 deaths in the province.

There were 1,703 cases of active tuberculosis of all types recorded on the provincial case register for a rate of 27.3 per 100,000 population. This represents a decline of 18 per cent as compared to 1960.

From the standpoint of public health, the pulmonary type of tuberculosis is particularly significant, as this in general is the source of infection to others in the community. Approximately 85 per cent of the active cases of tuberculosis in 1962 were pulmonary in type.

Since 1959, the tuberculin test has been part of the community mass survey procedure, all persons attending such surveys being tested. These surveys carried on throughout the province show that approximately 20 per cent of the population, an esti-

mated 1,200,000 persons in Ontario, have been infected at some time or another in the past with tubercle bacilli. Children and adolescents fortunately have a low incidence of infection—below one per cent under ten years of age; 2.5 per cent between 10 and 14. But the rate rises steeply thereafter until at the age of 55 we find that about 43 per cent of all our people have been exposed at some time or another.

At the present time, there are 12 sanatoria in Ontario with 2,255 beds available for tuberculosis patients. I am pleased to report that as of November 31, 1962, there were only 1,166 patients in residence. I think this is rather a striking figure when we remember that less than eight years ago there were over 5,000 patients occupying beds for tuberculosis in this province.

A total of 4,466 patients were treated in sanatoria in 1962, as compared to 5,053 the preceding year, a decline of 587 or 11 per cent. There was a comparable drop of admissions of 10 per cent.

We hear a good deal about the cost of sanatorium treatment. The province accepts the full responsibility for the cost of maintenance of patients in sanatoria, excepting certain cases such as those coming under the Workmen's Compensation Board, Indian Health Services, Department of National Health and Welfare and The Department of Veterans' Affairs. The average standard per diem cost as paid by the department in 1962 amounted to \$12.11, as compared to \$10.85 in 1961 and this called for a total provincial maintenance grant of \$4,320,930 during the year 1961-1962, the last year for which we have audited statements.

The pattern of treatment of tuberculosis has changed drastically in the past few years, largely due to the use of anti-tuberculosis drugs. While the total period of treatment has not changed—18 to 24 months—the duration of stay in sanatorium has greatly lessened. The result is that the greater part of the treatment is now carried on quite successfully and quite satisfactorily outside of the sanatorium.

Because of the growing numbers of these patients under treatment outside sanatorium and the need for strengthening the chest clinic service, which is responsible for the medical follow-up of such cases, the government proposes to accept the financial responsibility for this follow-up, now largely provided by voluntary agencies. The objective is to ensure continuous and effective care for the patient, and to provide better control of tuberculosis. An item of \$69,000 has been

included in the estimates of the tuberculosis prevention branch for the fiscal year 1963-1964 to cover the cost involved. It should be clearly understood this follow-up service is not the provision of total medical care of the patient. It is solely for his tuberculosis and to ensure that the patient is continuing faithfully on the treatment programme. Case finding of course looms ever larger in our whole programme.

On chest clinic service, frequent free regular chest clinics, easily accessible to the public, are essential to the control of tuberculosis. Ontario is well served in this connection, there being 287 clinics located in different centres, conducted by various agencies such as sanatoria, four city boards of health, as well as the department's own tuberculosis prevention branch.

The department maintains five permanent district chest clinic offices. The staff of the departmental clinics visit centres in their respective areas where no x-ray facilities are available, on a travelling clinic basis, and provide medical supervision for clinics held in general hospitals utilizing hospital x-ray equipment.

Very large numbers of people were seen in these various clinics. In 1962 there was a total of 67,082 examinations in connection with the provincial chest clinic service, 117 new cases of active tuberculosis and 152 re-activated cases being reported for a total of 269 active cases of tuberculosis. I think this should point up very clearly to all of us the constant need for maintaining this case finding programme.

In order to meet increasing needs in the area served by the provincial chest clinic offices, the following extension of services is proposed:

1. North Bay—(a) The transfer of three clinics in the district of Timiskaming located at Haileybury, New Liskeard and Englehart to the chest clinic in Kirkland Lake;

- (b) The transfer of medical supervision of the Sudbury Chest Clinic to the Sudbury and Algoma Sanatorium;

- (c) Manitoulin Island, a local physician will be employed on a part-time basis as part of the follow-up programme, two half-days a month, and a local registered nurse, one day a week.

The funds to cover the cost of the extended service in the areas outlined above have been included in the estimates for the ensuing fiscal year 1963-1964.

2. Provincial Chest Clinic Office, Lindsay—it is proposed to transfer Peterborough county

from the Belleville chest clinic office to the Lindsay chest clinic office. This additional service will involve the employment of two local private physicians on a part-time basis, one nurse on a full-time basis and the establishment of an office in the city of Peterborough.

3. Victoria County, Tuberculosis Eradication Programme—This programme, operated jointly by the provincial chest clinic in Lindsay and the Victoria County Tuberculosis Association commenced in August, 1959. Every person in the county has an opportunity to have a free tuberculin skin test, or a chest x-ray, or both, during special annual surveys. The fourth of these annual surveys has just been completed.

This unique programme provides the department with an opportunity to study new methods in the fight against tuberculosis. Anti-tuberculosis drugs are used not only for the treatment of tuberculosis, but also for its prevention; they are given in situations carrying a high risk of the development of the disease, such as, for instance, a recent tuberculosis infection. The problem of infections with bacteria allied to, but not identical with, tubercle bacilli, is also extensively studied.

4. Mass surveys—surveys of apparently healthy people in the community and industry continue to be a productive part of the case finding programme. During 1962, the branch conducted 238 community, industrial and special group surveys, 339,038 persons being examined.

5. Hospital admission chest x-ray programme—since 1948, the hospital admission chest x-ray programme has played a significant role in case finding. All general hospitals, Red Cross hospitals with x-ray equipment, three privately operated hospitals and seven hospitals for the chronically ill, for a total of 201 hospitals are co-operating to the fullest extent in the programme. During the calendar year 1962, a total of 327,251 patients were x-rayed.

It is of interest to note that 145 cases of active tuberculosis were admitted to sanatorium in 1962. An additional 110 were admitted to sanatorium for investigation who were shown to have inactive tuberculosis, or other significant non-tuberculosis chest conditions.

It is worthwhile pointing out to the hon. members, Mr. Chairman, that a great many of these cases might not have been discovered until the disease was much further advanced, or probably after it was too late, had it not been for these case finding methods that

have now been employed for some years.

6. Jail chest x-ray programme—this programme was first introduced in 1955 and has been expanded to cover every one of the 46 municipal, district and county jails in the province. Twenty-nine of the larger jails have been supplied with x-ray units; the staff members of these institutions having been trained to operate x-ray equipment. In the remaining 17 smaller jails, prisoners are tuberculin tested, positive reactors being taken to the nearest hospital for a chest x-ray. All prisoners are examined at the time of commitment. During 1962, a total of 26,302 prisoners were x-rayed, of which 64 were recommended for sanatorium. This represents one prisoner recommended for sanatorium in every 410 examined, a very much lighter rate than found in the general population.

As is usual, the one phase of the department's work where we ask for a sizable increase in funds is the division of mental health. This is the largest part of our work, and that part where the increase of population makes the greatest impact. Spending in this branch accounts for 76.9 per cent of the total budget, exclusive of the funds provided for the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. It might be of interest to note that Ontario provides a greater part of its health budget for mental health than does any other province in Canada—three per cent more than the second best and 54 per cent more than the lowest.

Although some hon. members apparently are of the opinion we do nothing for our mentally ill, this opinion is not supported by fact. A very great deal has been accomplished—and is in progress. We do not hide the fact that much yet remains to be done—but it is being tackled with a will. That mental disorder is, indeed, our greatest health problem is borne out by the following facts and figures.

On November 30, 1962, there were 23,437 patients on the books of Ontario mental hospitals and hospital schools; this figure includes 19,318 patients in hospital and 1,291 patients in approved homes, but excludes 3,458 patients in residential units. The latest published figure for the total number of patients in public general hospitals, hospitals for the chronically ill and convalescent hospitals, excluding newborn, for December 31, 1961, is 26,312.

I would repeat that on November 30, 1962, there were 23,437 patients listed on our records as suffering from some type of mental disorder.

Almost four persons out of every thousand of the population of Ontario are today on the books of one of our mental hospitals.

There were over 10,000 admissions to Ontario hospitals in 1962.

One of the best signs of progress in our operations is found in this matter of admissions. In the past four years, this House has given approval to changes in legislation affecting the admission of mentally ill patients to Ontario hospitals. The value of those changes is becoming evident. Then, fewer than six per cent of our admissions were voluntary—now, 23 per cent go into hospital on advice with no formality. Almost five per cent are admitted on the certificate of one doctor—a device not possible four years ago. Where almost 78 per cent of all patients in 1958 were committed to hospitals on certificates of two doctors, that figure now is 57 per cent. To me, this is real progress and in an area where I, myself, had grave fears when the changes were first decided upon.

On volume of patients treated there were 6,605 first admissions to Ontario hospitals, and 4,149 readmissions—that is, patients who had previously been in a mental hospital—for a total of 10,754.

There were 1,349 deaths during the year. Most of these occurred in the aged group, a mortality rate that compares very favourably with the mortality rate for the general population.

The problem of the older age groups has increased till now more than 20 per cent of our patients are in the 65-years-and-over age groups.

There is a marked improvement in accommodation—where four years ago over-crowding was of the order of 32 per cent over all our hospitals and schools, this is now lessened to under ten per cent in the hospitals and 6.8 per cent in the hospital schools. This will be still further reduced during the ensuing year by the completion of buildings presently under construction. All this will do much to wipe out existing waiting lists. For admission to the hospitals, there is no waiting list. For admission to hospital schools, applications for admission in excess of available beds number 470—and 300 beds at Orillia are almost ready for occupancy.

Approved homes were mentioned earlier in what I had to say. Since 1932, the department has operated approved homes where suitable patients are placed from the Ontario hospitals. There is a provision in the regulations of The Mental Hospitals Act which permits payment for the care of patients in these homes.

On November 30, 1962, there were 1,291 patients in these approved homes throughout the province.

The patients so placed are visited at regular intervals by the staff of the hospital and by the social workers. These homes are used for patients who are not well enough to leave the supervision of the hospital entirely, but are considered to be able to live in the community under sheltered conditions. In some instances, these are convalescing patients in transition from hospital to community living, the boarding home serving as a "halfway house". In other instances, the patients in the boarding home will continue in this setting indefinitely.

Mentally retarded children: This part of the work of the division of mental health is perhaps the most difficult of all work undertaken by The Department of Health. While many of us speak rather glibly at times about treatment, little can actually be accomplished by treatment, so emphasis is put rather upon care and training. Since the establishment of community schools for retarded children has taken the less severe cases—and this has been, and is, an excellent project—the department has admitted the severely retarded, and our task has become more difficult and our results less successful.

For many years, the admission age for children to the Ontario hospital school, Orillia, was from 6 to 16. This has gradually altered due to the pressure of admissions for younger children, and the new construction at Orillia, Smiths Falls and Cedar Springs, some of which was designed for younger children. Many of those younger children whom we now admit have, as well as their mental retardation, some gross physical disability handicap.

The policy with respect to admissions adopted in 1961 removes all age limits for the admission of patients with gross physical deformities concurrent with gross mental retardation. Other mentally retarded children may be admitted at any age over six. All patients for admission to Ontario hospital schools are now admitted only after an out-patient facility, operated by this department, agrees that admission is necessary.

This procedure has already been proven to be sound. Most authorities are agreed that many retarded children can be well managed at home, at least till they have reached an age when training can have some effect. Of greater importance, it is widely accepted that every child deserves to be reared within the family circle for as long as possible. As the more enlightened attitude of society to the

mentally disordered is accepted, these patients are looked upon differently than they were a few years ago, and parents and family find the problems less intolerable. Out of the research centre at London we have learned that many families prefer to keep the retarded child at home, so long as they can be given some help and guidance in the control and management of the patient.

This institute at London has now completed three full years of function. During the past year, administrative and clinical facilities in the Crombie building have been utilized, and at this time 77 beds are available for in-patient care. It is expected that within the near future, laboratory facilities will be functioning for amino-acid screening and chromosome analysis. The case load of the institute has increased from eight patients weekly to frequently 14 cases which includes the acceptance of approximately three emergency cases each week coming from departmental referral or from community juvenile and family courts and other social agencies.

The diagnostic clinic has, up to December 31, 1962, seen 1,164 patients referred by physicians, various community agencies and parents for the purpose of diagnosis, assessment and screening to Ontario hospital school, Cedar Springs. The team approach of psychiatrists, pediatricians, social workers, psychologists, teachers and nurses provides diagnosis; assessment of the needs of the patient and his family; advice to the parents, regarding immediate and future management of the patient; provision of out-patient therapy; and assistance to existing community facilities.

The in-patient treatment unit is now an integral part of the institute function. As of December 31, 1962, 700 patients have been admitted for an average period of stay of 43 days. This setting provides facilities for: A period of close observation for diagnosis and assessment; the treatment of physical and emotional problems of children; investigative facilities where special aspects of mental retardation are under study by the university of Western Ontario or clinic staff; short term relief to families undergoing a particularly stressful home situation; facilities for the mother to live in with the child are available on a limited basis; and a number of emotionally disturbed and mentally retarded children requiring longer term, active psychiatric treatment are receiving this care as a regular function of the institute.

A day-care programme for an average of 12 patients daily utilizes both the above facilities. This provides training and therapy

for a group comprised of mentally retarded, mentally retarded blind, and cerebral palsied children.

Research at the institute is closely related to the University of Western Ontario. The projects at this time are too numerous to detail, but fall into the disciplines of cytogenetics, endocrinology, biochemistry, psychiatry, psychology, human genetics, pediatrics and growth and development.

A very vigorous teaching problem is carried out in the undergraduate area and the post-graduate area for nurses and for others involved in the care and control of these children.

The institute has been honoured by the frequent visits of interested professional and lay groups during the past three years, and has been visited by psychiatrists and other visitors from Japan, Australia, England, the United States and Canada.

During the past year, an active volunteer programme has been organized consisting of 91 volunteers, all of whom take part in all aspects of the institute programme. This is, sir, another remarkable evidence of the new attitude of society towards the work going on among the mentally disordered.

Another of the special services of mental health is the Thistlethorn hospital for emotionally disturbed children. During this year, increasing attention and effort have been directed toward research.

At the present time, 30 investigations are being carried out at the hospital, and 20 others have progressed to a planning stage. It has been possible to recruit a highly skilled and competent staff of psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers to undertake these various projects, and it is essential that the resources of the hospital, in respect to staff for such activity, be maintained at a very high level. Such projects are very close to the central core and vitality of the total hospital effort.

A total of 203 children have been admitted to this centre since the project was undertaken in 1957. During the year 1962, there were 45 regular admissions, plus a group admitted for a short period of observation in conjunction with research in childhood schizophrenia. It would, therefore, appear that the predicted admission rate of approximately 50 per year can be maintained.

A classroom teaching programme is provided by a principal and eight teachers, utilizing nine classrooms which have been specially designed and equipped to accommodate the particular learning problems of these

children. Nearly 100 per cent of the children in residence attend the school programme, which is an integral part of the child's activity within the hospital. A speech therapist works closely with the school in providing a diagnostic service and remedial therapy relating to speech problems.

As of September, 1962, a total of 250 students have been enrolled in the training programme for child care workers since its inception in 1957. As I have stated previously in this House, Mr. Chairman, we believe this is the only training course of its kind in Canada.

Thirty-eight trainees graduated from this course during the past year, bringing the total number of graduates to date to 105. This course has attracted such interest that there is no difficulty in maintaining a full staff, and students completing this training are being sought for important positions in the field of child care throughout the province.

The last year proved to be a most successful period of progress and achievement for the rehabilitation branch. During these 12 months, the foundation for the further development of the programme was consolidated, and the cornerstone laid for a structure that will provide greater rehabilitation services and facilities for the tuberculous and mentally ill in the future.

During the year, all phases of the programme were reviewed and, as a result, changes made to strengthen the organization and its operations as well as our relationship with other professions and agencies functioning in the same field of endeavour.

Increased activity was marked among tuberculosis patients during the year and, by reorganization of staff, district rehabilitation officers now begin their work with the patients within days of admission to hospital for treatment. The TB patients accounted for 35 per cent of the case load. Of these, 60 per cent are in the age group over 45 years. This in itself has posed many and great problems and has challenged our staff to devise new methods and techniques.

Large numbers of the older age groups and the chronic patients lack education and training necessary to fit into the modern employment structure. Interesting experiments with such patients are going on in many jurisdictions with such people. Most of them involve the establishment of industrial workshops. We are carefully studying such programmes to see how they would fit into our social and economic structure. We see many obstacles to be surmounted in such

programmes, but we believe this can be done and are continuing our efforts in this direction.

In mental health 65 per cent of the total case load came from the mental hospitals and clinics. Because most district rehabilitation offices are located now in Ontario hospitals, working with patients has been greatly simplified and intensified. Assessment and evaluation of work tolerance and ability is thus possible while the patient is still in hospital, and in one Ontario hospital this is done by having established within the hospital a practical industrial workshop programme. Three additional programmes of like nature are planned for the ensuing year. It is satisfying to report that 854 patients were placed in gainful employment during the year, and the present active case load is over 1,000.

These figures may not appear large, but, in reading them, it should be remembered that prospects for such patients in the past were gloomy, indeed, and that any improvement is worthwhile.

Some of our plans for the immediate future might be of interest to hon. members, Mr. Chairman. In mental health, increasing emphasis will be put upon the establishment of community mental health clinics. This, we believe, is our most effective instrument of prevention. While it offers no prevention in the real sense, perhaps the community clinic by its informality and its situation near to the people served, invites patients to seek help early. Such help is often so effective that more serious illness is prevented. In about two-thirds of the cases presenting for care at the clinic, no other form of treatment is required. Of the one-third who do require further and more intensive treatment, the stay in hospital is often much shortened and the resulting disruptions in the normal pattern of living much less severe.

At present 24 clinics serve 43 centres under Department of Health auspices and 13 clinics operate under local agencies. In the next five years, we propose to add 27 new clinic teams. Five such teams will be added in the ensuing fiscal year as the first phase of this programme.

Mental retardation due to one casual agent is known to respond to a special type of diet. This is costly and often beyond the means of parents. We are now prepared to provide this special diet, phenylalanine, to those who cannot afford it. It is at present proposed this will be a five year programme from which we hope to gain a good deal of experience and guidance for our future action.

Community psychiatric hospitals, as outlined in the Throne speech will be begun at Timmins and at Sault Ste. Marie.

Very markedly increased interest by general hospital boards in larger psychiatric units is becoming very evident. We are most interested in this development and are following it closely.

Building of the first phase of the central laboratory will begin in a matter of weeks.

For four years we will co-operate with the Canadian Conference on Children in a research project to ascertain the needs of, and identify the services required by children. Naturally, our interest here lies in health matters chiefly.

We intend to continue bursaries for medical and dental students to encourage their location, after graduation, in areas where their services are needed and you will note that the budget for this, Mr. Chairman, is doubled from last year.

We are continuing our discussions begun a year ago concerning the need for the establishment of additional facilities for training doctors and dentists.

The addiction research foundation will proceed with the first phase of a five-year programme of expansion of treatment facilities. Three centres will be established in the ensuing year. A treatment branch was begun at the Lakehead last fall.

The beginning of the second phase of the expanded programme of education will call for an increase in spending of \$85,000.

The narcotic clinic will get into active operation this year. A good staff has been recruited and some tried and some untried techniques are to be employed in this difficult area. Our centre is presently being assisted by Lady Frankau, one of the world's leading authorities; we hope to learn and we are learning, a very great deal at firsthand from her experiences.

A central registry for handicapped children will be established and maintained by the department. Much of this information may be known—somewhere. But the urgent need for collation, co-ordination, uniformity of documenting was pointed up in a study recently conducted by the Ontario Medical Association. Such a register will be most valuable—not only to the department but to many interested agencies.

These are among the important new programmes. In addition, of course, there will be the daily continuance of present on-going programmes, all of which are part and parcel of the total effort and responsibility of The

Department of Health. We lay no claim to their being perfect. Indeed, if they were perfect, there would be no challenge—they would not be real. In our way we try to practise the philosophy of Osler, one of the great fathers of modern medicine: to cure sometimes, to help often, to comfort always.

Usually we leave the discussion of the hospital services commission to the end, but taking a cue from one of the hon. members of the Opposition who yesterday suggested that the whole story should be delivered to them at the outset, I will continue with that too, sir.

The Ontario Hospital Care Insurance Plan continues to operate well and effectively. At the close of the fourth year on December 31, 1962, the estimated number insured was 6,177,629, representing 97.3 per cent of the eligible population. One would be of the opinion that this is about as close to complete enrolment as we can hope to come.

The estimated number of hospital beds at the end of December last year, compared with the 1961 figure: active treatment for 1961, 31,786; 1962, 32,896 or an estimated 5.2 beds per 1,000 population. Convalescent care, 561 in 1961; 755 in 1962; or an estimated .1 bed per 1,000 population. Chronic care, 7,504 in 1961; 7,326 in 1962; for an estimated 1.2 beds per 1,000 population. A total estimated number of beds in 1962 of 40,977, or 6.5 beds per 1,000 population.

Using the accepted formula of five beds per 1,000 population for active treatment; .25 per 1,000 for convalescent and one per 1,000 for chronic care, there is an overall surplus of .25 beds per 1,000 population. These are average figures only, and the problem of unequal distribution still remains. Our research people are currently up-dating statistics for Metro Toronto in conjunction with the special study on this area. Preliminary indications are that the active treatment beds in Metro Toronto may now have reached four per 1,000.

On public hospital care utilization, in 1962, the estimated number of in-patients treated, based on discharges from hospital, was 911,639, with total days of care since admission totalling 11,277,998. The comparative figures for 1961 were 896,981 and 10,606,040.

The commission has in operation a committee to consider special cases where, due to infirmity, genuine misunderstanding or a "technicality" residents and former contributors become uninsured. Each case is examined on its merits. During 1962, 155

cases were brought into benefit on compassionate grounds.

On hospital construction under provincial and federal grants, the final estimate, based on nine months' experience and three months' forecast, of provincial grant contributions in 1962-63 is \$12,253,000. The estimate for 1963-64 is \$12,872,000, a much lower increase than we have noted for some years past.

A grant on the basis of \$75 per bed was also made to all public hospitals in 1962. Total disbursed was \$2,551,875. A similar grant, as you will recall, was passed by this House just last week.

With regard to extended out-patient services, formal legislation was introduced early in 1962 extending out-patient services under the plan in the case of: (a) the follow-up visit of an emergency treatment within 24 hours of an accident, as for instance for fractures and certain services which would normally require admission to hospital.

There has been a greater utilization than expected of the emergency treatment facilities but strangely enough, less use of the extended type of out-patient services. A more accurate assessment will be possible after longer experience with this comparatively new arrangement. Utilization may well broaden as the facility becomes better known and accepted.

The figures for 1962 are as follows: emergency services were estimated at \$3.1 million and actually cost \$3.7 million; optional services only cost \$638,500, whereas we estimated at the beginning of the last fiscal year \$2.2 million.

It is not possible to give the actual figures of income and expenditure for the 1962 calendar year until audited hospital statements are received after March 1, 1963, but the following estimates, based on 11 months actual and 1 month projected, may be of interest as a probable indication of the end results of the year.

And again taking my cue from a very excellent question posed by the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Thomas) last year that an interim financial statement be provided for the hon. members of the House, we have done that. But I want to make very clear to you, sir, that this is only estimated so far and will not be accurate until we have all the hospital audits in.

Total expenditure for 1961, actual was \$220,053,082. Our 1962 projected is \$250,055,000, an increase of \$30,001,918.

Again, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize

that this total of \$250-plus millions is only for general hospital care. Add to this the comparable costs for mental and tuberculosis hospitals, which are covered and have been since the inception of our plan, covered by the Ontario plan, and you get the staggering sum of \$329,401,000. Of that sum, the provincial government provided almost \$123 million.

It will, I am sure, be of interest to the hon. members of this House to note the improvement in capital debt situation of hospitals since the advent of the plan.

A study was made of hospitals' financial position in 1962. The total capital debt of hospitals has declined from \$68 million at the end of 1958 to \$48 million at the end of 1961, a drop of \$20 million, despite the large expansion programme during this period.

The number of debtor hospitals decreased from 104 to 61. In 1958, public hospitals had a deficit in their general accounts of \$2.9 million. In 1961, the same hospitals had a surplus of \$11.1 million. These figures exclude provision for depreciation of buildings because this is not a cash expenditure for hospitals.

The 1961 administrative costs as a percentage of the total plan may also be of some interest. We have compared this for the three provinces in Canada which still have some semblance of a premium structure—Ontario, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

The 1961 administrative costs as a percentage of total plan costs for Ontario, Saskatchewan and Manitoba are: Ontario, total plan costs, \$222,338,158; administrative costs, \$5,240,142; percentage, 2.4. Saskatchewan, total plan costs, \$36,056,608; administrative costs, \$974,591; percentage, 2.7. Manitoba, total plan costs, \$33,364,482; administrative costs, \$1,348,660; percentage, 4.

So I feel that our commission at least is doing a good job of administration.

The per capita cost of administrative expenditures are: Ontario, insured persons, 5,882,000; per capita administrative costs, .89; Saskatchewan, insured persons, 890,678; per capita administrative costs, \$1.09; Manitoba, insured persons, 896,700; per capita administrative costs, \$1.50.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I throw myself on the mercy of this House, knowing that they will deal kindly and justly with them.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, we always deal kindly and justly with everybody on this side of the House. Sometimes the

justice might hurt, though, when we look at the record of some of the departments of the government.

The hon. Minister of Health made some remarks to the effect that we are not all perfect and there is always something to be done. I think that it might be necessary to remind the hon. Minister and the government that there is a very great deal to be done. The government has a great tendency, not only in this department, but in most departments, to do a lot of window dressing, to do a bit here and a bit there—in fact I believe it was Hon. Mr. Frost who liked to say that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: It was your great former leader, Mr. Frost, and I think this tendency is all through the government. The government does something but not nearly enough to face the problems that are at hand.

Nothing essentially was said of the nursing shortage here in the province and what attempts are made to solve it. There is a shortage of hospital space, especially in an area like Toronto, and I would like to deal with that in some detail. I do not think a proper statement or enough of a programme, is laid out for the future in mental health and the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, avoided almost in its entirety the problem of medical insurance.

We are told that some legislation will be presented to this session of the House on medical insurance; but this problem being of such vital importance, you would think that the hon. Minister of this department would have something to say. Also I was not at all impressed with what efforts are being put forward in the realm of research, either in medicine in general or especially in mental health research.

I have mentioned before that this present hon. Minister does not make the mistake of announcing all kinds of hospitals, because ever since the government has been aware that we keep the records checked, they have avoided making a lot of unnecessary announcements. However, Mr. Chairman, I must come back to the one hospital that was announced long before I was a member of this Legislature; it has been announced either by a Minister or in the Throne speech or this time in this session by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). They have been announcing the Toronto psychiatric hospital, and Toronto has been waiting patiently for years.

As I have told this House practically every year, the former Minister, Mr. Mackinnon

Phillips, announced in 1958 that Toronto would have a psychiatric hospital—a \$5 million hospital it would be—and a few weeks later Hon. Mr. Frost announced that it would be a \$6 million hospital we would have here in Toronto. And so announcement upon announcement has been made but I do not believe that the hon. Minister in his remarks touched upon the Toronto psychiatric hospital. But maybe, like Christmas, it is coming; and with an election not too far off we will probably see a shovel in the ground in the Toronto area. I believe they have picked the site. I know in the last estimates so much money was allowed for planning and architectural designs but just what has been accomplished we have not heard.

I now note that the hon. Minister has told us that there are going to be hospitals in Timmins and Sault Ste. Marie; I imagine it will be a Liberal administration that will see that those hospitals are completed because at the rate this administration proceeds with hospitals, it is pretty slow. They say, "Yes, we put them up in Palmerston and Owen Sound"—they completed hospitals just recently. I have at various times gone into the long history of how those announcements were milked, and milked, and milked again. I am afraid Toronto is suffering in the same respect, and Toronto is suffering from a lack of bed space, not only at the Toronto psychiatric hospital, but in many hospitals here in the city. It is the result of a lack of leadership, and a lack of assistance, from this government.

There was a report prepared in November of 1962 by a committee called the committee for the survey of hospital needs in Metropolitan Toronto. This committee consisted of such well-known people as Dr. Harvey Agnew, C. C. Calvin, Q.C., S. W. Martin, Ontario Hospital Association, Dr. W. W. Baldwin of the Ontario Medical Association, Dr. W. Harvey Cruickshank of the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, and Dr. J. B. Neilsen of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission—I believe that gentleman is the vice-chairman of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission. When one goes into the report of hospital accommodation and facilities for children in Metropolitan Toronto one finds that there is a tremendous need.

I would just like to mention a few of the hospitals concerned, and what the committee thought the Ontario government should do about the situation. For example, there is work going on at the Hospital for Sick Children here in Toronto. The Hospital for

Sick Children in Toronto is probably the best of its kind in the world but the demands on it are very great. The committee said, even about this hospital, even though it has been improved, that:

—the renovated and expanded facilities now under construction are urgently required.

However the volume of visits cannot continue to amount each year as in the recent past, without receiving some relief from other hospitals in the metropolitan areas to help meet the demands made on space and staff.

This committee went on later in its report, to recommend that there be a second sick children's hospital in the city of Toronto, and also that the general hospitals in Toronto should make some effort to supply bed space for children. But, this cannot be done without provincial assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize for the moment, that I am just speaking on the lack of bed space in Toronto for children. The hon. Minister mentioned about the work being done in the Thistletown Hospital for emotionally disturbed children; there is no doubt about it that this hospital is a step forward, but the government is moving, it seems to me, with little haste. I pointed out last year that they had, in this modern hospital, a laboratory but they were unable to find the personnel to man the laboratory. I inferred from the hon. Minister's remarks today that they have managed to obtain more of a staff, and I do hope that that laboratory is now in use. This I do not know, but I hope it is.

If not, Mr. Chairman, the government will still let another year go by without having the research laboratory used at Thistletown.

But, this committee says—that is the committee for the survey of hospital needs in Metropolitan Toronto—of the Thistletown Hospital:

—the demand for admissions is extremely high, and the waiting list is purposely kept at 18 only, in order not to have it become unrealistic. The superintendent is anxious to sponsor a day-care programme, in relation to the hospital rather than see the hospital enlarge in size. In fact it is generally agreed that the 64-bed figure is a maximum size for one such unit. Judging by the inquiries for admission, one would be warranted in stating that approximately 200 a year should be admitted to the hospital rather than 50.

Well, I notice that the hon. Minister, in his remarks, said it would be 50 a year; this

committee tells us that you need four times that much.

I could certainly agree with the policy of the superintendent, that these hospitals should not be too large; and if you do enlarge hospitals they should be kept into units of a relatively small size. So when we hear the hon. Minister saying he has cut his budget, he saved a few million dollars, it would seem to me that he has not been arguing hard enough with the Treasury board to keep that money and put it to good purpose, or else the Treasury board has been far too niggardly in helping this department.

There is a need for more assistance and for such hospitals as the hospital at Thistletown for the emotionally disturbed children. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is just one instance where the need is being ignored by the government.

This committee looked further into psychological medicine in the Hospital for Sick Children and they pointed out one further need, one further lack of hospital care here in Toronto. They say in their report on page 21, the following:

The clinic for psychological medicine—that is at the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto:

—operated by the hospital has so many demands made upon it for treatment that it has been necessary to place severe limitations on the waiting list. In 1961 a total of 1,605 visits were recorded, compared with 974 in 1960, and 1,171 in 1959. The volume of visits is more dependent upon the staff available for treatment than to the demand. The psychiatric staff feel that the demand is almost unlimited, but are aware of the fact that they can only give good treatment by limiting the numbers accepted in the services.

Here I feel, Mr. Chairman, that this is just one overall problem in the province of Ontario. It is centred in the city of Toronto because, as I will later point out to you, 20 per cent of the case load in such a hospital as the Sick Children's here in Toronto is from outside Metropolitan Toronto. The Sick Children's Hospital here in Toronto literally is serving all of the province; and it is to the province that that hospital, as well as many of the large hospitals in Toronto, the large teaching hospitals especially, are going to have to look.

The Toronto psychiatric hospital has been mentioned by me on a number of occasions, and this is the one that we hope is going to have a new building and it is going to have

larger facilities. But, this committee reports on the Toronto psychiatric hospital as follows:

Those patients referred from the clinic to in-patient facilities are often placed on the waiting list at Thistletown, but with very little prospect of admission. Most are referred to Ontario hospitals in Toronto, or to special residential treatment centres in London, Kingston, Ottawa, or elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister feels that, by putting up a new hospital in Toronto for a new Toronto psychiatric hospital, he will necessarily solve this problem, the report says as follows:

Neither the in-patient nor out-patient services for the treatment of children will be enlarged in any marked degree when the hospital moves to its new quarters. The in-patient facilities are meant for teaching purposes only, but the out-patient services provide a very large portion of the treatment facilities for the community of Metropolitan Toronto.

But this committee points out that the patients that arrive at the Toronto psychiatric hospital, and who should be sent to Thistletown, are put on a waiting list. I know the hon. Minister made some remark about the waiting list being small, but this committee says—and after all, the report was made in November of 1962: “those patients referred from the clinic”—that is at the Toronto psychiatric hospital—“to in-patient facilities are often placed on the waiting list at Thistletown, but with very little prospect of admission.”

I suggest to the hon. Minister that a lot has still to be done for disturbed children. The children, certainly in the city of Toronto, are not receiving the attention they should be receiving, and I do not think that it is not unknown to most people that if you are to give these children proper treatment, the time to reach them is at this age when they are young, when something can be done with them. But if they do not receive proper treatment at that age a lot of them will remain a public charge as long as they live.

I think it is just sound dollars and cents that something should be done immediately in order to reach this type of individual, and that is why I feel it is most unfortunate that the hon. Minister should come into the House today and virtually be proud of the fact that he has cut his budget. The department is not doing the job it should do. We certainly have to look for better results.

The hon. Minister also made reference to mental health clinics. These clinics are most

certainly needed, and I applaud what work has been done by the hon. Minister in this field. Yet in Toronto the mental health clinics have got a long way to go and they still need a lot of help. The survey of hospital needs covered the Toronto mental health unit here in the city; and this unit in doing work with children from 12 to 16 is having a great deal of difficulty in doing its job properly because the committee reported as follows:

One of the major problems with this group, that is the children about 12 to 16, is the almost complete lack of in-patient treatment facilities for those in the 12 to 16 age bracket. Although the volume in numbers requiring treatment is not great, there is nowhere they can be referred to except an Ontario hospital.

So the hon. Minister may recite some of the accomplishments of his mental health clinics but they are not good enough.

It is pretty obvious that when an experienced committee, such as this committee that I have mentioned, starts to examine the facilities closely they certainly find out that there is yet a very great deal to be done. The committee said that, of the patients seen at the Toronto mental health unit, approximately 50 per cent are from the city of Toronto, 25 per cent from the township of North York, and the remainder from varied residential locations. This, by the way, Mr. Chairman, points out the problem that the city of Toronto has in carrying a large burden of the welfare costs and the health costs in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

The health problem in the city of Toronto also arises in relation to the Metropolitan Toronto juvenile court. Many of the children coming before our courts here in Metro need psychiatric treatment, they need treatment in a medical way, and how well are they treated, Mr. Chairman? Well, I think this committee on close examination came up with the answer. They said this:

A judge makes the decision respecting what service is required for the child based on recommendations of the social service department. In some cases he refers the child to the clinic.

That is a clinic they have here for the treatment of children who need psychiatric help, for testing before a decision is made as to the type of punishment or treatment.

Very often a decision for treatment is made but it is impossible to follow through because of the lack of in-patient services for children and the long waiting lists for out-patient treatment at one of the clinics

or hospitals. In many cases the child is then referred to a training school elsewhere in the province or to an Ontario hospital.

So that once again we have emphasized the lack of proper facilities to look after emotionally disturbed children.

The report says as follows:

The lack of in-patient treatment services for emotionally disturbed children is considered to be a serious problem by our courts.

So that even having to do with criminal law, Mr. Chairman, we see that these children, if they are not serviced, if they are not helped at an early age, are going to remain a big charge on the people of this province or of the city in which they live.

The committee looking into the hospital needs of the city of Toronto also examined Ontario hospitals and they said this:

The mental health branch of The Department of Health of the province is aware of the need for more in-patient facilities in Metropolitan Toronto. Although there are no specific plans at the present time for further construction, a research centre has been set up in London, Ontario, to provide a diagnostic service for children over six years of age. This is a very active programme.

And then they go on and they compliment what has been done in London, but they say it is felt that this type of research and diagnostic centre will spread to other areas of the province before long.

I had hoped that the committee, in writing that, might have had some information that this department was to do more in the way of research than has been done in London, but I did not glean that from the remarks of the hon. Minister. I think it is to be regretted, because certainly the facilities for children are not provided in the city of Toronto in the quantity that is required.

The Ontario hospital in Orillia, this committee reports, is for mental defectives only, but it has become much larger than was intended. Because of the size, it is almost impossible to undertake proper treatment and services. I would like to say a bit more about Orillia shortly, but it is a fact that our hospitals, like Orillia, have become overcrowded. Despite all the claims that the government has made in improving the situation, they are still not providing the facilities that we should have.

Mr. Chairman, the report of this committee, as a result of having many interviews, had

this to say about what doctors thought of the situation for children, the bed space for children, in the city of Toronto:

In our meetings with individual doctors, including those specializing in children's diseases and the subcommittee of the Ontario Medical Association there was no disagreement concerning the need for additional children's beds.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand how a Minister, having certainly the knowledge he must have, the personal acquaintances he must have, the opportunity he has to learn what is needed in the city of Toronto, can really come into this House and announce that he has cut his budget by some \$7 million and yet nothing is done in this regard.

I would just like to read to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, two or three of the recommendations made by this committee, and perhaps the hon. Minister might take it to heart and see to it that something could be done in the immediate future. One of the committee's recommendations was this:

It is recommended that since Metropolitan Toronto had a requirement in 1961 of 1,400 hospital beds for the use of children under the age of 15, the Ontario Hospital Services Commission be urged to support expansion programmes and encourage such beds to be built to the total of 1,700 hospital beds for children by 1970 and to a total of 2,000 such beds for the planning year of 1980.

The reason why the figures of 1,700 and 2,000 are mentioned, Mr. Chairman, is that the committee went into some detail as to what the needs of Toronto would be over the years. I do not wish to take the time of the House to discuss how they arrived at those figures, but their arguments certainly seem to be reasonable.

This committee further recommended for the benefit of the provincial government the following:

It is recommended that the mental health division of The Department of Health of the province be strongly urged to have a thorough survey of the requirements for in-patient and out-patient services for treatment of mentally ill children in Metropolitan Toronto and for the entire province. It is further suggested that such a survey, including evaluation of the numbers and types of personnel required and staff for diagnostic and treatment facilities, be recommended within the report.

Lastly, I have one recommendation to read from this report, and it is this:

It is strongly recommended that active encouragement be given by the Ontario Hospital Services Commission, by The Department of Health of the provincial government, and by the municipal authorities to the establishment of additional mental health clinics and out-patient centres for the treatment of mental illness for children in Metropolitan Toronto. The programme of grants to trained professional personnel in these fields should be continued and expanded.

I think that the record of this province has been a most niggardly one in trying to expand these services, and in obtaining the necessary personnel. For the knowledge that is available today we have been awfully slow in making progress.

Often the argument is used: "Well, the Liberals should have done something 20 years ago, back in the years when they were in power in 1934 to '43, but especially during the second world war" and since that time tremendous advances have been made in the research of illness of all kinds, and in particular of mental illness, that have been available to this administration that have never been available before. The government has not used the proper initiative that it should have over the past 15 years, especially.

Before leaving the problem of hospitals in Toronto, I would like to emphasize that there is not only a shortage of facilities for children in Metropolitan Toronto, but there is a shortage of hospital beds for adults as well. A lot of this shortage is a result of a lack of assistance from the government of this province. A group known as the Bureau of Municipal Research, which publishes a bulletin called *Civic Affairs*, in the fall of 1962 went into some considerable research as to the problem of financing hospitals in Metropolitan Toronto, and they said this in part:

The policy of the metropolitan council is based on the view subscribed to by many municipal representatives and associations in Ontario, that hospitals are a social service, and as such should be a provincial responsibility.

By refusing to make capital grants the Metro council hoped that the province would be forced to assume a greater share of hospital construction costs. The existence of several teaching and regional hospitals within the metropolitan area strengthened this stand, since the cost of facilities for educational purposes and care

of non-residents represents an inequitable charge if borne entirely by the taxpayers of Metro.

In its research, this group found out—as I have mentioned earlier—that 20 per cent of the people using Toronto hospitals, not only the hospital for sick children, but Toronto hospitals, come from outside the Metro area. Further, the centre of medical teaching is in Toronto, and the teaching hospitals contain a number of facilities not normally provided in general hospitals—class rooms, and interns' residences—the cost of this being borne largely by Metropolitan Toronto.

This, I feel, justifies why more assistance should be given to the support of hospitals in the city of Toronto. For example, one I have on hand, is the Toronto Western Hospital. When this hospital sought new capital funds recently they received about \$4.3 million from governments, a little better than half of that from the province, and they had to raise approximately another \$4 million from private sources, over half of which came from business and industry. The general public supplied a relatively small amount.

So today our hospitals are financed by government, by business and by industry; and the private funds that used to be forthcoming from individuals have not been as generous as is required. So the province of Ontario is going to find that it is necessary to assist the hospitals in large municipalities. I believe the situation holds true for such areas as the city of Hamilton.

Here in Toronto, not only is there a shortage of the hospital bed space for general hospitals, but we also have a shortage of bed space for the chronically ill. The bureau of municipal research reported that the shortage of chronic and convalescent beds in Metro in 1960—the last year for which complete figures are available—was 375. This has led to a less efficient use of hospital resources than is desirable.

It is generally conceded that many of the patients for whom these beds are needed are now occupying active treatment beds. The building cost of an active treatment bed runs from \$15,000 to \$20,000, while convalescent beds run from \$10,000 to \$12,000. Active treatment bed maintenance averages \$15.15 per day, as opposed to \$8.84 per day for chronic and convalescent beds. So that I think what we should do is to have the government make more funds available, not only for general hospitals, but as a matter of good economics the government should see to it that convalescent hospitals receive more government support and are put to better

use. In the long run you will save government funds.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister referred to how well they were doing in the problem of finding hospital space for retarded children; and to the different buildings that were going up in Orillia. I have known occasions when different individuals have phoned me saying they have a retarded child and they have been trying to get the child into a hospital for retarded children—usually they wanted Orillia.

I must say that the hon. Minister has been most co-operative; I have never been turned down whenever I have sought help for any family. But I think the tragedy in this province is that it is necessary for parents who have a retarded child to come to an MPP in order to get any action.

The last instance I had, the people had been waiting two years. I was told of another case where the people did not even apply because they were told they would have to wait for two years in order to get the child into the hospital.

The last time I made application, the hon. Minister was kind enough to help me, and the child went to Orillia. When the experts there saw the child they were able to assist it with the use of drugs and that child is back home today. If the opportunity had not been there for the child to get that help, it would still have been more or less a living bundle of arms and legs.

Something can be done for many of these children, if they are given assistance. The unfortunate part about it is, that there must be many cases in the province of Ontario where there is not the knowledge of where to go, or who to seek out—thus many suffer unnecessarily. I feel we still have got a very very long way to go.

In March of 1960, the Ontario Association for Retarded Children presented a brief to this province; to the then Prime Minister—at that time the Hon. Leslie M. Frost. They complained about the terrible facilities at Orillia, of the lack of facilities at that time. This was in March of 1960. They said when they referred to the board, that is the board of their Ontario association for retarded children, said this:

The board was convinced that the situation at Orillia has become so critical that the health and lives of patients are constantly threatened by an outbreak of contagious disease or fire.

Well now, that situation has been relieved by the building of the hospital at Cedar Springs.

The government has torn down some of the old buildings at Orillia and is presently replacing them with new ones. But they are still not beginning to meet the pressing situation that exists for these children who are in our hospitals. In fact, in that report, in their introduction, they said this:

We are pleased that during the past year—

that was about the beginning of 1959:

—the past year or so some concrete action has been taken to help alleviate this situation.

There they mean the crowded situation in the hospitals for retarded children.

With the actual start of construction at Cedar Springs, and the development of the research clinic at London, the transfer of some 300 adult retarded from the hospital school at Orillia in an effort to relieve to some extent the overcrowded condition there, is also evidence that The Department of Health is not unaware of the existing situation and is attempting to rectify it. This, however, is only a token effort to meet a problem that urgently needs positive and direct action by the government as a whole. It seems that the department is using the facilities placed at its disposal to the best of its ability.

Well, I give the government full credit for that. But I still say, as this brief says, that what the government has done is only a token effort.

This problem has been discussed before in this House, but since that time little or nothing has been done. The words still hold true that in relation to the problem it is only a token effort. It is once again what I have said: they do a little here, they do a little there, something for the problem, but they do not go to the heart of the matter.

The figures that were given to us in 1960 after three years still essentially hold true. For example, they said, this from the report of the Ontario association for retarded children—they said that:

—all the hospitals, Orillia, Smiths Falls and Aurora, all report serious over-crowding varying from 20 per cent to 33 per cent. There is no doubt but that Orillia continues to remain in the highest of these brackets. Waiting lists were recently reported at Orillia with 1,500 and Smiths Falls with 700.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the hon. Minister remark that there were no waiting lists. Now

I do not know just exactly what he meant when he said there were no waiting lists, because when I read what was happening in Toronto hospitals, be they waiting lists for in-patient clinics, out-patient clinics or hospital bed space, there were waiting lists. Any information I have had about retarded children, people are still told you have to wait two years. I do not think the situation has changed. I cannot understand the remarks of the hon. Minister that there are no waiting lists, unless they say, as in the hospital at Thistletown, they keep the waiting list at 18 so it will not be unrealistic, but the committee reported that they really needed space for 200 instead of 50.

So I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that there are waiting lists and there are long waiting lists. The figures that I have quoted of a waiting list of 1,500 for Orillia and 700 for Smiths Falls may be less than they were as a result of Cedar Springs, but I would say that essentially the figures are correct, because you must take into consideration the growth of our population. About two per cent of all children born, and that is the minimum figure, two per cent of all children born are born retarded. Ten per cent of those retarded children will require hospital care as long as they live, so we must make allowance for these children.

Now what held true in 1960 is still the situation, I believe, today. In consideration of Orillia alone there is an overpopulation of something like 1,000, and an active waiting list of 1,500. Simple figures indicate that the new 1,200 bed construction at Cedar Springs will actually take care of less than half the present known need at Orillia and will really do nothing to relieve the present overcrowded condition of other hospital schools, let alone do anything toward providing for the future.

The report of the survey of hospital needs at Metropolitan Toronto as late as November of 1962 seems to bear out that remark I quoted:

They said that the hospital in Orillia was very crowded and it was really in essence not being used as a hospital school.

Mr. Chairman, the Ontario Association for Retarded Children often argue, and continuously argue, that it is not so much the bed for the mentally retarded that is needed in many cases, but it is the opportunity to live a relatively full day of work, play and social and recreational activities. The government has done something in this regard, but I do not think it has really got its teeth into the problem. I think a government has to

take the long-term view of these problems. When it comes to providing hospital space for retarded children we certainly here in this province have been lying down on the job.

I read from page six of the report of the Ontario Association for Retarded Children, the report dated March, 1960, and they say this:

Assuming that the total population of Ontario at the end of 1959 was 6,040,000, 10 per cent of this population is 14,080. Totalling the population of Orillia, Smith Falls and Aurora at 5,400, the number known to be on active waiting lists of 2,200, plus an approximate 4,215 adult retarded who are present in Ontario hospitals, is a minimum of 11,815 requiring hospital care. When compared with the previously estimated demand of 12,080, it would seem that the method of estimation is reasonably correct. This demand will increase each year and in 1975 beds for at least 17,600 will be required, even then assuming that several new hospital schools are erected and wings added to existing schools demand and facilities will not balance.

Now, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, this matter has been brought to the attention of the government before and I fear it is going to have to be brought to its attention again and again, because it has not been taking the necessary action that should be required.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I have one item that I want to speak on. I think I have at least once or twice in every sitting of this Legislature attempted to emphasize the need for more assistance in mental health. I know that the government does something, like all these things it does something, but it does not do nearly enough. The greatest single social problem facing Canada and facing the province of Ontario today is mental health, or possibly the lack of it. As the hon. Minister of Health knows, about half of our hospital population consists of mental patients. This is a problem on which we must take far greater action than we have done in the past.

When the Royal commission on health was sitting in Ottawa, the Canadian Mental Health Association presented a brief and it made certain recommendations and they were these:

First, more money for programmes of public information and education. This government, I believe, two years ago prepared a movie called "One on Every Street" having to do with a retarded child and it

was an excellent movie. But since that burst of energy it has sort of faded back and it is hard to find very much interest taken in this field since that movie was prepared.

Second, the CMHA recommended that we integrate mental health services with the physical and personnel resources of the rest of medicine. Now this is one item in which I can agree with the former hon. Prime Minister when he was in Ottawa arguing that mental hospitals should be integrated with the other hospitals.

The member of Victoria (Hon. Mr. Frost) was talking then about the finances. The federal government argued that the provincial government already paid for mental hospitals, therefore the province should not receive any help from the federal government. I believe that the hon. member when he was arguing financially was correct at that time, and I feel that from a medical point of view that mental hospitals should be a part of the entire system, our entire health and hospital system. I do hope that we in this province can improve along that line.

For example, if every hospital, every general hospital here in Ontario were to have a psychiatric branch or to have a few beds available for mental patients, we would go far to integrate our mental hospitals with our general hospitals and our normal health services.

Then a third recommendation was psychiatric treatment services should be established on a regional and decentralized basis. Well, I believe that the government has done something in this field; its mental health clinics are along this line; but at the same time it has been slow in proceeding. An accelerated programme should be inaugurated to encourage young people to enter mental health careers. I feel that if the government used its facilities for bursaries more than it has in the past, or if some of this "\$7 million less than last year" that the hon. Minister bragged about was used in this direction, it would be of far more use.

Finally, CMHA said the amount for research needs to be increased by 10 to 20 per cent annually. Certainly in this direction the government has been far behind this requirement. We have had in Ontario the founding of the Mental Health Foundation, but it is most difficult to get any information from the hon. Minister on that foundation or just what it is doing. We hope that it is doing something; but I hope it is not like one of these committees whose report gets filed away, like the committee on air pollution.

The hon. Minister had a report on that and we have heard very, very little from that end of his department; I do hope that the mental health foundation is not allowed to become mired in a field of indecision. It is about time that we had more activity, and more assistance for research so that if the department here follows the recommendations of CMHA they can possibly look forward to an increase of 20 per cent in research next year.

The CMHA, when appearing before the Royal commission on health services, also recommended an overhaul of provincial laws dealing with the procedure by which the mentally ill are committed to institutions. There was some effort to improve our laws in Ontario last year, but it still happens in the province of Ontario where those who are mentally ill are sent to our jails instead of to our hospitals. And we should amend The Immigration Act and certain words in the Criminal Code and The Penitentiary Act in order to bring up to date the interpretation concerning mentally disordered persons.

I realize that this is a federal matter but it still is something that could be taken under consideration by our own provincial government in the form of a recommendation to the federal government that something can be done in this matter. I have had cases where people, who are new Canadians and do not have their citizenship papers, have voluntarily gone to a mental hospital, received treatment maybe for a few months, and been released; but because they received treatment at a mental hospital they have been refused their citizenship at the end of their five-year stay in Canada and have had to wait a second term of five years. In other words, instead of getting their citizenship at the end of five years they have had to go ten years, because for a period of time they were in a mental hospital. This, I think, should be corrected and although it is, as I say, a federal matter, the province could use what influence it has.

Then, too, I think—yes?—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt? The hon. member can continue his remarks when we go back into these estimates.

Mr. Trotter: Fine.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at 2 o'clock we will go on with the estimates of The Department of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Third report, standing committee on standing orders, Mr. J. F. Edwards	1143
Municipal clerks and finance officers association of Ontario, bill respecting, Mr. Singer, first reading	1143
Town of Burlington, bill respecting, Mr. W. E. Johnston, first reading	1143
Public school board of S.S. No. 1 of the unorganized township of Leduc, bill respecting, Mr. Noden, first reading	1143
Belleville General Hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Sandercock, first reading	1143
McMaster University, bill respecting, Mr. Innes, first reading	1143
Canadian National Exhibition, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading	1144
St. Catharines General Hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading	1144
County of Lincoln, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading	1144
Statement re natural-born and foreign-born Canadians in relation to crime, Mr. Yaremko	1144
Statement re government policy in regard to Ontario Agricultural College, Ontario Veterinary College and Macdonald Institute, Mr. Robarts	1146
City of London, bill respecting, Mr. White, first reading	1149
Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Stewart	1149
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1184

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1963

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery students from Ridgewood Public School, Malton.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth), from the standing committee on standing orders, presented the committee's third report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Of the St. Catharines general hospital praying that an Act may pass authorizing its board of governors to prescribe the term of office and manner of appointment of its members and extending its powers of investment.

Of the corporation of the county of Lincoln praying that an Act may pass validating the 1962 valuations made by the assessment commission.

Of the Municipal Clerks and Financial Officers Association of Ontario praying that an Act may pass authorizing and restricting the use of the initials DMFA signifying "Diploma in Municipal Finance and Administration."

For an Act to reconstitute the Belleville general hospital and to provide for its administration by a board of governors, etc.

Of the corporation of McMaster University praying that an Act may pass extending its powers and increasing the membership of its board of governors and the number of its vice-presidents.

Of the corporation of the town of Burlington praying that an Act may pass applying certain provisions of The Game and Fisheries Act to the town as if it were a township; and for other purposes.

Of the public school board S.S. No. 1, Leduc township, Thunder Bay, praying that an Act may pass authorizing debentures for school construction and equipment.

Of the corporation of the city of London praying that an Act may pass empowering it to grant to any local board the right to fence and use portions of highways abutting on lands used and occupied for the purposes of such board.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting The Municipal Clerks and Finance Officers Association of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF BURLINGTON

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton), in the absence of **Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George),** moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Burlington.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LEDUC SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. W. G. Noden (Rainy River) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the public school board of S.S. No. 1 of the unorganized township of Leduc.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BELLEVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. E. Sandercock (Hastings West) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Belleville General Hospital.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford), in the absence of **Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth),** moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting McMaster University.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Canadian National Exhibition.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ST. CATHARINES GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. Cowling, in the absence of Mr. C. Daley (Lincoln), moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting The St. Catharines General Hospital.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

COUNTY OF LINCOLN

Mr. Cowling, in the absence of Mr. Daley, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting The County of Lincoln.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Well, Mr. Speaker, surely we do not have to be jumping-jacks here, and the man who talks first has the first opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: I would point out to the member that I noticed the Provincial Secretary rise first.

An hon. member: Your eyes are always over there.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, certainly everybody knows we are playing a game here.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We do not play games; don't you play? Mr. Speaker, if the hon. leader of the Opposition would stop his babyish comments, I should like to make reference to certain remarks reported in the morning newspaper and attributed to Mr. M. J. Boylen, following a robbery at his home: In this connection, it is more than likely that the culprits will be apprehended and tried by our courts of law, whoever they may be.

Now as to his remarks, it can be understood that as a result of a grievous loss and injury done to his son, which could have been serious, perhaps his language was affected by his emotion. I cannot say that the exact words attributed to him were uttered, but I should like to make some comment in respect to the words as they were

published. Mr. Speaker, they constitute a reprehensible slander and utter nonsense.

One of the most dangerous utterances that one can permit himself is that of generalities. The statement is attributed to him that: Foreign elements are responsible for 90 per cent of Canada's crime. These statements are not borne out by an examination of the facts and study of the statistics which are available.

I do not know the source of his statistics. Certainly the papers have long ceased, and for this I commend them, to categorize any particular crime as having been committed by an immigrant for it has been learned that there is seldom any relationship between the commitment of a crime and the fact that a person is an immigrant.

Neither the metropolitan police nor The Attorney-General's Department, sir, keep crime statistics on an origin of birth basis. I believe this is quite in keeping with our general philosophy of judging men, not on where they come from but solely on what they are and do. However, there is no doubt in my mind that were the records to be examined the statement made would be conclusively refuted. Information provided for me by The Department of Reform Institutions, the latest report of which was tabled in this House by myself on December 12, 1962, do have some salient statistics. Table 2, referring to the "Population in Ontario reformatories, industrial farms and training centres" is as follows. The table is by nationalities:

Canadian-born: 7,999

Others: 1,021

The deputy Minister has provided me with statistics relevant to the nationalities of prisoners committed to jails in the province of Ontario for each of the following years:

Fiscal year, April 1, 1958 to March 31, 1959:

Canadian-born—49,594

Born other countries—and that is inclusive of the United States and all other places—7,011

April 1, 1959 to March 31, 1960:

Canadian-born—50,327

Born other countries—6,758

April 1, 1960 to March 31, 1961:

Canadian-born—54,220

Born other countries—7,484

The most recent figures published, Mr. Speaker, April 1, 1961, to March 31, 1962:

Canadian-born—54,918—an increase of 700.

Born other countries—7,218—a decrease of 200.

Mr. Speaker, comparisons are always odious, but these statements are made in order to set the record straight.

A further remark was made that: "The immigration that started in 1955 was 90 per cent riff-raff."

Mr. Speaker, I have come into contact officially and on a personal basis in the past eight years, indeed during the course of my lifetime, with many tens of thousands of people who have come to these shores. This has been my good fortune to a degree greater than probably any other man in public life and I can say that Canada has been blessed in the high quality of persons who have chosen this country for their new homeland, who have chosen this land to raise their children in, and who have chosen to make this country's destiny, their destiny.

As to the opinion that it is time "they stop these old-age benefits, etc." the fact is that the recipients thereof are entitled to them in accordance with the law of the land. I remind him, Mr. Speaker, that although the receipt of certain types of assistance is dependent upon a period of residence, sometimes of many years' duration, that the payment of taxation begins immediately and, of course, the monies in respect of benefits are made available from taxation.

The integration of people into a community is dependent upon many factors, the most important of which is the feeling of having been accepted within the community. An irresponsible outburst such as this, rarer though it is becoming as the years go by, and although it could be shrugged off as an emotional blurting forth under circumstances of stress, must be nailed down for it cannot but build up a resentment in the minds of many people and so do grievous harm.

More harm has been done in the three dozen lines of print that I saw this morning than he can repair in his lifetime. He could begin by the issuance of an unequivocal personal public statement of apology.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass). I might say, sir, that I was on my feet for approximately a minute before the others.

My question is that in view of the widespread publicity given statements by Mr. M. J. Boylen that immigrants are responsible for 90 per cent of the crime in Canada, will the hon. Attorney-General please refute this slander by putting the facts before this House.

I think, sir, that the hon. Minister of

Citizenship (Mr. Yaremko) has answered that, and if in any way my question had promoted it, I know that on all sides we deplore that kind of statement.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I will say that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Citizenship, has given what I think, and the hon. member for Dovercourt has said, a very good reply to the question now being directed to me.

However, I do have some further figures which may be of interest to the House and to the hon. member for Dovercourt particularly. That is, that I have been furnished by the chief of the judicial branch of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics with the figures for the year 1960, which is the last date that such figures are available. I am advised by the chief of this branch of the DBS that the country of origin is not required for reasons which the hon. Minister of Citizenship here has stated. But they do keep track of all those who have been convicted of indictable offences in Canada by their birthplace, either within or without Canada.

The figures which I have been given, and which I would like to give to the House now, as I say, are for the year 1960 and refer only to indictable offences. So in that year the number of persons convicted in Canada of indictable offences was 35,443, and of that 35,443 so convicted there were 31,468 or 88.8 per cent born in Canada, leaving approximately 11.2 per cent born out of Canada. In Ontario for the same year, the appropriate figures are as follows: The number of persons convicted in 1960 for indictable offences, 13,482 people and of that number those who were born in Canada amounted to 11,384 people, so that in Ontario for that same year 84.44 per cent were born in Canada, and 15.56 per cent were persons born out of Canada.

I think these figures, Mr. Speaker, amply answer the question of the hon. member and amply refute the quotation which has been the subject of this particular discussion.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Attorney-General, or whoever the appropriate hon. Minister is, a supplementary question? In view of the obvious racial prejudice of which this statement was born, is the government considering action under the Human Rights Code?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Well, Mr. Speaker, the commission which administers our Human Rights Code and Act does not fall under my

department. It reports directly to another Minister of the Crown, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree), and no action is taken in my department, sir, without first having these matters referred to this commission and the recommendation of that commission and of the responsible Minister being made to my department. If such an inquiry should be made and any recommendation be made to me, I can assure the hon. member that it will receive the very best and promptest of attention.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask the hon. Minister of Labour, under whose department this comes, whether some action is being considered?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the statement that was made, at least my knowledge of it, through the press. I have not given any consideration to any charge against this man. I think the facts speak for themselves. It is a statement made in a situation which I would think that the man himself regrets having said, if, in fact, he did so make the statement. But I have not given any consideration to a charge in these circumstances.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General would accept a supplementary question? I was wondering if he was aware that his figures of 88.8 per cent of native-born Canadians being in difficulty with the law, that is of the 88 per cent who are convicted, are behind the times? It is now 92.2 per cent of those convicted who were born in Canada, and my source for that is page 34 of the annual report of the commission on penitentiaries. I do not think that the hon. Attorney-General is aware that whatever his source is it is behind the times. The so-called immigrants to Canada actually have been improving in that less and less do they seem to get into trouble with the authorities. I think that should be borne in mind.

I was wondering also if the hon. Attorney-General was aware that the last time this hue and cry that 90 per cent of the crime was committed by immigrants was started by this government when the assistant Attorney-General, Mr. Magone, said that 90 per cent of the crime was caused by immigrants?

Hon. Mr. Cass: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the question be put to me so that I may understand it?

Mr. Trotter: All right. I was wondering if the hon. Attorney-General was aware that

the last time this hue and cry about immigrants being responsible for 90 per cent of the crime in Ontario, was caused by the hon. Attorney-General's department when the deputy Attorney-General, Mr. Magone, made the same accusation? Is he aware of that?

He does not answer.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Before the orders of the day, I would like to make a statement concerning government policy in regard to the Ontario Agricultural College, the Ontario Veterinary College and Macdonald Institute in Guelph.

In the near future I intend to make a comprehensive statement concerning the university system of our province in general but in view of the fact that the estimates of The Department of Agriculture are to be considered this afternoon, I felt that this was a proper time for me to inform the House of the policy of the government in connection with these institutions.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that last year certain legislation was introduced which had the purpose of strengthening greatly the research facilities of the colleges at Guelph. At that time I pointed out that these institutions were basically developed for the benefit of the agricultural community of the province, and I pointed out that under their organization they did not fit the pattern of our general university development in the province.

The legislation introduced last year served the purpose of separating and strengthening the educational and research functions of the three institutions. I also said at that time, Mr. Speaker, that as far as granting university status to these three colleges it would require a great deal of thought and the bills introduced last year were the first steps in the possible development of a university embodying the three institutions. I am happy to say today that this has been given a great deal of consideration through the intervening year, and it is my intention to refer the whole matter to the advisory committee on university affairs immediately, with a view to developing a university around the three institutions I have mentioned.

I want to make it very clear that the historic and very necessary function of the Ontario Veterinary College, the Ontario Agricultural College and Macdonald Institute will be in no way impaired by this development but will, in my plans be strengthened.

These institutions exist for the benefit of the agricultural community of the province.

Their contributions over the years to the agricultural industry and to the rural communities of the province have been enormous and must be continued. On the other hand, we are faced with an unprecedented demand for university accommodation in the province. I am of the opinion that we can create additional facilities to provide university education for young people in the province, making use of the physical assets of the plant that we have in Guelph, and sharing the excellent facilities which have been developed in these three institutions over the years.

It would be our intent to establish a citizens' committee to develop a university here in the same way that we have developed our other universities throughout the province. Ontario Agricultural College, Ontario Veterinary College and Macdonald Institute would be an integral part of the new university and the plan would be to develop additional facilities to handle young people in areas outside the field of agriculture. It is obvious that many of the facilities for teaching basic sciences and the arts could be used jointly by students in both agriculturally inclined and academically inclined courses of study.

This is in broad outline what we propose to do and we will proceed immediately to establish the citizens' committee which I have mentioned. I will ask the advisory committee on university affairs to conduct the necessary studies and advise the government concerning the actual mechanics of achieving the objectives which I have outlined here. Our intention, Mr. Speaker, is to establish a full university and to have as an integral part of that university the Ontario Agricultural College, the Ontario Veterinary College and Macdonald Institute, in order that we may service our agricultural communities by way of education and research as we have in the past.

I am firmly convinced that we will be able to fill every seat that we are able to provide in these facilities for the army of young people who will be knocking at our university doors in the years ahead. I would hope that in five or six years we could look forward to from 5,000 to 6,000 young people attending the university in Guelph. The pressure on our universities is so great that we must avail ourselves of every available opportunity and facility we have in the province to provide the education that our young people not only will want but must have, if we are to preserve our position in Canada and in the world. I think that these steps will help us achieve this goal.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, as I think is your custom, I hope you will permit me to take but a moment of your time and in that brief time I would commend the hon. Prime Minister and the government for moving in this direction. I regret that this is still in an advisory and study stage. We in this House have advocated this move for a long period of time. I think that had this been done earlier, the unfortunate situation where many students had to be turned away this past September would have been overcome. We will look forward to the speedy implementation of what is a commendable statement, and I only hope that the government will move with a dispatch that has not been wholly characteristic of it in the past.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time of the House to add my words of commendation. I have a question. The hon. Provincial Secretary used the word "babyish" a few moments ago, and I think it has wider application than he realized at the time.

Mr. Speaker, the supplementary question I wanted to ask the hon. Prime Minister was this: Would it be correct to assume that this new university that is envisaged would be operated under an independent board of governors?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes, there are many details to be worked out as I pointed out in the statement. We started this procedure a year ago and the steps we took then permitted us to separate the functions of research and education at that time. I would envisage now a university under an independent board of governors supported by graduates and people in the community and other sections of our society interested in universities. But we will preserve the autonomy of the agricultural college, veterinary college and Macdonald Institute, because we think that The Department of Agriculture here has a very deep interest in what they do in their very specialized field. What in fact we are going to do is use these facilities for two purposes.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a few questions I would like to address to the hon. Minister of Labour, a copy of which I have sent to him. Today's newspapers carry a story of a worker who had to be rushed to Buffalo suffering from the bends because no decompression chamber was available in Toronto. My question to the hon. Minister is, will the Minister explain to the House how his department's inspecting staff would permit a job of this nature being conducted when no

decompression chambers are available for the protection of the workers involved?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, the question directed to me is based on a news item in one of today's papers. The fact of the alleged incident is being presently investigated and as soon as I have these facts before me I will be in a position to make a complete answer.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might put a supplementary question to the hon. Minister which he might consider when his report comes in. I wonder if he would give consideration to having established, through the initiative of the Workmen's Compensation Board or some other agency, a central decompression chamber for an area as big as Metro—because I think I can envisage smaller jobs not having this kind of facility—and a central one would meet the needs of the whole area.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to take that suggestion under advisement.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), a copy of which he has already received. Has the second report on the extension of universities prepared by the presidents of universities been received by the government? If so, when will this be available to the Legislature? Because of the precedent of establishing an off-campus liberal arts college in Scarborough—liberal in the broader sense—is it the policy of the government to encourage such off-campus colleges rather than to establish further universities?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for notice of the question. Over a year ago the department of educational research at the Ontario College of Education at the request of my department undertook further studies of prospective student enrolments in the universities in the years ahead. These were made available to the advisory committee on university affairs. The advisory committee then called together the committee of presidents of provincially assisted universities and discussed the Ontario College of Education's studies with them. At the request of the advisory committee, the presidents prepared a working paper entitled "Post Secondary Education in Ontario, 1962-1970" which was a report of the presidents of the universities of Ontario to the advisory committee on university affairs, May, 1962.

Recently the presidents undertook some amendments to the original working paper. I am advised that the amended report has just been submitted to the advisory committee on university affairs.

Part B: While it is my understanding that the report was prepared primarily for the advisory committee I shall be pleased to see that copies are made of it and made available to the hon. members of the Legislature.

Part C: In the development of new institutions of higher learning, several patterns have been followed to meet the particular circumstances in the different areas. For example, I think it is quite obvious that the limitations of geography make it impossible for an institution such as the Lakehead College to be an off-campus development of an older institution. On the other hand, the proximity of the University of Toronto to the proposed liberal arts college in Scarborough makes it possible for the new college to receive considerable help and guidance from the older, well-established institution.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day; I was asked a question some short time ago by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy), and the question was in five parts. It was: is the Ontario Northern Railway Commission conducting, or have they conducted, research into the feasibility of conducting an additional railway line from the present terminal in North Bay to a point on Georgian Bay?

The answer to the question is that studies were made a number of years ago, and new studies are now under way, but are not yet complete, and, therefore, are not conclusive. The inference from the studies which have proceeded to date suggest that the cost of such a line would be in the neighbourhood of \$25 million to \$30 million and it would seem to suggest that the new line would become economically feasible only if there was such a movement of a bulk commodity of approximately 4,800,000 tons a year or about four times the tonnage from the Adams mine. There is no such bulk movement at the moment in sight.

The second part of the question was: if the answer is in the affirmative, will the report of this survey be presented to the Legislature this session?

The answer is, likely not, as the survey is continuing at the moment.

Three, what is the cost per mile of the new spur line that is being built to service the Adams mine?

The answer is, while this has not yet been finalized the railway engineers estimate the cost at \$.25 million per mile, including track.

The fourth question asked by the hon. gentleman, is as follows: Is the Minister prepared yet to announce to this House that the commission of the Ontario Northland Railway has been recognized?

The commission includes the entire railway and also the road transportation and, therefore, I advise the hon. gentleman, the commission's real organization is not yet complete.

If he has in mind the personnel of the commission itself in terms of those who are called commissioners, that is not yet complete either.

Since the Legislature convened, in April 1962, Lieutenant-Colonel S. E. Reynolds, the previous chairman, has died, and now the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. A. Johnston) has been appointed as acting chairman. Mr. J. A. Kennedy of North Bay and Mr. Roy Thompson of Kirkland Lake have been added to the commission, and Mr. R. R. Aubeat and Mr. R. Potter, commissioners, have retired. The remaining commissioners are Mr. J. A. Fullerton, MPP for Thessalon (Algoma-Manitoulin), and Mr. R. Brunelle, MPP for Cochrane North.

The fifth question was: if the reorganization has been completed, would he name the personnel including the name of the permanent chairman, and I have answered that with the fourth question.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): No permanent chairman?

Mr. Speaker: With the permission of the members I would like to revert to private bills in order to introduce a bill at this time.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. D. H. Morrow in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman: On vote 101:

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, in rising today to take

part in the procedure of the estimates of The Department of Agriculture for the second time during my brief ministry in this department, I want first of all to express my own personal appreciation to my deputy Ministers and to the members of The Department of Agriculture, the assistant deputy Ministers' branch, directors, and all of the civil service connected with The Department of Agriculture right across the province of Ontario.

If I may say so, sir, it is to the everlasting credit of my predecessors in office and in particular the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Goodfellow) for having gotten around him a staff of people who are dedicated to the agricultural industry in the province of Ontario and who have spared no effort in its stabilization and its promotion through every facet.

I believe it is customary at a time like this for one to say a word about the general farming conditions in the province of Ontario during the year that has just gone past and to say in retrospect that the all-time high for gross income was achieved in agriculture in the province of Ontario for 1962, of something exceeding \$1.25 billion. 1962 was a year in some areas of the province where severe drought was experienced. In other areas of the province we had exceedingly good crops. Certain varieties turned out better than others, and certain types of field grain yielded much more last year than they ordinarily might have. Generally speaking, it was a good crop year in the province.

At the beginning of 1962 we recommended to the farmers of the province of Ontario that feed grain production should be increased in the province. We suggested that a 20 per cent increase should take place. The farmers of Ontario reacted to this suggestion because they believed, first of all, that there was a necessity to produce feed grain for themselves, so they would not have to buy this grain from other areas of Canada or from other areas in Ontario. They increased feed grain production last year by at least 10 per cent.

In 1961, our feed grain production in Ontario equalled 164,212,000 bushels; in 1962 this figure went up to 180,500,000 bushels of grain. The five-year average from 1956 to 1960 inclusive was 161,482,000 bushels. And so we can see that agriculture in the province of Ontario, as far as feed grain production is concerned, is moving ahead.

I should think that it is in the best interests of Ontario's farmers to continue this trend, to increase feed grain production. Certainly the demands that are being made

upon our livestock feeders to meet the growing demand for meat products and for livestock products in this province indicate that there will be increasing emphasis placed upon the availability of feed grain supplies. So it would seem that with the current situation being what it is, we should continue to emphasize the production of feed grain in this province. There are many ways in which it can be done. Our agricultural representatives and our soil and crop specialists will be providing some of the answers for the information of farmers as the year progresses.

Relating to prices in the province of Ontario, hog prices held up exceedingly well. A very high average, indeed four cents above 1961, and five cents above the last five-year average for Ontario hog prices.

Cattle prices were exceedingly good. We had the second highest average price for cattle ever paid at the Toronto stockyards, only exceeded by the year 1951, when cattle for a two-month period averaged \$33.69 a hundredweight. In 1962, during the months of September and October, good slaughter steers at the Toronto yards averaged \$28.50 a hundredweight, the second highest on record. In 1950 it was a close third. The average then was just under \$28 a hundredweight for the same period.

Since that time increased western feeding of heavy cattle and the increased feeding of heavy cattle in the United States, with the added poundage that always comes from these heavy cattle when they are marketed, has tended to depress our cattle markets in Ontario. How long this will last, no one knows, but it is safe to assume that the long-term look at the beef industry in this province is safe and it would appear to be relatively sound.

We must recognize the fact that our population in this country is growing at an exceedingly rapid rate and this refers to all North America. Our disappearance of all red meats is increasing at about two per cent per year with the population. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you will recognize the importance of the livestock industry in this province to the farmers of this province when we suggest that well over 70 per cent of the income of Ontario farmers is derived from livestock and from livestock products.

We also have another exceedingly valuable industry in this province in the fruit and vegetable industry. It is estimated, as closely as can be determined by the fruit and vegetable growers association of this province, that the income in 1962 from this product

amounted to well over \$125 million in Ontario. We recognize the tremendous amount of organization that has been done in the fruit and vegetable industry in this province. It was one of the first commodity groups to organize.

We have more negotiating plans for market development in this province, associated with the fruit and vegetable industry, than with any other particular commodity. The value of such plans can be determined when we make a comparison of prices paid for commodities considered as fruit and vegetables in Ontario, in comparison with other areas of Canada and with the United States.

For instance, green peas are looked upon as a very valuable commodity production as far as vegetables are concerned in Ontario. Our price last year in Ontario was \$107 a ton; in Quebec the same green peas were selling for \$85 a ton; in Alberta for \$84 a ton; in California for \$70 a ton; with the United States average price at \$85 per ton.

Sweet corn, another product grown extensively in Ontario, contracted at \$26 a ton in Ontario, in Quebec at \$21 to \$22, in Illinois at \$21.10, in Ohio at \$18.70.

Green and waxed beans, another very valuable vegetable commodity, sell in Ontario at \$105 a ton, in Quebec at \$75 a ton. It is only fair to point out here that the companies in Quebec harvest and deliver green and wax beans to the processing plants and this is estimated to be worth around \$25 a ton, so there would not appear to be a great deal of difference there. In the state of Wisconsin waxed beans are selling at \$70 a ton, in New York at \$100, but here again we have perhaps this variance due to harvesting and transportation.

It is interesting to note also the prices for tomatoes that are paid in Ontario; for No. 1 last year—and I think this price has been negotiated again this year—\$41.50 per ton; for No. 2 \$25.50; with an average obtained last year of \$36.50 per ton.

Ontario stands alone in Canada as far as tomato production is concerned, relatively speaking, because just under 90 per cent of Canadian tomato production takes place in Ontario. But it is interesting to note that in the state of California tomatoes were being sold to the processors at \$27.60 per ton.

These are figures that I bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and I would like at the same time to suggest that prior to the introduction of the negotiating marketing plans that we have in the province of Ontario, these same low prices that obtain in other areas were also being paid in the province of

Ontario, and it seems to me ample evidence of the effectiveness of marketing plans as far as the producers are concerned.

But I also would like to point out other interesting figures that have come to my attention concerning comparative acreages of these commodities that are grown here in Ontario and other places. We are told that during the period 1955 to 1962 Ontario's green-pea acreage dropped by over 50 per cent; that sweet-corn acreage decreased by something like 5,000 acres; that Alberta's green-pea acreage nearly doubled its production; and that Quebec's green- and waxed-bean acreage more than doubled in production.

I must qualify these figures by suggesting that the acreage figures that we have here mentioned do not include the processors' own acreage, and this I feel, and I am sure will be agreed, is substantial.

I think all of these things point to the fact that it is increasingly difficult for producers in an area where there is a great deal of organized marketing plans to maintain their price structure when such comparative plans do not exist in areas where comparative products are produced.

I would like also to refer, as I did a moment ago, to tomatoes. To me, this is particularly important to Ontario, because as I mentioned, this is practically an exclusively Ontario-grown crop. In 1962 in Ontario we grew 19,356 acres of tomatoes that averaged 16.8 tons per acre in production. The gross value of these tomatoes was \$11,864,000 to Ontario farmers. In 1961 the imports of tomato products in Canada amounted to a value of just under \$5.5 million, or the equivalent of 4,500 acres of tomatoes yielding 16 tons per acre, and most of these imports came from the United States.

In 1950, when there were relatively no imports of tomato products from the United States, the price paid here in Ontario was in the approximate range of \$20 per ton. As the price increased, up to the average last year of \$36.50 per ton, our imports also increased accordingly.

It is significant to note the tremendous increase that has taken place in the average yield per acre of tomatoes in Ontario. In the late 1950s the average yield was around six tons per acre; in 1962 this yield had gone up to 16.8 tons per acre; and so I think, Mr. Chairman, that you and the hon. members of this House would agree that the problems of Ontario's fruit and vegetable growers are many and varied, but are compounded to no little degree by the fact that we have here in

the province of Ontario a very outstanding market service, and markets development service so far as the marketing plans for these individual commodities are concerned, which certainly has placed their product in direct competition with that grown from outside Ontario's borders.

But all of this leads me to a description of what I like to refer to as one of the highlights of 1962 and certainly one of the major steps forward as far as Ontario's food production disposal programme is concerned, and I refer to the British Food Fair held in August, 1962, in Great Britain. This was the first all-Ontario food exhibit that we have ever had. In other years it has been our privilege to be associated with the federal government in the food display, but this year we rented a booth for Ontario-produced food and we put the show on with The Ontario Department of Agriculture, the producers' association and the processors' association working together.

The Department of Agriculture sent over five very attractive young ladies from the province of Ontario chosen because of their outstanding records in home economics and 4-H Club activities. Miss Marilyn Sherwood from Burlington was one of these girls, and was Ontario's champion cherry-pie baker; the others were Miss Betty Opersko of Waterford, Ontario's cheese maiden of a year or so ago; Miss Rosemarie Haight of Consecon; Miss Joan McCartney of Ramsayville, and Miss Marjorie Papple of Seaforth. These young ladies went over to Great Britain and represented Ontario young people in this British Food Fair exhibit.

We sent along 53 tons of Ontario food products. They were made up as follows: 22 tons of fresh peaches; 1 ton of carrots; 25 tons of canned fruit and vegetables; 2 tons of bulk cheese; 1 ton of packaged cheese, and 2 tons of packaged honey. And while we sent along a 1,000-pound display of Ontario tobacco which could not be sold, the Flue-cured Tobacco Marketing Board gave away packages of Canadian cigarettes containing 5 cigarettes each. I think it established a taste for our Canadian cigarettes over there.

These products that I have mentioned were sold to individuals to the extent that 33,200 individual sales were made by these girls and those who assisted them in the food fair booth. It is estimated that 235,000 people visited the Ontario display in that booth.

Peaches were sold individually or they were sold in small cartons and it gave the British people a taste of our fresh peaches. Carrots

were sold in 1-pound bags. Chilled tomato and apple juice was dispensed and sold in seven-ounce paper cups. Other canned fruit and vegetables were sold in one-can lots. Bulk cheese was sold in eight-ounce wedges. Packaged cheese was sold in eight-ounce to one-pound sticks and wedges, and one-pound centre cuts and three-pound speciality blocks. Honey was sold in containers varying from one-ounce to one-pound.

So all of this programme really resulted in the British people acquiring a taste for our products and an opportunity to buy them.

Our present programme is being carried on in The Department of Agriculture markets development branches overseas, the good work that was started in the British Food Fair. The demand for Ontario onions, for instance, has simply been fantastic. In 1961 we sent over 120,000 50-pound bags of onions; in 1962 we sent over one million 50-pound bags of onions. In 1961 we sent over 2,000 bushels of fresh carrots; in 1962 we increased that to 400,000 bushels. All of this is a direct result of what happened at the British Food Fair. I think it is significant to look at some of the other commodities we have promoted to such an extent through this combined effort we have exhibited in the British Food Fair.

For instance, in 1960 we sent over just over half a million pounds of canned pears, in 1961 we sent over just under one million and a half, but in 1962, we stepped this up to 4,197,000 pounds. In canned peaches, in the first 11 months of 1961, we sent over just under a quarter of a million pounds, but in 1962, in the first 11 months, comparative figures are 1,689,000 pounds. In canned fruit the most significant trend is taking place. In 1960 only 651,000 pounds were sent over; in the first 11 months of 1961 we stepped that up to just over one million pounds, but in the first 11 months of 1962 this figure reached just under six million pounds.

I referred also to vegetables and vegetable juices. In 1961 we sent over 3,100,000 pounds, but in 1962 we sent just under 11 million pounds. I would like to mention also pickles and relishes, another product of Ontario farms. In 1960 we sent over less than half a million pounds, but in 1962 this was stepped up to 4,285,000 pounds. This tremendous success of our fruit and vegetable industry, in particular achieved on the British market last year, leads us to believe there is a tremendously wide export market for several Ontario quality food products. But I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if Ontario farm products are to continue to flow to the British market as they have, and as it has been indicated by

these figures they are now doing, it cannot be done simply by The Canada Department of Trade and Commerce and The Ontario Department of Agriculture exhibiting at one or two United Kingdom fairs. The industry itself, must recognize that the prime responsibility for increased export is its job as well.

There is a limit beyond which a government should not go in rendering assistance and support. There is nothing that can replace private and co-operative enterprises. The government's principal role is that of giving a lead, providing an opportunity for producers to participate in creating a favourable climate. This is what we are attempting to do in the markets development branch of The Ontario Department of Agriculture in the field of increasing farm product exports from Ontario.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we must recognize, as farm people in the province of Ontario, the enormous technological changes that are taking place in Ontario agriculture. These technological changes are no different, in a comparative way, than the technological changes that have taken place in practically every other industry in this province. We in agriculture have moved ahead. Indeed, some people refer to us as having moved ahead faster and to a greater extent than have many other industries in Ontario. It has been for this reason that we feel in The Department of Agriculture, and I am sure that the farmer members of this honourable House will agree with me, that there is increasing necessity for emphasis to be placed on agricultural research in Ontario.

The establishment of the agricultural research institute of Ontario a year ago has proven conclusively in its first year of operation that the co-ordination of research, the exploration of new fields of research and the necessity for the use of facilities for agricultural research are essential if Ontario agriculture is to maintain its lead as far as Canada is concerned.

There must be increasing emphasis placed continually on the importance of having new and better methods of production and marketing. As an example of this, I wish to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Beef Improvement Association of this province was developed this year. It seems to me that we can give credit to the fact that outstanding beef cattle producers in this province—and I can see many of them sitting here in this House; my great friend and cohort from Middlesex county the hon. member for Middlesex South (Mr. Allen), an outstanding beef cattle producer. The hon. member for

Lambton East (Mr. Janes) and the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil), all of them outstanding beef cattle men, and a great many others.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): And the hon. member for York North (Mr. MacKenzie), too?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot say anything about his beef producing characteristics, as I am not too sure how deeply he is involved in the beef industry. But there are a great many of them in the province of Ontario who recognize the necessity for exploring new methods of beef production. The very fact that we have come up against problems; for example, feed conversion, that seems to be at a very satisfactory level as far as certain other types of meat products are concerned; points up the necessity that we as beef producers in this province must examine every possibility of determining new and better methods of producing beef if we are to compete with the other meat products now being produced in this province and also to meet the tremendous demands that our consuming public has for this very delightful product.

We feel that there are many things that the new beef improvement association among themselves, as beef producers in the province of Ontario, have now determined to carry out that may very well embark a promotion for feeder cattle breeding in the province of Ontario. They might very well embark upon studies in research for beef feeding.

I would like to say a word about the great dairy industry in this province. All of us in this House, I am sure, have looked back upon this year of 1963 in retrospect with a degree of pessimism at the fact that the four major dairy groups failed to arrive at a satisfactory milk marketing plan for the province of Ontario. Yet I do not for one moment suggest that this year has been wasted. I feel very definitely, Mr. Chairman, that the year of 1962, as far as the dairy industry in Ontario is concerned, must be considered to have been a year in which the four dairy groups sat down together and attempted to work out among themselves a programme to meet their own needs.

It is not entirely to my way of thinking unreasonably regrettable that these organizations failed to reach a common agreement. There are very many varying degrees of opinion. But I believe that if 1962 accomplished nothing more for the dairy industry in Ontario, it has brought a realization among

the dairy producers in this province of the necessity for some type of an organized plan for the dairy industry.

We have attempted this year to point out the fact that in the province of Ontario the dairy problems that are confronting Canada, and are indeed the concern of Ontario people, are not problems of the making of Ontario farmers alone. We feel very definitely that this is indeed a national problem. It has been because of this realization and the acceptance of this realization by farmers not only in Ontario but across Canada, and particularly the farm organizations, that a national conference was called for the dairy industry at Ottawa on February 21 and 22 last.

This conference was called by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, working in co-operation with the National Farmers Union of Canada. While this meeting, Mr. Chairman, I must say was closed to the press, the results of the meeting were, I would like to say, as follows. I think I would be well advised to read these two pages because we have summed up here in this very brief statement the deliberations of two days of solid conference:

A meeting was attended by provincial and federal representatives, producers and processors of dairy products and certain other advisory people. This was a delegated meeting, attendance was by invitation and the total attendance was about 75.

The purpose of the meeting was to assess the current dairy situation from a national standpoint and attempt to arrive at some starting point on this problem from a national standpoint. I am sure everyone appreciates that under the constitution provinces have been given certain responsibilities in the milk industry and certain other responsibilities have been accepted by the federal government.

It was the conclusion of the meeting that some co-ordination and realistic way at national level of dairy industry policies and activities was necessary.

The meeting also concluded that the most important basic step was to get some committee functioning in an advisory or co-ordinating capacity. It was felt that if the right personnel were on this committee and if the activities of the committee were supported by all parties concerned in the industry, it could perform a real service in recommending uniform policies and action on a national basis which would be in the interests of the overall industry.

Another conclusion of the meeting which

was of great interest was that dairy processors could form a part of this national dairy committee. It was pointed out by several speakers that the processors formed a very essential part of the industry and not only was their advice and help needed in discussing policies and programmes but as well the acceptance of these programmes might be made easier if the processors were part of the initiation.

It was decided that this national dairy committee would be formed on the basis of five zones. These zones would be: the Maritimes, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. Each zone would appoint through the industry one producer and one processor, and the provincial government or governments as the case may be would appoint one independent representative. The federal government would also appoint at least one independent person.

It was agreed that the committee not only study the short-term interests of the dairy industry but the long-term interests as well. Their terms of reference will be all-inclusive, but in particular the conference decided that the industry must work towards a national dairy policy which would embrace the following points:

- (1) have adequate and realistic pricing arrangements;
- (2) be flexible enough to allow for shifts and diversions in the use of milk;
- (3) provide for uniform quality requirements;
- (4) provide for general research and market promotion, which would include adequate exploration of increased markets both at home and overseas;
- (5) that all policies and programmes to receive a national co-ordination to as great a degree as possible.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is a start of national thinking insofar as the dairy industry is concerned and should only result in good for the entire industry.

This complexity of problems, that I have suggested this afternoon confront Ontario farm people, to me point up more than ever the increasing emphasis which must be placed on farm management in this province. Our agricultural representative service, has provided a very excellent extension service down through the years. Our home economists, through the leadership they have provided in the homemaking services of this province, and indeed in home management, and the leader-

ship that they have provided for the 4H home economics clubs of this province, to my way of thinking are simply tremendous.

But it seems to me that we must go even further and while as my hon. predecessor in office (Mr. Goodfellow) put special emphasis on this farm management service in designating each agricultural representative across the province as a consultant in farm management and assisting in creating farm management clubs and courses in every county and district in the province—service that has met with wide acceptance from one end of the province to the other—I feel that we must continue to develop this service. It is with this thought in mind that I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should give very great consideration to the appointment of zone or regional directors who might assist the agricultural representatives in a very specialized way as far as farm management service is concerned in this province. I would like to suggest that there should be one appointed in southwestern Ontario, one in central Ontario, and perhaps one for eastern Ontario and one who could look after the interests of our northern farmers as well.

It would seem to me that we must follow this type of programme because these technological changes that I have mentioned this afternoon, and of which we are all aware, has placed increasing necessity, to my way of thinking, on the establishment of sound business management in the operation of every farm in the province. It seems to me that these special consultants, working with the agricultural representatives across the province, could very well deal with economic matters affecting individual farmers, and the basis of decision making and farm planning, as farm business consultants and particularly in legal financial matters.

It would seem to me that they could very well perform a useful service in assisting our agricultural representatives to discuss with farm families the establishment of agreements for the operation of family farms and for the establishment, where it might appear to be warranted, of corporate family farms. These, to my way of thinking, are the things this type of a service might provide.

Along with this would be the service provided through the re-enactment of the junior farmer loan legislation for this province with all of the guarantees and the services that would be provided if this loan legislation meets with the approval of this House.

These, to me, Mr. Chairman, are the indications of the interest of this government and this department in providing a service for

Ontario farmers that they can in many instances not find for themselves. It would seem to me that if we can do more to assist Ontario farmers to help themselves through this programme of economic assistance and consultative advice from a managerial standpoint, that we will have done much to maintain, to stabilize and to strengthen Ontario's family farms.

I would like to call to the attention of the House through you, Mr. Chairman, that there has been a major reorganization of the soils and crops branch of our Ontario Department of Agriculture. This last year we regretted that the time for retirement had come for Mr. A. H. Martin, who had been the director of the soils and crops branch for so long and who had rendered such tremendous service to the farmers of this province. But these times for retirement do come, so Mr. Martin retired and we send with him our best wishes for a happy and prolonged period, and a very enjoyable time in his retirement.

In his place was appointed Mr. Doug Parks who has long been associated with the soils and crops department of the Kemptville Agricultural School. We recognize that in bringing Mr. Parks into the department we were bringing in an outstanding agriculturist in the province of Ontario, that we were taking a man out of eastern Ontario who is literally admired by all who are privileged to know him for the service that he provided in eastern Ontario as far as crops and soil were concerned. But Mr. Parks has come to our head office here in Toronto and he is, I am sure, very capably filling the shoes vacated by Mr. Martin.

With reference to the reorganization that has taken place in this particular branch, we have co-ordinated the soils and crops branch into one. At the OAC there were five soil specialists, three of whom were working full time in soils advisory work and two part of the time. In addition, there were two summer assistants, one stationed at Markdale in Grey county and the other at Brighton in Northumberland county. As of April 1, three positions from the OAC will be transferred to the soils and crops branch and the two former summer men will be appointed to full-time positions in this branch.

In the former field crops branch, there were seven crop specialists, including one on potatoes and one on turnips, who has now been transferred to the markets branch and one on seeds. A new position will open in New Liskeard on April 1 to be filled with a bilingual soils and crops specialist. This will make a total of ten soils and crops

specialists, including the assistant director of the branch, located across the province to provide information and advice on soils and soil management and on crop and crop production to agricultural representatives, to farmers and to farm suppliers.

The specialist will also supervise and conduct field demonstrations and local evaluations of research findings in soils and crops and as projects through the county soils and crop improvement associations, each of which is entitled to a \$500 grant.

Whereas formerly each crops field man was responsible for administration and enforcement of The Weed Control Act and supervision of county weed inspectors within his district, as of April 1 these responsibilities and duties will be removed from the soils and crops specialists. They will, however, be expected to be informed on chemical weed control methods insofar as these are an integral part of crop production.

The administration of The Weed Control Act will be carried out by two seed and weed specialists, one of whom is the former seed specialist who will have direct supervision of the county weed inspectors and will also inspect and license seed cleaning plants. One of these men is located in Guelph and will be in charge in the western half of the province. The other, which will be a new appointment, will be located in Brighton and will be working in the eastern half of the province.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in this session, before the present session adjourned for Christmas recess, we passed a bill intituled The Meat Inspection Act for the province of Ontario providing meat inspection for all meat sold in this province. I believe that this bill met with general acceptance in this House. It was thoroughly discussed in the committee on agriculture. Many people appeared before the committee and I think generally there was agreement on the terms of the bill. The regulations were not at that time drafted but are now in the process of being drafted. I can assure you that this is not an easy task, because it is most all-embracing.

However, there does appear to have been certain misunderstandings which have been expressed in letters to the press and by comments that I have read in the papers that would seem to me to be based on misunderstanding of the facts involved in the new meat inspection Act.

I refer to the fact that in certain press reports that have come to my attention there has been reference made to the fact that the bill calls for ante-mortem inspection but not

for a post-mortem inspection. Now I would like to suggest this, Mr. Chairman, that as far as post-mortem inspection is concerned, the bill provides that all meat sold in the province of Ontario, unless exempted for reasons which will be provided in the regulations and which are understood in this House, must carry the stamp "Canada Approved". I believe the misunderstanding may have developed because there is not a thorough appreciation of the fact that the stamp "Canada Approved" means post-mortem inspection.

No one can stamp or use that stamp on any meat product unless that meat product so identified has been inspected during slaughter and immediately following slaughter as to health standards. I believe that this meat inspection Act, which has been approved by this House and is now legislation, will strengthen the position of the operators of our small slaughterhouses. I believe at the same time that it will give consideration to the pleasant relationships that have been built up and presently exist between producers and consumers who deal on a direct basis. Through all of this, there has been a very great appreciation of our desire to provide a wholesome, healthy product as far as meat is concerned for the consuming public of this province.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted in this rather brief summary of Ontario Department of Agriculture activities to outline some of the things that we are attempting to do in our department and that have been done to strengthen and to correlate Ontario agriculture.

Might I say, Mr. Chairman, that our entire programme is directed towards stabilizing Ontario agriculture, to help Ontario's farmers to help themselves. Our agricultural educational programme outlined as it was this afternoon by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), is being carried on not only at the OAC, the OVC and Macdonald Institute, but at Kemptville Agricultural School and at the Ridgetown Agricultural School, both operated by The Ontario Department of Agriculture.

Our extension programme and the type of work that is being done through the 4-H clubs in this province, and I would like to say that there are something like 13,000 boys and well over 16,000 girls as members of these clubs in 1962. Surely we can hardly estimate the impact of these young people being so trained and developed through the 4-H clubs as far as our agriculture is concerned in this province and as far as the

development of leadership and citizenship is concerned.

Our farm management programme that I have mentioned, our assistance in farm marketing—and I would like to say here, Mr. Chairman, that we in The Department of Agriculture do not necessarily believe that assistance can be completely rendered through every commodity coming under a farm marketing plan. We believe there is a place for development of marketing and for assistance in working out plans that do not necessarily have to come under marketing legislation.

All of these matters I have mentioned—and I could mention many more—but I trust they will be discussed as we proceed with the estimates of our department.

I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the attention of the House, reports that I read from the *Rural Co-operator*, of remarks by Mr. William Tilden, the immediate past-president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. I am sure the hon. members opposite will agree with what Mr. Tilden has to say. He says in his speech to the annual meeting of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, and I want to quote:

The necessity of adjusting rapidly to an entirely new way of farming, consistently low prices for most farm produce occasioned by unusual surpluses and the uncertainty as to whether or not individual farm enterprise might be forced to yield to a system of corporation farming, all combined to lower the morale of the agricultural community.

Now, however, there seems to be a new-born feeling of hope in rural Ontario. It may be because we have been unable to weather out the trying period of the 50's; it may be that our marketing programmes are now, at last, bringing stability to Ontario farm markets, it may be that increased population has brought us to a point where domestic consumption of food products may be sufficient to relieve them of embarrassing surpluses. Whatever the reason, we are now enjoying prices for many of our commodities much more in line with their cost of production than has been the case for some time.

This brings to an end Mr. Tilden's quotation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like also to call to your attention that the brief from the Ontario Federation of Agriculture which was presented to the hon. Prime Minister and other hon. members of the Ontario Cabinet, and I

believe to hon. members of this House as well, reads as follows, and I quote from this brief, on page 7, chapter 16:

In general then, the Ontario farm economy appears to have found fairer weather. Supported by a more numerous and a more affluent consuming population, the adoption by skilled managers of advanced and improved farming techniques is beginning to return dividends.

Mr. Chairman I suggest to you that it has been because of the programme of The Ontario Department of Agriculture and this government that this is so.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the remarks of my hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture and for the last hour he has fluttered around the perimeter of the problems that really beset the agricultural industry, and his speech was far more notable for the things it omitted, than those that it contained. As I move on to an examination of his remarks and of the agricultural problem in general, it is just possible that I will touch on some of those omissions.

First of all Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the House that this is the 19th budget estimate statement that I have listened to from Tory Ministers of Agriculture. My joy at this time knows no bounds because I think it will be the last.

There is a remarkable similarity, you know, between the estimates of the hon. Minister today, and the 18 others who have preceded him in the last 19 years. Similarity is borne out in two or three ways. In the first place it presents an estimate for our consideration which is a very small part of the total provincial budget. It is an estimate whose money value grows less each year in comparison with the taxation income of the provincial government. It is an estimate, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that relegates the agricultural industry into a position of second-rate importance in the minds of this government. Moreover, it is an estimate that down through the years has varied little. There have been nominal increases year by year in the amount spent in the agricultural department, but these amounts have not been dramatic. They have just been the ordinary vote that you would expect increase-wise from a department that felt that the problems had been met, and that it was easy sailing, and it was just a question of doing the same thing this year as we did last year, and that there were no great problems that one had to meet which would employ the expenditure of more public money.

My hon. friend's long talk today substantiates that definition. The Tory government that sits in office for the moment, in my way of thinking, has no appreciation of the great problems that beset the agricultural industry. My hon. friend today skated all around the important problem. He took little jabs at the problems that were somewhat less important, the greater ones he touched not at all. The reason is either that my hon. friend and his government are incapable of meeting and conquering these problems, or else they do not recognize their existence. Either one of these approaches is fatal to the agricultural industry of the province.

I want to deal more specifically with some of the things my hon. friend said and some of the things that he did not say. My hon. friend can talk all he likes about gross income for the farmer. What the farmer is interested in is his net income, and it does not put food in his mouth or clothes on his back to have a provincial Minister of Agriculture give us an object lesson on how great the gross income of the farmer was in the preceding year.

What we are concerned about in this Legislature, or what we should be concerned about, is what the farmer has left over with which to pay his ever-increasing costs. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer) and my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. Whicher) put these figures on record and I make no apology for putting them on again, because apparently they have not sunk in, as far as this government is concerned, and only repetition, of perhaps monotonous character to some of us, can find a way into the minds of my hon. friends opposite.

And may I pause to say this, that my hon. friend said when he was speaking that this was the second time that he had presented estimates to the House, giving the impression he was a new Minister, that a new breeze was blowing on the other side of the House. Now my hon. friend is in fact a comparatively new Minister, but it is a comparatively old government. You belong in that institution of government that has been in power for well on to 20 years in this province and at the end of the 20-year period—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The farmers in the province are enjoying the highest gross income in history.

Mr. Oliver: Gross—yes, you are saying it again. What difference does it make what his gross income is? He has to have a net income to allow him to pay for the things that he has to have to operate his farm with. The

gross income is not the figure that counts, and my hon. friend knows it. But it is the only one that he can use that will give any credence to his claim that farmers are prosperous. It must make the farmers feel good to hear my hon. friend get up year by year and say, "My friends, I bestow upon you today the mantle of prosperity. Whether you know it or not, my friends, you are becoming more wealthy as one year blends itself into another"; then, to hear him pat himself on the back as he did in his closing sentence, and say in all modesty, "I suggest to the House, that if there has been an improvement then we and we alone are responsible."

A few sentences previous, a few minutes before, my hon. friend was saying that we have to let the farmers work out their own problems. "We want to keep away from it, we want to let them work out their own problems." Well, I am glad you told them that—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not say that. I object to that. I object, sir. I have the greatest respect for my hon. friend. I want to correct that impression, because what I have said was that The Ontario Department of Agriculture will continue to help farmers to help themselves. This is the thing that we want to do and we have always done.

Mr. Oliver: I am sure the comment of my hon. friend has tremendous importance and great weight, and as I move forward in my examination of his policy I will bear what he said in mind—it will be ever present in the things that I say.

Now, my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, has said this, and I want to read these figures again from the 1951-61 period: The gross farm income increased three per cent; the wholesale price of farm products, that is the price the farmer gets for his products, went down in the same period by 20 per cent, and the cost attributed to the farm and payable by the farm people went up in the same period by 19 per cent. Now, I suggest you throw away all your figures of gross income and remember that in this one 10-year period in which your government was in power and during most of which you had a counterpart at Ottawa, in that 10-year period, mind you, our position has increased to this extent, that our farm costs have gone up 19 per cent and our farm prices have gone down 20 per cent. Now, if my hon. friend wants to take credit for that situation I am willing to give him all the credit in the world.

Now, I want to talk about my hon. friend and some of the things he forgot to say this afternoon. He spoke about milk. Well now, what is the word one should use—floundering around in milk ever since he came into office. The government is not doing any more about milk now than it was when he came into office.

I want to make two or three statements in respect to the whole milk problem. One of them I think bears out what I will say in a moment or so.

You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that according to a formula worked out with the producers, there was due to the producers an increase in the price of milk of some 19 cents, I think it was, a hundred. Now what happened? My hon. friend at that time, in that very hour, showed his true Tory colours. He showed what I have thought for a long time: he is a Tory among Tories and when it comes to a position where one must balance the good of the farmer against the good of his own political party, then my hon. friend chooses his political party. On this question of a moratorium, my hon. friend chose his political party rather than the farmers of this province. When a crisis arises, as it did arise on that occasion, my hon. friend was weighed in the balance and found wanting.

Now, from what was true in that one instance, I suggest, that the farmers have not any right to expect that my hon. friend will look on them with any greater favour in any future decisions that have to be made.

In regard to the whole milk question and the four dairy groups and their efforts to get together in some sort of unity, I want to say a word or two about that. My hon. friend said, "If you fellows do not get together in a year's time there will be chaos in the milk industry." Those were words that fell from the lips of the hon. Minister.

Then he said, "Now, you go out and go to it and get together and remember that there will be chaos unless you do get together."

The hon. Minister revealed the truth this afternoon when he suggested to the House that they were unable to get together. I agree almost with him that it is not too surprising that they were unable to get together in the period of time that they had at their disposal. But what I say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister and to the House: the hon. Minister has a role to play in this, a role that he did not play. He stood aside, afar off, and he said to the people in these four dairy groups: "Go out and reconcile your differences and come together."

I say to you that the government has a role to play. I do not want to say this afternoon that the government should force any agreement down the throats of the producers, I do not mean that at all. But I mean this, and I will tell you, apparently you do not know; I say that your role is this: surely you have got the solution in mind; surely you could come to these producers with alternative proposals; surely you could work out a plan which in your opinion would work, bring it up to these people and have them consider it and see if they could not get along and come together and iron out their differences.

But no! The hon. Minister goes to the barn, he keeps away from the scene altogether, he does not help them out, he does not give leadership. With magnificent indifference he says to the dairy groups: "Now you go out and do it, we wash our hands of the whole affair."

You have a role in this matter, my hon. friend, and you fail to carry it out.

The hon. Minister said today—I was going to say a word or two about this—he made a speech at the federation of agriculture—and he is getting pretty good at speech-making, I would say. Sometimes, you know, I like to listen to the hon. Minister. If one does not feel that he should be moved by what the hon. Minister says, it is pleasant indeed to hear the words roll from his lips.

But at this federation meeting he said to them: "Now, look, this government of mine"—boy, he can well know it. Actually, these are not the words, but I am paraphrasing it and if my hon. friend thinks I am wrong he can correct me.

What he said was: "Now look, we are getting blamed, I am getting blamed for this milk situation. Too much butter in Ontario. Now do you want to know the truth, do you really want to know the full facts? Well, I will tell you. We are not wholly responsible for the surplus of milk products that exists in Ontario. Some of them come in from Manitoba, a few from Quebec, maybe a few from somewhere else. We are not to be held responsible, surely."

Well what a specious argument. What does the hon. Minister want to do, build a line fence between here and Manitoba and another between here and Quebec and keep out all interprovincial trade? That was a statement made, of course, at the time that he thought the making of it would help him in the peculiar situation in which he found himself. That was a political statement if ever there was one.

While we are talking about milk, one could say that I read in the paper where the hon. Minister said there were too many political voices in these discussions and he wanted an end to it. Well, so far as the hon. Minister is concerned, coming from him that sounds good, because his voice is always a political voice if we can interpret his voice accurately.

Now then, I want to come to some of the things that the hon. Minister left out.

There was quite an agitation, I think it was based legitimately, that there should be a farm machinery Act in this province. It was suggested that there should be a place available, or places available where farmers could go to get parts for their machinery. The hon. Minister professed to have great interest in this project. He said: Well done to the federation of agriculture. To the farmers' union he said: Now you just place your trust in us and all your dreams will come true.

So he stood up in the House and he professed interest and almost support of the farm machinery depots. Then as the session moved on, what did my hon. friend, who always meets problems head on, do? He appointed a committee to study the matter. Now this is a Tory recipe from away back. If you cannot meet a problem head on, if you cannot give the fellow what he is asking for, then tell him in heaven's name you will at least appoint a committee to go into the problem.

That committee has been appointed, I do not know whether it died or what happened to it, we do not know where they are, what they are doing, if they ever made a report, and yet the hon. Minister led the federation and the farm union people to believe that he was sincere when he said this government is interested in bringing in a farm machinery Act into this province. He was not sincere at all. He was just playing politics.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Surely the hon. member for Grey South, Mr. Chairman, is not imputing motives, that is beneath his dignity. Certainly I felt there was just a trace of it there, because surely he recognizes the fact that the farm machinery committee, one of whom is one of his hon. members—

Mr. Oliver: I do not give a hoot who they are.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —is a member of this committee and to my knowledge the committee is still meeting.

Mr. Oliver: I guess they would be, yes. I think that is plenty from the hon. Minister.

I doubt very much if he is adding anything to the discussion. He is not saying anything that contradicts what I said at all.

I said the expedient that this government uses, if it wants to paralyze, if it wants to delay, if it wants to mitigate against a certain thing, is to appoint a committee and say to that committee: I do not care two hoots when you report, some time when you feel good about it you might send us in a report, but there is no hurry, because if you bring in a report we may have to act on your recommendations". Now that is one thing the hon. Minister did not talk about today. If he was going to bring in this Act in this session of the Legislature, we would have heard it from him today. He has not any intention of bringing it in. He sold the organized farm people of this province down the river on The Farm Machinery Act question. And the hon. Minister knows that quite well.

Now the hon. Minister has appointed more committees—Committee-man Bill, we will have to call him. He appoints a committee on tobacco, he appoints a committee on milk, and he appoints a committee on integration. Now this one I want to deal with at some length.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Vertical or horizontal?

Mr. Oliver: If he mentioned it at all it was in passing this afternoon. He has not any formula to meet what I consider is a great and growing problem to the farmers of this province. Not a word fell from the hon. Minister's lips as to how he was going to correct the situation that has grown beyond all reasonable bounds and which threatens the very existence—not only of the vegetable growers, but of farmers in every walk of life in this province—if it is allowed to continue. A year and a half ago, when I first spoke about this matter in the House, you would swear the hon. Minister had not heard about it before because, within two weeks, what did he do? He appointed a committee. Now, as far as I know, they are still sitting and are still discussing the problem, and the hon. Minister gave no intimation this afternoon as to when he thought they might report, perhaps in a year or two.

There is no hurry about this thing. It has been with us for a long time. The problem is of long duration, and the hon. Minister's recipe is apparently that the cure is going to be of just as great a length. I do not agree with that at all, because if the hon. Minister needs any evidence I think it can be supplied to him that vertical integration

as practised by certain processors in this province is making hewers of wood and drawers of water of good farm people, and that it poses this ugly situation that today affects the vegetable growers in southwestern Ontario particularly.

But it is only a short step to the livestock growers of this province and all of them could be engulfed in the situation that exists among the vegetable growers. The hon. Minister sits there in magnificent indifference and, as I said a moment ago, he does nothing about it at all. He does not even want to admit that it is here, that it is a present problem. It is one of those great problems that you have in Ontario, so big that it is too big for you to handle.

I say to the hon. Minister from this vantage point, I say to him this afternoon, we have to find an answer and a solution to that problem. He cannot keep putting it off, no matter who it hurts. No matter how far we have to go, we have to give back to the farmers of this province their long existing rights to grow products on their own farm and dispose of them where they will. That right has been taken away from them today, as the hon. Minister knows, in more and more numbers.

The hon. Minister said something about vertical integration when the House was not sitting, at a little town, I think, in Middlesex county. The papers carried a story that there was to be a great break so far as news was concerned. The reporters asked the hon. Minister and he said: "Don't ask me. It is important, but don't ask me now, it will come out in the fullness of time."

He was speaking to the federation of agriculture. He said, "It has to do with vertical integration, I can tell you that. At last we have come to grips with this problem, we have found the answer and I am going to apply it." He got up before the meeting and what did he say? He said: "I am going to resurrect"—and I think that is a good word—"the junior farmers loan board in the province of Ontario and that is my government's answer to vertical integration."

I suggest to the hon. Minister that that is no answer at all to vertical integration. It was the only answer he had, I will grant him that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a complete distortion of the facts and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. Oliver: Well, does the hon. Minister think that that is an answer to vertical integration? Does he think that is an answer?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is not what I said.

Mr. Oliver: Well, that is all right.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, then, why does the hon. member contribute it to me, and distort the facts?

Mr. Oliver: Anything useful that I can contribute to the hon. Minister, he should recognize and accept it with both hands, I will tell him that. He brings in the junior farmers loan board and he wants us to clap him on the back and say, "Now, isn't this a great government, it is going to establish farm loans". Of course, all we have to remember is that it was this same government that threw them out a few years ago. So their re-establishment is surely not a great adventure in progress. It is simply doing something now that should never have been undone a few years ago. So far as we are concerned, we are all in favour of the loaning legislation, there is no question about that.

I want to speak just for a moment or so on two or three broader questions and one of them is on public relations.

One has to be careful how he examines this problem because I understand that the hon. Minister's department has quite a group of public relations men.

I would just say to him that in my humble opinion I feel that his department is not doing a good public relations job in the sense and in the area in which I think public relations should be a great factor. That job, it seems to me, would be this: to sell the farmers' position to those who live in the urban areas of the province of Ontario. And on that point, the hon. Minister's PR men have been a dismal failure.

The farmers of this province are being subjected to misunderstanding, to misinformation, all along the line when it comes to dealing with their problems. I saw in such an important paper as the *Globe and Mail* the other day—and the hon. Minister perhaps saw it—an editorial dealing with the junior farm loan board, and it said in so many words: when are we going to stop giving sops to the farmers of the province of Ontario?

Now, I ask you in all fairness, and I am sure the hon. Minister will agree with this if he has not agreed with anything else I said, that it is no sop to the farmers of Ontario to lend them money and have them pay interest and principal until the money is paid back. That is a business arrangement, it is not a sop, and I think the hon.

Minister's public relations in that respect have been very inadequate indeed.

It is true that every time there is an increase in the cost of food everybody gets the jitters and the farmer is blamed from one end of the province to the other. Every time the index goes up one point and the man is able to say the reason it went up is because there was an increase in the cost of food, then you drive another nail in the public relations as between the urban and the rural centres of this province.

I have been amazed, as I am sure the hon. Minister has, time and time again, how urban people will accept an increase in the price of cars, an increase in the price of soft drinks, an increase in the price of clothing, and almost everything else without a murmur but when it comes to a small increase in the things that are produced on the farm then everything breaks loose, to use a mild term. That should not be.

When we have a condition on the farms as I have indicated here today, surely any fair minded person whether he lives in Toronto or Hamilton or where he lives can say with pride; I am willing to pay this price for the farmer's products because that price is not one that gives him an exorbitant profit but gives him the right life and the ability to live in this province of Ontario. I want to close with this remark. I have said in this House many times, and the hon. member for Bruce has said it as well, I think we could do much more than we are doing in getting food to those people throughout the world who are hungry. We could do it in a systematic, planned way. I am quite aware of the difficulties involved, I know how difficult it is to arrange distribution, I am conscious of the difficulties that arise from the lack of continuity in the supply, I am aware of all those things. But while we have food to spare—and particularly while it affects our price and disrupts our market, that small surplus—and while on the other side of the world people are starving for the produce that we have in abundance, surely it is not common sense to say that we are not capable enough to get the food from where it is to the place it is needed so badly. You see on the television every day about these packages that are sent from this country to other countries of the world, food packages. Why would it not be possible to expand that programme and to decrease our surpluses and to fill the stomachs of those overseas with products that we grow so well on the farms of this province?

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: I do not think we have tried actually and earnestly. The best weapon we can find to fight communism, and any other brand that we do not like, is to fill their stomachs and put clothes on their backs. Until we have discharged our full responsibility in that regard we have been somewhat of a failure.

Now, as the hon. Minister's estimates come up one by one, my hon. colleagues and I, and no doubt the hon. members of the CCF or the New Party, will have something to say about the things that you have said and the things that you have left unsaid.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, it has been a very interesting afternoon. We have had a rip-snorting political speech from the hon. Minister of Agriculture and we have had a rip-snorting political reply from the spokesman for the Liberal Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I would say—oh, I am not going to be playing politics, no. As somebody interrupted last year one time and said I was playing politics, my comment was "What do you think we are doing here? Playing tiddly-winks?"

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): You are.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, let me say this: most of what the spokesman for the Liberal Party has said, I would agree with. I would have minor reservations—and I do not want to spend my time arguing with them this afternoon because there are some other I hope rather fundamental things—

Several hon. members: That will be a change!

Mr. MacDonald: —rather fundamental things that I would like to raise with regard to the policy of this government. But I just want to pick one to show how the hon. member for Grey South has desperately tried to cover up a miscalculation on the part of two or three of his hon. colleagues which set the stage for this government to procrastinate on the farm machinery legislation.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Going back 25 years!

Mr. MacDonald: A year ago last December when the issue of the farm machinery legislation came before the standing committee, I fought—and I fought alone—that if they wanted to study the issue, we should insist

that they should report by the beginning of February so that we could have a farm machinery Act at that session. But the hon. member for Bruce, aided and abetted—and I could never understand this—by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Innes) espoused the cause of the farm machinery dealers or the companies. They played right into the hands of this government that wanted to procrastinate. They set the stage for this government to appoint a committee and now it has been working for a year and it will be working for two or three more years, but as usual—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would like the hon. member for York South to retract that statement because they were supposed to report back to the committee, the agriculture committee, and they did not.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not have to retract any statement.

Mr. Innes: You said that we did not ask them to report back.

Mr. MacDonald: I shall use some future occasion to remind you of the exact wording of what went on, because I have it in many—

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): He is not a politician.

Mr. MacDonald: Of course, he is not a politician! The hon. leader of the Opposition never plays politics, never.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Here is his naivety and self-righteousness bursting out once again.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): It does not take much to stir those fellows up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Tommy Douglas, one time when he was—

An hon. member: Who is he?

Mr. MacDonald: —when Jimmy Gardiner quipped at him about what he knew about farming, Tommy's quip was that you did not need to be a hen to know how to lay an egg.

Mr. Reaume: It helps though!

Mr. Whicher: You just laid an egg now.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what all the shouting is about, because we have more eggs laid from this quarter of the House and they are not hens'!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: However let me get down to serious business.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): That did not work so well!

Mr. MacDonald: Oh it worked!

Mr. Wintermeyer: How about Hazen Argue's views?

Mr. MacDonald: How about Vince Kelly's views on the Liberal Party?

Mr. Wintermeyer: He was a very nice fellow.

Mr. MacDonald: He still is and a very bright lad.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Very bright!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, so that I can let the blood pressure subside, let me try to come to grips with a number of issues which are rather fundamental problems in the agricultural scene today.

It is commonplace to say that agriculture today stands at the crossroads. We are constantly being reminded that the family farm faces elimination. Even this government has faced up to the fact that vertical integration is destroying the traditional independence of the farmer by reducing him to a position of economic subservience to the trade.

All of these are problems which we have discussed in the House many times in the last few years. The hon. member for Grey South has reviewed that discussion this afternoon. I take it as read. I repeat that I would agree with most of what he had to say. But I want to try to focus attention this afternoon on two or three of what I think are fundamental mistakes in approach of this government which are compounding our difficulties.

I want to start by relating to this House an experience of some three or four hours one afternoon recently. I think it may be of some interest to hon. members.

I had been planning for many years to squeeze a few hours when I was passing Belleville to drop in and see the cheese marketing board and its operations. I had a meeting further east in Ontario on this particular day and found that I could use these hours for this purpose. I dropped into this

very interesting and commendable achievement of a group of Ontario producers, the cheese marketing board, visited their refrigeration areas, saw some of the millions of pounds of cheese that have been bought on their exchange, brought from many parts of the province and are in storage there until they can be shipped out to some future buyer.

In the process of discussing this situation with the people, including some of the executive members of the cheese producers at the present time, I was astounded at the ludicrous situation which we face today. We are constantly being reminded by these critics of the agricultural community, who misrepresent the rural problems—editorials of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, for example—that we are adding to the mountains of surplus butter in this nation. This surplus of butter is both an economic and political problem. We are being reminded of this all the time and yet here, when I discuss the current situation with the cheese producers, I am informed in very emphatic terms, that they are faced with the prospect of a shortage of cheese.

Our domestic consumption is increasing. Last year we did not meet all of the export market we might have filled in Great Britain. At the annual meeting of the cheese producers held recently, they had a spokesman from the trade in Great Britain who said they could absorb—if they had some assurance of continuity of supply—something approaching 30 million more pounds of cheese in Great Britain. The present situation might be summed up in a recent press release that was put out by the Ontario Cheese Producers Marketing Board in which they point out that Canadian cheddar cheese production should be increased from 115 million pounds manufactured in 1962 to at least 140 million pounds during the coming season. So stated H. C. Arnold, chairman of the Ontario cheese producers. It was pointed out that last year they needed 20 million pounds more cheese to fill our export orders, production in Canada decreased by 2.5 million pounds; domestic consumption increased about 12 million pounds, stocks were depleted by 12 million pounds. Canadian cheese consumption is most likely to increase each year, so an additional amount will be required annually. Canada will require 40 per cent more cheese for the domestic market, or nearly 200 million pounds by 1970. The Ontario cheese producers were only able to purchase 17 million pounds of cheese in 1962 for export and this was about half to meet the requirement of the British market.

So there you have summed up the situation, Mr. Chairman, in which we are adding to the mountains of butter, and we have a shortage of cheese, yet both products are made from milk. It would seem to me it should not be beyond human ingenuity, if you had governments that had some desire and willingness to come to grips with this problem, to devise the ways and means that would result in the milk that is to be channelled from the production of butter into the production of cheese—since we have the mountains of butter already in surplus, and we have a growing market for cheese.

Yet what happened? Representations have been made to the federal government to establish—and I think the phraseology used was vague—some sort of a national organization, the equivalent of a national marketing board. I can understand why it would be vague at this stage, because clearly this would have to be developed. It would have to grow. We have had no action from the Tories in Ottawa and from what I have been able to see we have had no action that really comes to grips with the situation from the Tories at Queen's Park. So there was one part of an afternoon's visit.

Having visited the cheese marketing board, and being a rather keen enthusiast for cheddar cheese, and as I had an extra hour or two, I visited the Black Diamond company, which is right off 401 Highway. Now if the situation that I found in an up-to-date review down at the cheese marketing board was ludicrous, it was equally so when you spoke to one of the Canadian manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, the situation, briefly, is this. The big company in Canada today is an American owned and controlled subsidiary, Kraft. Only four per cent of Kraft's worldwide production is in Canada.

The biggest Canadian company is Black Diamond. Yet, Black Diamond has been faced with a quota against exports to the United States. This quota is some 500,000 pounds—a half million pounds. Virtually nothing in terms of what could be if we had an opportunity of developing the market.

They have been going to the government in Ottawa trying to get the government to do something. They have come to the conclusion that for some reason or other they just cannot tune in; somebody else has the ear of the government at Ottawa. It will not listen to them. There have been endless efforts which I want to spell out through reference to documents that have been supplied to me.

I talked to some of the top officials of

Black Diamond and if I ever talked to a group of people who were on the one hand frustrated and on the other hand fighting mad about a situation they had been attempting to come to grips with for ten years, these were the men. They had not been able to get anywhere as far as Ottawa was concerned. They pointed out for example, that four times as much cheese is coming from the United States to Canada as we are exporting. They pointed out that while these quotas limited to half a million pounds were put on some ten years ago, in the interval the Danes and the New Zealanders were allowed to increase their quotas. Yet no increase was given to Canadian cheddar cheese. They pointed out in a statement, which I think has gone out to hon. members of Parliament and others whom they can interest, that when they sought the assistance of our trade commissioner, down in New York, the kind of reaction they got was typified in the reply on one occasion when one of the agents of the trade commissioner replied, "It is not so easy to negotiate, for instance, on cheese alone, when we have lumber, aluminum and other things to haggle over and adjust tariffs, and quotas et cetera".

In other words, to the cheese producers of Ontario, they said: "You are a small cheese; we just cannot bother; you are not important enough in the overall picture." They pointed out that the Ontario cheese producers marketing board, at a meeting on January 3 of this year, passed a resolution. I want it put into the record:

Canada has been unable to increase its exports of mature cheese to the United States.

Whereas Ontario matured, raw milk cheddar cheese does not compete with American cheese in sales or price in the USA.

And whereas the quantity of special cheese imported by Canada from the United States is about four times greater than our exports to the United States.

And whereas the United States with ten times the population of Canada is exporting about four times the amount of cheese to our small market.

And whereas we have an unfavourable trade balance with the United States.

And whereas the federal and the provincial governments are endeavouring to restrict our imports of foreign merchandise.

And whereas the Kennedy administration is advocating freer trade with Europe;

Be it resolved that we request the federal

government (1) to ask the government of the United States to increase the quantities of our cheese that can be shipped to that country or (2) restrict the imports of cheese from the United States.

It was interesting to discover, by way of proof of the co-operation between the trade in Canada, and the farmers as producers, that this resolution was actually sent by the Black Diamond company to an organization called the *Cheese Reporter*, in Madison, Wisconsin—an organization that circulates throughout the whole cheese industry in the United States. It was the Black Diamond company which was spending money and time and effort to get this to the *Cheese Reporter* in the United States. Interestingly enough, back came a copy of a press release which they sent out to the whole of the industry in the United States and which was an incorporation of this resolution plus some of the comments of the company.

Mr. Chairman, I shall go no further into this long tedious, frustrating effort to get some action from the federal government. But then the frustrated officers of this company, trying to build the market, suddenly had their attention captured by the activities of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay). He was holding his marketing opportunities conference.

So on December 21 they thought, "Well, we got nowhere with Ottawa; let's try Queen's Park. The province is apparently going to seek to do the job that the federal government is not doing." Indeed, by the very fact that the provincial government was moving into this field it implied that the federal government had neglected the job.

So on December 21, an official of the company wrote to the hon. Minister as follows:

I have read with interest your marketing opportunities for Canadian industry. While I did not see any mention of the Ontario dairy industry, we personally feel that the opportunities for increased sale of Ontario cheese on the world market is large, and we have met with a good reception for our high-quality products wherever we have been able to make satisfactory distribution.

We are, of course, almost shut out of the American market, and we feel that it is completely unfair, inasmuch as the United States is shipping into Canada approximately four times as much cheese as its quota system allows us to ship to them. Inasmuch as the federal government appears to be disinterested in this, and since it is Ontario cheese that is being

exported to the United States generally, we are wondering if your department would be willing to discuss this.

In our opinion the reason for the reluctance of the federal government to consider any pressure in this matter is due to the fact that in general it relies on the advice of American-controlled firms. Naturally no American-controlled cheese firm is interested in having our Ontario cheese products in the American market, because if we are successfully able to market Ontario cheese under a brand name in the United States, this is a stepping stone for further competition with the handling of American cheese.

The letter goes on, and at the end concludes rather hopefully:

Certainly, if it were possible we would be most happy to come to Toronto and discuss this problem with you.

What was the reaction to that? On December 28, within about a week a letter came from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. It was as follows:

Thank you very much for your letter of December 21 with regard to the marketing of Ontario cheese. This matter comes entirely under the jurisdiction of The Department of Agriculture, and I am taking the liberty of passing your letter on to the hon. W. A. Stewart, Minister of Agriculture, asking him to get in touch with you concerning your query.

So, Mr. Chairman, persistent people that they are, they wrote to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. What was the reply? I do not have a copy of it here now, but the gist of his reply as will be seen in subsequent letters was that this is not a provincial matter, this is a federal matter, and there is a dairy conference being held in Ottawa in the latter part of February, and perhaps they can present their views there.

If I might digress for a moment, Mr. Chairman, we have had from this government the greatest array of political propaganda about their efforts to develop job opportunities in this province. We had an hour the other day launching a great blast of publicity about the efforts of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development through which he has revived, at least temporarily, an industry up at Owen Sound.

Fine, very fine! But here, as I shall point out in letters from this company, you have an opportunity not only to meet the problem of the dairy industry and its surplus but to create job opportunities in the processing of

cheese. As I shall point out, this would provide job opportunities before it is sent to the United States. Yet because apparently this is not the kind of nut they can crack, because there is not a propaganda possibility in this, it is buck-passed from one hon. Minister to the other, and then on to Ottawa, and they let the matter rest, for they have had no further reply.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): If the hon. member would allow me to make one uncontentious comment relating to that—

Mr. MacDonald: I find it difficult to believe that you could do that.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, you can test me out. When that letter was received, I took it up with the hon. Minister of Agriculture and my understanding of the situation was this: The federal government of the United States had imposed a quota upon the entrance of dairy products, cheese particularly, in the United States, because it has a very heavy farm support programme, and it supports their industry there. Now, it is the United States quota which will not let the cheese in. We have no direct negotiations on a provincial basis with the federal government of the United States. If anyone is to lift this quota, it would have to be done on a federal basis.

Mr. MacDonald: I will not deny this.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Let's be perfectly fair.

Mr. MacDonald: Until quite recently, the hon. Minister who has just spoken had a federal running-mate in his own riding, a man who is responsible for this kind of thing. The point that I want to make—and I shall come to it again and put it in the words of the officials of this company—is that they have attempted to get some forthright action from the government at Ottawa in doing something about these quotas.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: That is not our fault, I cannot help that. We have no more influence than you have, which is just about at the bottom.

Mr. MacDonald: If I may reiterate what I have said, both Denmark and New Zealand have been able to negotiate an upwards adjustment in their quotas over the last ten years, and we have not been able to get any changes. Four times as much cheese is coming from the United States into Canada as is going from Canada into the United States. The answer is plain and simple, Mr. Chair-

man. Kraft is the big company in that field. Kraft is an American company. Kraft has the ear of the government at Ottawa. It has the ear of the Tory government now, as it had the ear of the Liberal government when it was in power up until 1957, and this company has successfully lobbied the government at Ottawa to do nothing about it. This is the old-party approach to this issue.

It is a familiar situation, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, I am almost tempted to go off on to a little tub-thumping myself. This is the reason why there is a future for the New Democratic Party in this country. You just listen for a moment, and you might perhaps learn something. The reason why you cannot get a change here is because the Kraft company dominates and it is an American company, and Canadian policy is made to meet the needs of Kraft. Meanwhile Black Diamond and all the other Canadian companies are out in the cold. Of course, the reason why the policy will not be changed under old parties, is because beyond any shadow of doubt—this is what makes politics tick—Kraft is willing to kick into the party slush fund to protect itself. This is the way politics operates. There is no point in howling over it.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Make this speech in Ottawa, not here.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me concede to the hon. Minister that this is a federal responsibility. But I have said to the hon. Minister that he has gotten into the field, and is trying to do something because the federal government has not done the job. In fact, one of the most interesting aspects of provincial government in recent years is the extent to which it has felt it had to move in because of the inadequacy of both the effort and the achievement of the federal government. The thing becomes even more ironic when the two hon. Ministers engaged at the federal and provincial level happen to come from the same riding.

However, just let me try to conclude this, Mr. Chairman, with a final letter from the vice-president of Black Diamond. After he had picked up his newspaper one morning and read some comments on the dinner that the hon. Minister had given in the Royal York Hotel, apparently he could take it no longer, so he wrote to the reporter in the *Globe and Mail* who had written this story, as follows:

We recently read your report on the dinner given by Mr. Macaulay at the Royal York Hotel.

This is dated incidentally, February 21—not too long ago:

We do note that you suggest that Mr. Roberts' speech was unnecessary, but you credit Mr. Macaulay with "E" for effort.

We would like to report on our experiences with Mr. Macaulay. Possibly if we give you the background of the problem you will understand better what we have been attempting to accomplish.

In 1951, the United States government imposed an embargo and then a quota on cheese products from Canada and from some other countries, which at that time limited Canada to exports of approximately 500,000 pounds of cheddar cheese.

Ontario, producing approximately 60 per cent of the cheese produced in Canada then and now, certainly should have an interest in this market, and while over the year we have been promised relief from these quotas, to date nothing has been forthcoming.

At present the United States is shipping into Canada four times as much cheese as we are shipping into the United States. But, even here it has an advantage, because the duty on Canadian cheese going into the States is approximately twice as high as that on American cheese coming into Canada.

With this in mind, the Ontario cheese producers at their annual meeting passed a resolution and we enclose a copy of this resolution together with our letter of February 4 which went to each member of the House of Commons. We also had an interview with a reporter from the Toronto *Daily Star* and we enclose a copy of this article.

We corresponded with an American newspaper, the *Cheese Reporter*, and we enclose a copy of its article dated January 25, and also our letter dated February 12, which was sent to each member of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

If I might just interject here, Mr. Chairman, we had some comment from the hon. Minister that if companies want to get into the market they have to do something about it themselves; they cannot expect government to do it all for them. When he made that comment, I could not help but think of the Black Diamond Company and how little it got from the government and how much it has done. Let me continue the letter:

Now let us go back to Mr. Macaulay and see the support we have had from Mr. Macaulay on this.

On December 21 we wrote him and congratulated him on his report, "Marketing Opportunities for Canadian Industries," and suggested that an increased allocation of Canadian cheese on the American quota system would be beneficial. How beneficial is perhaps demonstrated by the fact that a million pounds more quota, if used for pre-packaged products, would put into the hands of our employees in direct labour approximately \$40,000, and we would need to purchase approximately \$60,000 from Ontario suppliers.

Mr. Macaulay replied to this letter on December 28 and said that it came under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture and on January 15 we had a letter from Mr. William A. Stewart, Minister of Agriculture, who said: "You are possibly already aware that a dairy conference is being held in Ottawa on February 21 and 22 and that might be a good time and place to raise some of the items mentioned in your letter to Mr. Macaulay."

On January 18 we wrote Mr. Stewart advising him as follows: "As you perhaps realize we believe that we are one of the larger if not the largest all-Canadian cheese company and our point of view may be different from that held by foreign controlled cheese companies and it is quite conceivable that we might be excluded."

And then they conclude this way, Mr. Chairman:

To put this thing plainly, to me it has been a matter of passing the buck and we are wondering whether Mr. Macaulay's efforts with other firms have been similar to our experience, because if it has then certainly we think the whole operation is probably better classified as "P" for political effort.

And it is signed by the vice-president of the company.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: And with that, how many friends does he think he has made?

Mr. MacDonald: I think, Mr. Chairman, the obvious comment is that he is not out trying to influence friends, what he is trying to do is to get some action.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: He is trying to make friends in the United States and there is no point in abusing me when I have absolutely no power to deal with this thing.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Does the hon. Minister mean that from now on he is not going to help them because of that letter?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I meant nothing of the kind, I say he is trying to make friends in the United States and he does not make them by abusing them.

Mr. Thomas: But the hon. Minister said—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: But I do not think he makes any that way.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the estimates before this House are the agricultural estimates and I am not going to digress any further.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. member dragged me into this thing.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not going to digress any further than to make this comment and then we will get back to it and deal with the substance. The hon. Minister is putting on a great display of doing something about exports. The hon. Minister has not faced up to the fact that a significant proportion of the industries in the province of Ontario are subsidiaries of the American companies and are forbidden to go into the export market.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I have said so in New York and Chicago and have been applauded for saying so. Now what more am I supposed to do: go out and shoot them?

Mr. MacDonald: Okay! I will tell you.

Mr. Macaulay: The hon. member gives us great, powerful speeches in here, but he never gets out of the country because no one will invite him to hear him on the subject.

Mr. MacDonald: Well now, we are getting really nasty on the subject. Now we are getting peevish and nasty. Mr. Chairman, we will leave this and get back to it when the hon. Minister's estimates come forward. His blood pressure will have returned to normal and then we can smile at each other and deal with the substance of it.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Okay, let us get back to agriculture, shall we?

Mr. MacDonald: Obviously we have struck home.

Mr. Chairman, the basic point here in dealing with the range of farm problems, on which I have focused attention as one illustration of the broader problem, is that agriculture has not got adequate income. Now here I would share completely with the hon. member for Grey South this proposition of the hon. Minister coming in here year after year and

talking about gross income of agriculture. This is nonsense, because agriculture is faced with the cost-price squeeze.

Sure their income has gone up some. Everything has gone up some, but their cost of production has gone up even more. The hon. Minister knows full well that this is the case, and obviously he is skirting around it. But the net result of all this, Mr. Chairman, is that you create this PR problem, the problem of everybody "climbing aboard" the agricultural community because farmers are always looking for some assistance.

The fact of the matter is that the agricultural community in Ontario represents some nine or ten per cent of the province and it is getting something like five per cent of the income. This in a nutshell, is the situation. So if anybody is entitled to a subsidy when you think of all the range of people who get one kind or another of subsidies, from the gold mining companies in the north, through the long list—it is the agricultural community which is entitled to get a subsidy to redress the balance. Then they will be in something of the kind of situation that you have, for example, in Denmark, where 20 per cent of the people are on the farms and they are getting 19 per cent of the income of the nation.

This is what you would call "parity"—the term that is used by the western farmer. But when the government does not really come to grips with this, then they play into the hands of people who spend most of their time browbeating the rural community from the ivory towers of the editorial writers in the city—people who echo the views of big business interests on Bay Street.

Let me cite another of the problems that we have to face here, Mr. Chairman. This is with regard to the milk situation. Now I am not going to review what the hon. member for Grey South has been talking about—the warning of the hon. Minister a year ago that the four groups in the dairy industry must get together and come up with some sort of a solution because if they did not there would be chaos. Well, we certainly got chaos.

Here I do differ a little from the hon. member for Grey South. In the course of his comments—and I jotted it down—he said "the government has a role to play," and "surely you have a solution in mind," and should be giving a lead with that solution, and he referred to the hon. Minister's "magnificent indifference."

Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that that is not what happened at all. What happened

was that a provisional committee was established of the four different groups in the dairy industry and behind the scenes this government had a policy. Behind the scenes this government, through officials that were working very closely with this provisional committee, was making certain that its policy was accepted. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this statement without any fear of contradiction from the hon. Minister, even though he has attempted it in the past, that the proposal that ultimately emerged from that provisional committee was the proposal that this government wanted.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, no!

Mr. MacDonald: I am rather interested that his protest this time was no less as violent as his protest last time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Does the hon. member want me to make it violent?

Mr. MacDonald: No, but I will tell the hon. Minister this: I have talked to people in all four of the groups after the hon. Minister made his comment; for example, at the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. He observed that some people were playing politics in it. I have not found anybody who will deny the very ingenious and subtle way in which The Department of Agriculture has worked through farm organizations for years. What happened in the prolonged negotiations of this provincial marketing board was that the plan that was presented to the farmers—and blew up in the face of the government, was a plan that was acceptable to, indeed directed by, this government.

So if the hon. Minister has chaos, he has got chaos because of his own plan and its unacceptability.

Mr. Chairman, this brings me to one of the fundamental points that I want to present to the hon. Minister. I am not suggesting for a moment that part of the problem in the instance of the dairy industry was not the conflict between the vested interests of four groups who were trying to come together. I am not suggesting that this conflict did not play something of a role in the situation. But what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the difficulties were compounded by the fact that this government once again, in the instance of the effort to get a milk marketing plan, has not clarified its thinking on the nature of a marketing plan, whether it is going to be a producer marketing plan or whether it is going to be a government marketing plan.

Now without threshing an awful lot of old straw, Mr. Chairman, we are right back to the hog marketing battle, we are right back to Bill No. 86. We are right back to the basic fact that for 20 years the farmers of this province have been fighting to achieve effective collective bargaining machinery for selling their products.

As long as their collective bargaining machinery was not a real threat to the trade they got away with it. Once they got into a position where they really got some control of the trade, where they were upsetting the status quo of the marketplace, then this government intervened. Because when the government had to make a choice between, for example, the packers and the hog producers, they chose the packers and they brought in Bill No. 86 which, in effect, destroyed producer-controlled marketing in this province. Every marketing plan has now to operate under the dictates and with the day-to-day supervision of the Ontario farm products marketing board.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It gave us the finest hog marketing programme in Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: Related to it, Mr. Chairman, are a couple of other points which I think are mistaken. For example, we have had the hon. Minister come into the House a number of times—and here we find that the Liberals apparently agree with him—and tell us that when you are attempting to work out a marketing plan the trade should be involved in the efforts.

For example, the hon. member for Oxford, the other day when the hon. Minister indicated appointment of these inter-provincial milk marketing committees that are going to be established, one in Quebec and one in Ontario and then come together as an inter-provincial committee, he was glad to see that the dairies were going to be involved in it.

Mr. Whicher: They should be involved in it.

Mr. MacDonald: All that comment has done is confirm that I have made my point very accurately—the dairyman from Wiarton has underlined it.

Mr. Innes: You have never had to produce milk—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh yes I have. I grew up on a farm where it was produced.

Mr. Chairman, the basic point I want to make here is this. The farmers of Ontario

are attempting to build effective bargaining machinery and no group of producers, whether they be trade unionists who work with their hands or farmers who produce products, can build effective collective bargaining machinery if, involved in this effort, are the people with whom they are eventually going to bargain.

Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, the result is a company union. If you try to work out a marketing scheme with the dairies sitting in, this is the equivalent of a group of workers attempting to sit down and build a union when, sitting right with them, is the management with which ultimately they are going to have to negotiate. This is typical of the kind of fuzzy thinking that leads the hon. leader of the Opposition to talk about labour-management committees when in many instances we have not even unions that can play a part in labour-management committees.

Mr. Chairman, if I may put this in solid academic terms that will be completely unprovocative and in the terminology of a very great Canadian. I am referring to John Kenneth Galbraith, a graduate of our own OAC, now an American citizen who has reached distinction in many fields, including his present as American ambassador to India. In his famous book, basic book, even more basic than "The Affluent Society", namely, "American Capitalism", he outlined his thesis of countervailing power.

He says: "When anywhere in the course of producing, processing or distributing of particular products one or a few firms first succeed in establishing a strong market position, they may be considered to be the possessors of what he describes as original market power." They are the people who dominate the marketplace.

His argument is that countervailing power invades such positions of strength, whether they be held by suppliers or customers and redresses the position of the weaker group. In other words, trade unions come in to challenge the original power of a company, farmers' marketing schemes, come in to challenge the original power of the processing company.

Then Galbraith addressed himself to what is the role of the government in this kind of a situation. His comment is this, to be found on page 138 of the revised edition:

The role to be followed by government is in principle a clear one. There can be very good reason for attacking positions of original market power in the economy if

these are not effectively offset by countervailing power. There is at least a theoretical justification for opposing all positions of market power. There is no justification for attacking positions of countervailing power which leaves positions of original market power untouched.

Translated into terms of the current battle, it means that if a trade union is trying to establish itself as a countervailing power to the established power of a company, then it is certainly not the role of government to frustrate the efforts of the union to get established. This, of course, is what a Tory government does all the time.

Similarly, when the farmers attempt to build a countervailing power through a marketing scheme to cope with the original power—whether it be the packers, the tobacco companies, or what you will—it certainly is not the function of the government to step in and try to frustrate the efforts to build an effective countervailing power. Yet this is what this government did.

Indeed, when they got to the point where these producer-controlled marketing schemes were going to be in a position to wield effective countervailing power and upset the status quo of the marketplace, then what this present government did was to step in with Bill No. 86.

As a result they have destroyed producer-controlled marketing and established government-controlled marketing.

Mr. Chairman, I now come to the final point that I want to make in dealing with basics on farm problems at the moment, and this is the role of the Ontario farm marketing board. I dealt with this last year and I am not going to go into the full details of it again today, but merely in relationship to what I have just been talking about.

I think the position of the Ontario farm marketing board is becoming an increasingly invidious one because, if I may go again to an authority on the picture, in his report on the milk industry back in 1948, Mr. Justice Wells made this comment,

In my view it is quite impossible to fairly combine the powers of bureaucratic administration with those of a judicial nature in the same person with any hope of dealing impartially with a subject's rights.

Now what in effect he was saying, Mr. Chairman, was this: that it is impossible for one agency to exercise administrative powers and judicial powers, and at the same time protect the individual's rights. I want to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is

precisely what is happening in the province of Ontario at the present time.

The Ontario farm marketing board has ceased to become a quasi-judicial body. On occasion it meets to fulfill this function, but the Ontario farm marketing board today is an administrative agency of this government.

It is not a criticism of the men on the board to say that they are the servants of the policy of this government. Therefore it is idle for this government to think that this group of men can be the servants of the policy of this government in an administrative way; going around the province, indeed even adding to their staff to intensify their going around the province; and then expect the same people who have been intervening in the battle, to deliberate on a case before them—to become quasi-judicial people on the board and render a completely impartial decision. In the words of Mr. Justice Wells, this is an impossible kind of achievement.

Mr. Chairman, I draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture the comment of the hon. Attorney-General when he had his department's estimates before the House just two or three days ago. He was referring to another similar body in the province of Ontario, namely the Ontario Securities Commission—and coming in as a new broom that is going to sweep clean in The Attorney-General's Department, listed five things that he was going to do with the OSC. One of them was that he was going to separate its administrative and judicial functions.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is elementary. I make the plea once again that if this government wants—and unfortunately I am not persuaded that they want—to establish producer-controlled marketing and give farmers the right to get into the marketplace and to build their own collective bargaining agencies, then this government has to do something about the invidious position in which the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board is at the present time.

They of course also have to do a lot of amending of The Farm Products Marketing Act because of what they introduced in it through Bill No. 86.

Only when they have done that, will they have given to the farmers the genuine power to go out and help themselves. Only when they have done that will they have cleared the decks so that the farmers can help themselves to a greater extent and remove the necessity of having to come back to get the assistance of government to redress the imbalance between ten per cent of the people

who are only getting five per cent of the wealth of this province.

I submit this to the hon. Minister—it may not be a good political issue because I do not know how much interest there is in this out in the hustings—but I submit this to the hon. Minister as evidence of what I am convinced are fundamentally mistaken conceptions upon which this government is operating at the present time. Until they are willing to face up to it they are going to be compounding the difficulties faced by agriculture instead of helping to solve them.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 101:

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, on vote 101, mention was made of the gross farm income of last year. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what the net farm income was in Ontario?

An article from the *Free Press* in December states that:

Canada fared the worst among countries where farmers' net incomes fell last year, United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization annual review reported yesterday.

The fall was 24 per cent. It brought net farm income in Canada in 1961 to the lowest level since 1945. Farmers' cash incomes, however, rose because of the sales from previous years' stocks as reported.

In Britain, Australia, Italy, United States, France, Greece, and Poland net farm incomes went up by nine per cent in 1961-62. In Japan the increase was seven per cent, in Yugoslavia and Norway five per cent, Germany, Switzerland and Belgium had a net farm income increase of two to three per cent.

I would like to know what the hon. Minister has on the net farm income in Ontario last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously there is no pat answer to that question and the hon. member for Oxford knows that.

Mr. Whicher: You have the gross?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have the gross, yes. But the net farm income is something that is just as variable as the number of farms that exist in the province of Ontario today.

Mr. Whicher: So is the gross.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The gross income can be determined by the income from each

commodity marketed, but what the net income is in direct relation to the costs of the farmer involved, and I think that my hon. friend the dairyman from Bruce, Mr. Chairman, would be the first to recognize that even within his business there can be differences in net returns to the proprietor, or to the shareholder, this is a standard fact.

I think it is only fair to say that we have recognized the fact that there is certainly a squeeze on the net farm income of Ontario farmers, this is why this government has attempted to do the things it is now doing and will continue to do to assist the farmers who have this very squeeze on their net income.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Minister, might I ask you, if the other countries can find out the net income, might I suggest it might be wise to send some of your department out there and find out how they do it, so we can do it here too. I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Then you criticize us for spending money.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Not for useful spending.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, on vote 106. We have a statistics branch for The Department of Agriculture. It seems to me that we should be able within reason to find out what the average net income of the farmers of the province of Ontario is.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is no such figure of which I know.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Do you know whether anybody has made any effort to compute the net income of the farming community in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is dealt with through various organizations. I can think of those groups that have done cost studies of one kind or another. But here again, one group of farmers, we will say in beef production, may show a very appreciable net income, while at the same time farmers in the same commodity of beef production might show a substantial loss. I think it is exceedingly difficult to determine what the net farm income of a certain group of commodity producers might be.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that the hon. Minister has made several unusual statements. Certainly—as the hon.

member to my left points out—the same variables go in many respects into gross income. This has become a science and certainly there are those who are schooled in economics and statistics who are quite competent to make these computations. I think that it is quite inaccurate to suggest that the science of the determination of the net income for the farming community is any more difficult to compute than the net income of any other portion of our population.

While I will agree, sir, that it may be that you could shoot down any set of statistics that are brought forward, I would suggest that the very presentation of the hon. member who is advising you now and to your left is premised on the presumption that science and statistics and economics have developed to the point where you can intelligibly and accurately and for good reason estimate these things. I think that the farming community net income can be just as accurately estimated as any other income in the community.

I think that you are being either naive or attempting to avoid this particular issue when you suggest that answer is not available to you. It is available to other responsible bodies that are interested in the farming community. I have heard it mentioned and used many times. I think the other countries have it. I think the Ontario Federation of Agriculture has estimated and other responsible—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Estimated, yes.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, of course, it is an estimate! Even your gross income is an estimate, my dear man.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister without Portfolio): A different thing altogether!

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now we have got the great businessman from Frontenac-Addington.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, it is your look-out, you are not a businessman.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Let me tell you this: How would you estimate gross income?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Now, let us hear how you would estimate gross income, for the farmer, for instance.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Yes, I certainly will!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: He would not get excited the way you are getting excited and

agitated now. You would sit down, sir, very quietly and you would make a determination of all those things that go into gross income. I suggest to you on your farm if you were to sell a tractor to a stranger, there is no way of estimating, there is no total that you can use to determine that.

Sure, you can estimate and you can accurately determine your total week's sales, your total produce sales that go into known markets, but your private sales are estimable or are estimates only. You can shoot down gross sales or gross income just as accurately as you can shoot down net.

The simple fact is that it is politically embarrassing for you to tell us what net income is and there is no other reason whatsoever for avoiding this issue. It is just as calculable a figure in determination as gross income.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, how do you determine the income tax of these farmers? Is there no way of getting this?

When I look at the statistics branch and see that there is \$349,600 being spent for the statistics on farmers in the province of Ontario, it seems to me we should know what the net income is. While I am standing on my feet, a few minutes ago you suggested you took the credit for the high gross income; will you now take the credit for the low net income for the people in the province?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 101 carried.

Mr. Whicher: Just a minute, we are going to get some answers here right now. You are a highly paid Minister over there. We want to know what the net income of the farmers, the average farmer, in the province of Ontario, is? If you do not know, you should move over and let somebody else give it to us.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I think I have made a reasonable explanation—

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister of Economics and Development knows it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If my hon. friend from Bruce will only contain himself for a moment or two, we shall attempt to suggest that the object of this government is today, and always has been, to get the gross income of Ontario farmers as high as possible.

We believe, and I think you would be the first to agree, that free enterprise prevails in Ontario agriculture as it does in every other industry in this province, and that it depends on the initiative and the managerial ability of the individual farmer which contributes in

no small way to the net profit realized on each individual farm. This is why I attempted to explain, and my hon. friend from Bruce has these figures available in his own riding.

Mr. Whicher: Right. Why do you not have it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have those figures, and I can get them for you, my hon. friend. It is not necessary to have every figure for every farmer in the province of Ontario and you know that. We can tell you that there is this variance between the farmers in any given category and this applies right across the counties.

Mr. Oliver: What difference does that make?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I think there is no absolute way of determining. You can average it if you wish, but that really is not the answer.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, how do they do it in the other countries? You have travelled half way around the world trying to find out what was going on agriculturally. Let us know what is going on in Denmark, for example.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is something that I cannot possibly answer—how it is done in the other countries. This I could not say. We can take this under advisement.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, the fact is this, that the future of the agricultural industry in the province of Ontario is very dim indeed. For years, this government has been trying to let all people, including the farmers themselves, live in the feeling and the belief that they are enjoying the greatest fruits of this life. Now, the brutal truth is, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers of the province of Ontario for many years have not been getting their fair share of the economic progress in this province; it would be politically embarrassing for the hon. Minister of Agriculture this afternoon to stand up and tell us the small pittance the farmers of this province are getting as far as their net income is concerned. Politically embarrassing.

A young farmer today, with an investment of \$25,000 or \$30,000, to buy a farm, to equip it, and put stock on it, is going to have to work twice as hard as any other man in the province in Ontario to make ends meet.

When you, over there, take the credit for the good things of this life, then I say to you, you must accept the responsibilities. Be quite truthful and tell us the farmers are not

doing well in Ontario at all. If you take the credit for the things that are good, then you must accept the responsibility and admit that you made a mighty poor job.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I must say I have been amazed at the answers the hon. Minister has been giving—or has not been giving—on this question. It is a strange state of affairs when a department spends somewhat more than \$18 million, ostensibly in support of agriculture in this province, and professes to tell this House it is unable to produce what I think would be the key figure. There are many statistics that are important, but surely the figure of net income is of basic importance. I do not know how the government can make determinations for its own information if it does not have that sort of figure.

The hon. Minister says that there are problems involved in producing figures on net income. There are problems involved in producing almost any kind of statistics, but there are certainly a great many statisticians in this country who could solve the problems for him and could produce reliable estimates as to the net income of farmers in this province. That certainly is far from an insuperable statistical problem. I can think of a good many more difficult ones that are being dealt with by government agencies, certainly in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, right now.

I would make one elementary suggestion to him. His department being an agency of government has certain resources at its disposal that private groups do not have, and I have no doubt in the world that they could make an arrangement, perhaps through the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, whereby they could get access to income tax returns from farmers in this province. With modern business machines it is not by any means an insuperable problem to process those income tax returns to find what the declared income tax of farmers for tax purposes is in this province that would give the Minister at least a first approximation to a figure on net farm income.

There are other ways, no doubt, in which the matter could be approached. It certainly is too much for the hon. Minister to come before this House and say that it is difficult to produce a figure on net farm income and, therefore, his department, which is spending nearly \$19 million, is not going to be bothered with this difficult problem, even though the figure to be produced is one of the utmost significance, and one on which both the government and the Legislature should be informed.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to give up on this. If the hon. Minister cannot give us the figures that he should be able to give us this afternoon, the only thing I am going to have to do is ask somebody who, I believe, can give us the figures. I am going to ask the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, Mr. Chairman, whose job it is, to look after the economics of Ontario. I am going to ask him this minute I cannot get an answer from the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, so I have to ask somebody who knows what is going on around here. My question is to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. What is the net income for the average farmer in the province of Ontario today?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: I am sure that I will be able to give the hon. member the answer to that question when my estimates come up. But whether the figure will be useful or not is another matter.

Mr. Whicher: In other words, you will admit you have statistics, that he is incapable of producing them. You have them, and he has not.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend would contain himself for a moment or two, I will suggest to him that his story this afternoon is indeed confusing. First of all I would like to say, I will back this up in a moment, that the statistics obtained from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics under gross income of Ontario agriculture have been available since they were compiled. The statistics from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, on net income of Ontario farmers, or any farmers in Canada, have not yet been released. When they are released we will be able to deal with them. I have not got last year's figures here.

Mr. Whicher: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I told you, the 1962 figures were the ones quoted this afternoon.

Mr. Whicher: Those were the gross.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Those were the gross figures which I quoted, and I have just told you that the net figures for 1962 are not yet released. I have not got them. Do you want to change your question to something else? I think it is indeed enlightening to know that our hon. friend from Bruce is suggesting that there are many things we should be doing to increase the income of the Ontario farmers. I want to read you a letter that

appeared in the *Warton Echo*, over his signature.

Mr. Whicher: It has been read here before.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will read it again, and I think it is indicative of which side of your mouth you are really talking out of. This is the letter:

Dear Sir:

Inasmuch as I feel that the public of Warton and area deserves some explanation for the increase in milk prices going into effect all over the province today, I wish to give the following information to you. All dairies in the province recently got the following letter from the Milk Industry Board of Ontario, dated October 4th.

"Please take note, that in each market covered by a collective bargaining agreement or board award, which provides for a basic price to be paid to producers, based in accordance with the terms of the formula, there will be, in the formula, an increase of 19 cents per hundred pounds, in payment of milk, on and after November 1, 1962. Signed by C. M. Meeke, Director of the Fluid Milk Division."

The letter continues:

I have shown this letter to several people and without exception they have suggested that I let it become public knowledge. The fact is, that this is one of the most dictatorial orders that is possible for any industry to receive and gives that same industry no chance of bargaining whatsoever. Under these circumstances, I felt that your readers should have some explanation and hence this letter. Yours very sincerely, Ross Whicher, The Warton Dairy.

Mr. Whicher: What I said there was truthful, everything. The hon. Minister messed it up the same way he is messing things up this afternoon. I got that letter the day after it was to come into effect.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This letter that I have read to the hon. member, that he is quoted from here, is dated October 4, and the formula increase in the price of milk was not to take place until November 1.

Mr. Whicher: That is not true.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is true.

Mr. Whicher: How did I get the notification a month before it came into effect, be-

cause we got the notification that it was to be cut off the day after it was to take effect.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member is talking about two different things.

Mr. Whicher: The hon. Minister is all mixed up.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I am not mixed up, because this letter appeared under date of November 1 in the *Warton paper*. There is the whole story. Now, if the hon. member is so keen on this business of increasing the farmers' net income, why then did he go out and print this letter and say he had no choice but to do this?

Mr. Whicher: We had no choice whatsoever, Mr. Chairman. My point was this: Why should we get a letter from the dairy industry in the province of Ontario, saying that as of tomorrow there should be a 19-cent increase? Why should we not be able to bargain? Maybe there should be a 25-cent increase. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister saying he is interested in the net income, was the one who cut them off and did not give them one red cent increase. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister this afternoon said that he does not know what the net income is. He does not know whether they should get 19 cents more or 25 cents more or 10 cents more. But one thing is sure, Mr. Chairman, and every farmer in this province knows that the hon. Minister did not give them one cent increase. He cut them off just like that.

Now, the hon. Minister should read a couple more letters while he is at it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not going to read any more. I just want to straighten the hon. member out on the dates in this letter, because he does not know what is in his own letter. This letter came to the hon. member on October 4, and he sent it to the editor under date of November 1. Now, what is the hon. member talking about?

Mr. Whicher: I cannot recollect the dates. One thing is sure; the letter was exactly as I stated, it was completely dictatorial. It said that we must give a 19-cent increase as of a certain date without any chance of bargaining whatsoever. We pay a substantially higher rate, I believe higher, perhaps, than in any other area in the whole province of Ontario, but perhaps there should have been a 25-cent increase, but the Milk Control Board comes along and says that we must pay 19 cents, without any chance of discussion whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I was quite willing to discuss this and I am, at any time, but the hon. Minister of Agriculture, was not willing to discuss it with the farmers at all. He said after sending this letter and getting the dairy industry into the greatest confusion imaginable—where they had spent probably a million dollars in advertising—that the price of milk must go up as of tomorrow. That very night, after the ads were all in the papers, this great department of the government that we have telling what is going on in the province of Ontario today, after all the ads were issued—issued a telegram—that the price increase was not to go into effect.

Talk about a department of confusion. Over there we have the master of it, and when it all boils down, Mr. Chairman, after he said that the farmers deserved this 19-cent increase, he did not give it to them. They could not come in and talk to him at all. He said: "I admit that I am confused," and I have made a mistake and the 19 cents increase is cut off.

Mr. L. Reilly (Eglinton): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know where this comes under 101, I cannot follow it. I cannot find it under 101, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, the point is that the hon. Minister's salary is in vote 101, and I have said by not presenting the statistics this afternoon and giving us the net income, that he is really not worthy of that salary.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, I want to, as nicely as I can, thank the hon. Minister of Economics and Development for telling us that he will let us know what the net income of the farmers of Ontario is when he brings in his estimates, which I hope, Mr. Chairman, will be in the very near future so we know what is going on in the agricultural world.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I think we have seen the most flagrant display of ignorance that I have ever seen in all my life, this afternoon from the hon. member for Bruce and I attribute it entirely to him. As an hon. member of the Legislature and as a dairyman himself, he should be the first to realize in the province of Ontario as a processor-distributor, that this statement that has come out from the Milk Control Board leaves every opportunity for negotiation of a price either higher or lower.

Mr. Whicher: Well, why was it cut off?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now, just wait a minute until I get through. This went out on October 4. On October 4 this notice went out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I must ask the members to give the speaker a chance and you will all have a chance.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Between the dates of October 4 and November 1, indeed before the end of October, the milk markets across the province of Ontario had indeed met, and 31 of them agreed among themselves and had made application to the milk industry board that they did not wish to accept the 19 cents increase themselves. We had representations made to us by farmers and leaders in the dairy industry in this province suggesting that this increase should not be dealt with on the basis of the 19-cent formula increase, but that it should be suspended in order that they have a chance to examine all of the factors involved. This was adhered to. But the hon. member knows or he should know very well that all the milk price formula is, is an indication of cost factors that are made up of various indices that indicated a 19-cent increase was—

Mr. Whicher: Why was it cut off then?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was not cut off, it was only suspended and is today back in operation. It was only suspended after we were asked to do it. And I think it is time it was put on the records of the House.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Why did the price of bread go up?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, I have nothing to do with the price of bread, nothing to do with the price of bread.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? Who asked him to suspend it?

Several hon. members: The Premier. The Premier.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, sir, it was not. I think I am capable of answering the questions without help from my hon. friends.

An hon. member: Some doubt about that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, there could be. We were asked to suspend this formula in order that the dairy industry might take a

look at it by representatives of the whole milk league. This is who asked us. There is nothing secret about this whatever.

Mr. MacDonald: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that at the time of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture convention I put that question to somebody in the whole milk league in the province of Ontario—and I will not name him—who said that there had been no representation to the government. The hon. Minister did not get any representation from the whole milk league at all. I will tell him what happened once again. There was some discussion of the issue in the executive of the whole milk league, but there was no decision by it. Then this government with its friends—the people who are more Tory than they are farmers—there are two kinds of farmers, those who farm and those who farm the farmers, and sometimes the Tories are in the latter category—moved into action. But there was no official request from the whole milk league for this to be done. It was a request by the process of what I describe as “political mental telepathy”, from the hon. Minister’s friends in the farm organization. He had no request from the whole milk league, and I defy the hon. Minister to get up and deny that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I had no official request from the whole milk league, but I had representations from farmers across the province and from people who are executives of the whole milk league.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would just say this: It is all very well for the hon. Minister to go in and to speak to whom he chooses to speak to, or to listen to those he chooses to listen to, but I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. Minister is going to indulge in this kind of an arbitrary act, he should at least pay minimum courtesy by speaking officially to the body as an executive, and not just listen to those whom he wants to listen to. The hon. Minister has, in effect, confirmed that you had no official communication from him and that is the fact.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence I would like to put the record straight on this situation, seeing that we are talking about the milk situation. I thought we would leave it for a later vote, but however the—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think we are all responsible for this and we got into vote 104 before we got there, but could we leave it now and get back to 101. Let us have a good kick at the

can when we get to 104 but let us wait until we get there. Now, everybody has had a run at it but let us wait until we get there.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence, I would like to put the record straight on the Toronto Whole Milk Producers League. I would like to give you a statement from one of the directors, Mr. Albert McLellan, director of the Toronto Whole Milk Producers Board.

This is news and a surprise to me. At a meeting in Toronto on Monday there was no indication at all. Productions are definitely rising and the farmers will be disappointed. Last year at this time we turned down a similar increase but even since then the cost-of-living index according to our formula has gone up 19 points. Maybe with the increase the sales would go down a bit but we should abide by the formula. What this last move means is simply that the formula is to be discarded, for the Premier—and I say this and I underline it—for the Premier seems to be saying that this fair system which has worked for a number of years is no longer of any value. But the farmers have been looking forward to this even a month ago. A moratorium would have been different.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did not want to cut off the hon. member and now he has made his statement. Now, let us go on with 101, could we, please?

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on this?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer a question—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am going to answer a question which the hon. member for Bruce asked me just a moment ago. He asked me for the net farm income for 1960—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This, I think, is thanks to the fact we have some people in our department who went and got the figures and brought them over. I did not tell you I would not give you the figures, I told you I had them but I did not have them here. Here it is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The date on the letter is February 25, 1963. It arrived today in our

office. And this is the figure for 1960: \$869,285,000 was the farm cash income in Ontario in 1960. In 1961 it went up to \$890,065,000—this is cash farm income over and above all other—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, in regards to this net income in discussion, I have an article here of February 11, 1963, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa, saying, "More farms in Canada earn \$1,200 a year." That is from Ottawa.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister on No. 6, farm labour service. I notice where salaries are \$5,500 and the maintenance is \$18,000. Could we have an explanation of that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am sorry, I did not understand your question, sir. Mr. Chairman, what has happened here is that Ottawa pays 50 per cent of the cost of the farm labour service operation in the province of Ontario. That is why one appears out of relation to the other.

Mr. Worton: That would still make the salaries considerably less than what the maintenance of it would be, would it not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, well, that could be. The salaries here are involved with the administrative details, as I understand it correctly, with the tobacco labour camp that was established in the Oxford county area. The maintenance here, I believe, has to do with the provision of meals and services for the time that the camp was in existence.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this is not in reference to any specific issue under 4 there, but does the hon. Minister of Agriculture or any other department, if I may make it all-inclusive, make a grant to the Canadian National Exhibition?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, we make a grant to the Canadian National Exhibition.

Mr. MacDonald: Not the Royal; the CNE. I know the Royal gets—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, \$2,500. \$2,500 is what we make to the CNE as far as I know.

Mr. MacDonald: What is that for?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it is the same amount of grant we give to the CNE that goes to Ottawa and London.

Mr. MacDonald: \$2,500? That must help their budget!

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, the next item I would like a question on, item 7, automobile insurance \$20,000.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What does the hon. member want to know?

Mr. Worton: What I want to know, sir, is that in none of the other departments have I seen this figure show up, and I was just wondering how the rest of the automobiles of the government are insured.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the automobiles as far as The Department of Agriculture is concerned are insured through The Department of Highways on a blanket coverage plan.

An hon. member: And this is your share, is it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is our share of the cost, yes. This is what we pay for the fleet that we have in The Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Whicher: How many cars have you got?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is 186 cars.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Could I ask a supplementary question to that, sir? Who is this placed with and how do you decide who it is going to be placed with?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What did you say, sir?

Mr. Thompson: I wondered who this insurance was placed with and how you decide which company it is going to be placed with.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We do not place the insurance. We turn it over to The Department of Highways who handle the placing of insurance.

Mr. Thompson: You have no idea how it decides to place it?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: We can deal with that in The Department of Highways estimates.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, the agriculture economic research grant of \$7,500. Could the hon. Minister outline to us what that is?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This economics research council is one that is established for across Canada. It is set up on a regional basis

similar to—and I believe on exactly the same zoning as—the dairy council that I mentioned earlier this afternoon. Our share from the province of Ontario is \$7,500 toward the overall cost of the administration of the research council.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, are we still talking about automobile insurance, because I notice in the public accounts for the year ending March 31, 1962, you have this figure of \$20,000, and then you have expended only some 300-and-some dollars out of the \$20,000. What is the explanation for that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I am told that when The Department of Highways took over the provision of insurance for The Department of Agriculture the year began as of April 1 and we did not pay. The Highways had paid it previously. This is really what happened, and now it is charged to The Department of Agriculture instead of to The Department of Highways.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned the fact that they had purchased approximately 180 vehicles. What is the department's policy concerning the purchase of vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The Department of Agriculture purchases the vehicles on tendered call. Most of our vehicles are out through the province—through the ag-rep service, our extension field men, our dairy-branch field men and extension workers. Now, we call for tenders from the dealers in the areas in which the car will be used, generally speaking.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may make one observation. This is the third department that I have asked this question of, and now I find that there are three different policies concerning the purchase of automotive vehicles. I think it is time that this government should set one policy for all purchases of vehicles.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, with respect to the grant of \$50,000 to the Royal Winter Fair, what part does the department play in the administration of that fair? Surely some direction goes along with the money?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would think that representing this investment at the Royal Winter Fair is the fact that we carry on a very extensive 4-H programme there. To me it is the culmination of the 4-H programme

in the province of Ontario as far as beef cattle are concerned.

We have there the Queen's Guineas class, and I think that anyone who has attended the Royal Winter Fair will recognize that that is generally considered to be the highlight. The interest that is exhibited there by the thousands of people who come from all over the province of Ontario to see what The Department of Agriculture, the 4-H clubs and the beef-cattle industry are doing, in my mind, is phenomenal. Indeed, my hon. friend, the new member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) at one time was the winner of the Queen's Guineas class at the Royal Winter Fair. Certainly we commend and congratulate anyone who has ever won that high honour.

Our representation also includes the judging competitions that our junior farmers participate in, from across the length and breadth of the province. Every county has a judging team that goes to the Royal Winter Fair. While this may not represent a significant number of young people, it does represent a great number of young people who take part in the original judging competitions that take place in the counties and districts from which these young people are chosen. Then we have the various green clubs, and the 4-H clubs that come in as club contests for judging purposes as well. Along with that, our assistant deputy Minister, Mr. W. P. Watson, is on the executive committee of the Royal Winter Fair, we feel that while this does represent a sizeable amount of money it does to my way of thinking keep Ontario in the forefront. After all, we in Ontario stand to profit more from the activities of the Royal Winter Fair than any other province in Canada. To my way of thinking, it keeps the emphasis on the show-window of Canadian agriculture in Ontario.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, on vote 9. Recently Mr. Sparrow, chairman of the workmen's compensation board, in a speech at London mentioned that he felt all farmers in the province of Ontario should have workmen's compensation. While I agree that this is a very fine statement, you will realize that the rates currently for farmers are very very high and almost forbid this. Would the hon. Minister like to make a statement with regard to workmen's compensation and how it could be implemented to take care of all the farmers in the province?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The workmen's compensation board under item 9 in this vote, refers to employees of The Department of Agriculture that are being covered. As any

general statement as regards workmen's compensation for Ontario farm people is concerned—is this what you want?

Mr. Innes: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I feel as do many farm people that workmen's compensation is an essential for our farm people in this province. I would like to see every farmer carry it.

Mr. MacDonald: What is your policy to make this possible?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would suggest that we cannot do anything more with this than we can with any other type of industrial activity as far as the workmen's compensation board is concerned. We have discussed these matters with the various farm organizations. We all recognize the necessity for workmen's compensation, but we also recognize the fact that it is available to any farmer who wants to use it. I carry it myself in my own farm and I am sure that a great many other farmers do, too. But how can you force farmers to buy something that is available to them today if they do not want to buy it? This is what really counts as far as I am concerned.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): What I have to say here is along the lines of what the previous speaker has mentioned.

Some time in the past I asked the hon. Minister to help me with a problem which was a federal problem. This he did, again I say this is a federal matter, and I realize that before I ask the question. But, I would hope that the hon. Minister would have some views in this matter. It concerns unemployment insurance.

In my area, we have fruit and vegetable growers, and they are concerned with the turnovers of employees in the summertime. They would like to have their employees placed under The Unemployment Insurance Act. They feel that by having employees under the Act, that they could keep their employees for a long time and there would not be such a turnover. Furthermore, in the winter, some of these employees that were employed for eight or nine months of the year would be drawing unemployment insurance. They realize it is a federal matter but they have brought it to my attention, and I would like to know what is the feeling of the hon. Minister on this. I would also like to know whether there is any possibility of having a change in legislation to that effect. I realize it is a federal matter, I do realize this.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the hon. member has said that this is a federal matter, and indeed it is not our problem to change and correct. These, the fruit and vegetable people, have mentioned this to us that they feel it would be in their interest to have unemployment insurance for farm labour, and, frankly, I can see many advantages to this. But, on the other hand, I think we have to recognize that there are many farmers who perhaps do not feel quite that way about it.

I have no other statement than that to make. I know it is something that is of concern and interest, but that is about as far as I can go.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Would the hon. Minister amplify No. 10? This refers to the purchase, at least the fund for the purchase, of livestock for feeding research. Is that in addition to the livestock that you already have at your experimental farms? What type of livestock is involved, what are the areas in which this research is carried out and is it your own director of research that you refer to?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the hon. member has raised this question. This, I think, is one of the major steps forward. As far as research along the beef cattle industry is concerned, I have referred earlier this afternoon to a necessity that has been brought to our attention for such types of research. One of the projects of the agricultural research institute in Ontario has been suggested to us as one that might be directed towards nutritional study in livestock feeding relative to the beef industry.

It will be under the direct control of the research institute and the director of research, Dr. Huntley. The purpose is to purchase feeder cattle, on what might be described as a revolving fund basis. This amount of money is set aside and the cattle will be bought and they will be fed on various types of rations under various conditions so that we might determine through research the best method and try to improve the nutritional standards of our feed relative to beef production, and, more particularly, to determine whether or not it is possible to lessen the cost of producing beef per pound. It is a research study right through and through. The cattle will be fed and will be sold on the market when finished and the fund will be recompensed to this extent. Anything that is accruing over and beyond the figure here stated will be returned to the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr. Troy: Sir, will this research be carried out in various sections of the province? For example, will you carry it out under winter conditions in northern Ontario at your experimental farm there?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That question, I am afraid, I cannot answer, Mr. Chairman, because, as I mentioned earlier, this will be under the direction of the research institute and this is comprised of very practical people from across the province of Ontario. I think it is fair to suggest that there would be a considerable amount of this research done at the Ontario Agricultural College where they have the facilities for this type of scientific research.

Mr. Troy: But they have not got the climatic conditions at Guelph. I am sure that those factors should enter into it.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the hon. Minister through you, sir, what the factors were in your making the decision to encourage farmers in this province to grow more feed grain here? What were the factors involved in your decision?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that comes under this vote but I would be very happy to answer the hon. member's question.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I was thinking that it would come under the Ontario Beef Cattle Producers Association because I am referring specifically to that part of the agricultural industry.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: One of the reasons we felt that it was wise to advise the farmers of the province of Ontario in 1962 to increase the production of feed grain was because there had been sustained in western Canada in 1961 a very severe drought. Increased sales of grain beyond our borders and the fact that the scarcity of grain had induced higher prices meant that it was certainly of economic interest to Ontario farmers to grow more of their own grain.

We have been importing, I believe, 28 per cent of our feed grain requirements in the last few years. Frankly, I thought as one interested in the welfare of Ontario farmers that it might be to their best economic interests to increase grain production so that they would have more ample supplies of feed grain on their own farms so that they could feed livestock themselves on their own farms. I think we have to recognize the

fact and this is a long story. But to sum it up in a word there is a very great change going on in the whole economic and agricultural structure of meat production and consumption on the North American continent and where one time our feeder cattle moved east they are now moving south, and where one time great quantities of fed beef moved east it is now moving west and south to those very heavily populated areas of the United States, and, to a lesser degree, western Canada.

This has resulted in the fact that during the last few years there would appear to be a scarcity of red meats developing in eastern Canada and we felt, and certainly this is backed up by the federal authorities at Ottawa, that there is great necessity for Ontario, and particularly eastern Canada, to increase its feed grain production to take care of the growing demand for red meats in this province.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister what prompted him to make these speeches in which he is reported to have urged the Ontario farmer to get into beef in a big way, and that the market looked stable for years to come and "for heaven's sake get into beef". What had my hon. friend in mind when he made those statements?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to answer this question.

Mr. Oliver: I wish you would, I have often wondered about that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is what I would suggest is the reason why I said this, and I do not for one moment apologize or retract in any way. I believe firmly that the long-run interests of the beef industry is one of the brightest spots in Ontario and Canadian agriculture. While my hon. friend has suggested that I have said to the farmers of Ontario "get into the beef business in a big way", I think he is exaggerating this to a certain degree. I have suggested to the farmers of Ontario that it is time they explored the possibilities of increasing feeder cattle production in Ontario.

Mr. Oliver: No, the hon. Minister went further than that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is an entirely different matter, saying get into the beef business in a big way. For many years we have brought in to the province of Ontario up to 185,000 to 250,000 head of feeder cattle from western Canada. This is a great

market for the western farmers. This is fine for them.

But we in Ontario, who are feeders of beef, have to go to western Canada and compete with the western farmer and the western feed lot operator who is next door to the ranch, who is next door to the greatest source of grain that could be found anywhere in the country. On top of that we are in competition with the buyers from the United States who have moved into western Canada and are competing for these feeder cattle.

It is for this reason that I think there are areas in the province of Ontario that do not lend themselves to the intensive type of agriculture, that might be found in certain other areas of Ontario, where we might very well explore the possibility of establishing cow-calf herds that we might produce more of the feeder cattle that are required in the province of Ontario.

That is the extent and that is the purpose behind what I have said in this province.

Mr. Oliver: The hon. Minister's counterpart—I do not know who he is at the moment—he went on the rampage too, you know, and said we have to have more beef, more beef. The hon. Minister echoed the call. Beef was then about 30 cents a pound. The hon. Minister got it all right, it is down to about 24 or 23 now.

I think it was a crazy thing for the hon. Minister to do, really. What he has done, of course, with his clarion call, was to weed some of the people out who have been put out of work by the processor integrators in southwestern Ontario, got them into the beef industry. He got some out of the dairy industry into the beef industry because of the muddle he made of the milk situation. As a result now he has everything in a muddle. I think that is about the size of it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is not what the farmers say.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to return for a moment to this business of workmen's compensation. I think the hon. Minister cannot dismiss the situation by simply saying that you cannot force farmers to take it and therefore nothing more can be done about it. This government has to face up to the fact that at the present time workmen's compensation as far as the farmers are concerned is virtually out of the picture. The last figure that we had—and I am speaking from memory now—before the committee on agriculture last year was something in the range of fewer than 2,000.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Seventeen hundred!

Mr. MacDonald: Seventeen hundred! I think it was down to as low as 1,700. The hon. Minister really is in a vicious circle. There are so few and the premiums are so high, that there will be even fewer. The total is going down and down.

There are one or two ways out of this. Either you can work out with farm organizations some procedure for a form of compulsory enlistment of farmers, or alternatively the government is willing to subsidize it to get the rates down. Conceivably it might be possible to subsidize and get the rates down so that you would get your spiral going up rather than down. If you subsidized them for a number of years perhaps you would make it attractive enough that more farmers would get in and you would have a broad enough basis to make this an economic proposition.

But the only reason I rise, Mr. Chairman, at the moment, is that I think it is idle for the hon. Minister to say that it is there for the farmers if they want it but we cannot force them to take it. The situation has been neglected for so long now that with only 1,700 farmers in the whole of the province taking it, you might as well acknowledge that the thing is out the window and face the fact there needs to be some genuine government leadership in building a new programme to give the farmers coverage in this area.

I do not need to emphasize something that is well known. There are few industries in which the accident rate is higher than it is in the agricultural industry. This is a real problem. Therefore it seems to me that some leadership is required from this government to help farmers to meet this as one of their high costs.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would be inclined to agree with the hon. member that the agricultural industry certainly has a high accident rate. This is one of the reasons why our workmen's compensation board rate is so high. I want to go this far, to say that we have already discussed within our department the possibility of calling together the two major farm organizations in the province of Ontario to sit down with us and their representative. I have suggested that it be the vice-chairman of the workmen's compensation board of Ontario, I believe it is Mr. Cauley; that we might sit down with them and discuss the very points that the hon. member has raised.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have to appreciate the fact there are so many hours in the day and so many days in the week and this is one of the problems with which I feel we must deal. We will take a look at this and see what we can come up with.

Mr. MacDonald: We have been talking about this for as many years as I have been in the Legislature, and done nothing.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This may be all very true for the hon. member to say these kind of things about it, but he does not know what we are doing over there or he would not make these kind of statements.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The very fact that we have the farm safety council in the province of Ontario, that is financed entirely through the subsidization of this department of agriculture, is evidence the government is directing its interest to lowering the accident rate for Ontario farmers. If we can accomplish that, then maybe we can approach the other subject with a degree of common sense and practical application.

Mr. MacDonald: The fact that the hon. Minister—they are wired for sound—the point that the hon. Minister is ignoring is all during this period in which good work, I acknowledge, was being done by the farm safety council, fewer and fewer of the farmers are being covered. You take a look at the record for the last ten years. I do not know what the total was ten years ago, it would be interesting to know. But it has gone down 200 or 300 a year until you are now down to 1,700.

So you are not meeting the problem by reducing the accident rate. If you reduced the premium rate, conceivably more people would come in and provide a broader economic base on which to operate.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of interest. What is the rate now for farmers, is there one stable rate?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I believe it is \$4.50 per hundred.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Can the hon. Minister give us any idea of what the rate would be if all farmers were in fact covered?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I cannot, sir. I am sorry, I cannot. This has been a matter that has been promoted by the farm organizations

before I ever became a member of the Legislature here in Ontario. I was actively engaged in promoting this very thing in our own county. Quite frankly, many people just do not want it. Even at that time, when it was 75 cents a hundred. That is where it started.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to get back to this beef cattle situation that we had before. I would just like to ask the hon. Minister if he has in mind a status of self-sufficiency as far as our cow-calf operations here in Ontario are concerned? That is to say, does he have in mind the growing of our own replacement stock here in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In answer to the hon. member's question, I would say that it may never be possible to grow enough feeder cattle to meet the demands of Ontario's feedlot operators, but I do believe that there is a vast area where we can grow cattle in this province to meet that demand. Now whether we will ever reach the time when we can produce enough feeder cattle in Ontario to meet the demand I do not know. I do not see how anyone else could know.

Mr. Oliver: What would the western farmer do with his at that time?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think that the western farmer has very definitely reached the place where the maximum carrying capacity of the range will limit his future production as far as increased numbers are concerned, unless extensive irrigation comes about. If this is the case, and we are told by those in western Canada, and indeed by those people who have been associated with the beef industry all their lives, that this is indeed a reality now. The feeder cattle of western Canada are being fed out there and are being fed in the United States.

I find myself, sir, as a farmer here in Ontario, and speaking I trust for the farmers in Ontario, in the position of being in very definite competition with those people who have an advantage over us as far as proximity to the cattle and to the grains are concerned. I feel we should promote this business of raising more feeder calves in the province.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 101 carried?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, if I just might add one final comment on this. I think that if we do that, perhaps the western farmer will see fit to finish off more of the feeder cattle out there and will in turn ship the meat down here to eastern Canada as dressed

beef. This will certainly place our beef industry in a bad position.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is already happening now.

Mr. Gaunt: It will happen more.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

This means that the vote is not carried and we will return to it.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Agriculture and there will be a night session.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: This House stands adjourned until 2 of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Seventh report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Morrow	1187
Public Lands Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	1187
Children's Boarding Homes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading	1187
Line Fences Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	1187
Local Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	1187
Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	1187
Department of Municipal Affairs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	1187
Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	1188
Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Stewart, continued	1188
Recess, 6 o'clock	1227

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1863

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the east gallery students from the Registered Nursing Assistants School, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West), from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's seventh report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. Pr52, An Act respecting the town of Mimico.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr38, An Act respecting the town of Hearst.

Bill No. Pr50, An Act respecting the town of Wallaceburg.

Your committee would recommend that the following bill, having been withdrawn, be not reported and would further recommend that the fees, less the penalties and the actual cost of printing, be remitted:

Bill No. Pr42, An Act respecting the township of East York.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, it has been the practice for many years in granting or leasing Crown

lands to except and reserve in the letters patent, existing roads and a percentage of the area granted or leased for road purposes. A public lands investigation committee set up in 1959 to inquire into, and make recommendations in respect of, the disposal of public lands under The Mining Act and The Public Lands Act, has recommended that such reservations, where such is not already the case, be established by legislation for the convenience of those having occasion to refer to these matters. It is a further recommendation of the committee that the reservation be one of the surface rights only.

THE CHILDREN'S BOARDING HOMES ACT

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Welfare) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Children's Boarding Homes Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE LINE FENCES ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Line Fences Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): These first three bills, Mr. Speaker, are more or less tidying up some of the

provisions of the Act and I will give a complete explanation on second reading. These will be referred to the committee on municipal law.

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, in explanation I might say that these amendments to The Department of Municipal Affairs Act are concerned with the matter of tax arrears procedures in unorganized territory and also the matter of the necessary notice of registration of a tax arrears certificate. This will also go to the committee on municipal law.

THE PLANNING ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, here again these amendments are tidying up some of the provisions of The Planning Act and I will be prepared to give a full explanation upon second reading.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us: In the series of bills that he has brought in is he just tidying up or has he any new principles that he is prepared to enunciate?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: As soon as the bills are printed, the hon. member will be able to see what the recommendations are. I would suggest there is not much use in debating them twice.

Mr. Singer: I am not debating them, I would just like a statement of—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, there will be many more bills coming from me during the session. What more does the hon. member want me to tell him?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. D. H. Morrow in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 101:

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, yesterday I questioned the hon. Minister (Mr. Stewart) on item 6 of 101, and one of the things that I have been unable to find in many of the departments, and this one included, is the public relations men who act on behalf of the different departments.

Now, I think it can be said that the number of public relations men hired by this government must come to an alarming figure, and I would like to have the amount of money which is spent by this department on this particular item.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member refer to vote 101, item 6?

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, I thought that perhaps six was the item under which I should have asked the question, but nowhere through the estimates can I find this figure. And I would like to know which vote it is on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is in the information branch. I am not sure what the hon. member is referring to as far as public relations men are concerned. I think all of our people in The Department of Agriculture are public relations men, I like to think of our agricultural representatives as being such. We have none engaged for that specific purpose at the moment.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, I do not know where I would bring up the concern of many of the farmers in the London South area, concerning the water shortage that has been caused due to the pumping of the PUC in the city of London. I noticed, when the hon. Minister made his remarks, that he did not refer to this problem which is, of course, of vital concern to the farmers in that area. I might point out that many of these farmers have been engaged in farming operations there for—well, I could say almost 100 years—and all of a sudden they find that due to a situation that has never occurred to them before, they find that although drilled wells were envisaged to last them for years, the supply of water has suddenly become depleted due to the pumping which has been promoted by the city of London, and due to the Public Utilities Commission.

Now, I would like to know if the hon. Minister has any comments which he would like to make to the House concerning the situation there. I know it is of utmost concern to the farmers in that particular district. They have in fact requested that the department do something to alleviate this difficulty.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the question which the hon. member for Oxford has raised is one that I feel should be dealt with by The Department of Municipal Affairs under whose branch the Ontario Water Resources Commission operates. This is a matter which directly relates to the Ontario Water Resources Commission, and it seems to me that it is under that department that such a matter should be raised.

However, I would like to say this, that in this morning's *Globe and Mail*, I noticed an article which described a resolution, passed yesterday by the London Public Utilities Commission, recommending that a request be made to the London city council for a debenture to establish a pipeline to Lake Huron. This, I think, is a major step forward in resolving this matter, and I believe that the procedure from now on will be through the normal channels of the Ontario Water Resources Commission and The Department of Municipal Affairs to the municipal board for final approval. I would like to point out to the hon. member that the paper this morning reported that the resolution also calls for the abandonment of 90 per cent of the wells now being used outside of the city of London for water for the city.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): That is what the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver)—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): The hon. members should worry about their own ridings.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. If you have a question, address the chair.

Mr. Innes: Might I ask the hon. Minister if his department made a request to the Ontario Water Resources Commission subject to what he has mentioned at the moment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot hear what the hon. member said.

Mr. Innes: Did The Department of Agriculture make a request to the Ontario Water Resources Commission that they implement regulations that are currently in existence in

their department; that they refrain from pumping more water out of the wells in the London South district if it was detrimental to the farmers in that territory? I think these regulations are on the books of the water resources commission at the present time. Did The Department of Agriculture request that the Ontario Water Resources Commission implement those regulations? I know the department was requested by those farmers to do so.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, as far as the answer to that question is concerned, I have repeatedly expressed my opinion along the lines so expressed by the hon. member for Oxford. We have certainly been of the opinion that the water rights of the farm people and all the rural people outside the area surrounding the city of London should be protected. And we have so expressed ourselves.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the hon. Minister what is entailed in the \$5,050, under the heading of Canadian Council on 4-H Clubs? What is entailed in that amount of money or grant?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The figure represents the amount paid by The Ontario Department of Agriculture to the national 4-H club council, based on the figure of 25 cents per registered member.

Mr. L. Quilty (Renfrew South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, under vote 101, Ontario Beef Pasture Improvement Committee, \$6,000; just what is done with this \$6,000?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, The Ontario Department of Agriculture for many years has operated beef pasture demonstration farms across Ontario. There are five of them altogether in existence across the province. They have been set up in areas that were used mainly for beef cattle production. A good many of these farms, when taken over, were just in grass; many of them were grown up with thorn trees; there had been no regeneration of the pastures done at all. They were taken over and divided into areas and various types of research was done, indicating the value of fertilizer in one particular part, the value of ploughing up and working and re-seeding. Then a check plot was left as well.

Cattle were purchased and were put on those farms. They were weighed as they went in and weighed periodically through the summer. A determination was made of the

amount of beef produced on each of the sections so that a determination could be made of the relative value of fertilization and rejuvenation of pastures. This has been a very worthwhile project and has been followed with great interest across the province.

The deputy Minister has just mentioned to me it has proven in these tests the various types of grasses that seem to lend themselves to beef production. These are facts that have been determined and I think it has been a very worthwhile project.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question in regard to exhibits. I see there is less money estimated for exhibits this year than there was in 1962. Could the hon. Minister inform me if these are exhibits from Ontario over in Europe, say, in England? Or what does exhibits cover?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will find that, in the information section, there will be certain money set aside which has been transferred from the main office vote to that particular section for this type of advertising.

One of the reasons for the money being used last year, and this again will be used, was for the development of a very fine exhibit at the British Food Fair last summer in Great Britain. This was set up in such a way that it could be used again over there and, in fact, it is being set up through the British Home Show. I feel, while this represents a capital investment, it is something that can be used over and over again. Certainly it paid off great dividends over there. Of course, we do have exhibits across Ontario at the various fairs and exhibitions.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, following that along, some of the citizens visited Europe this summer and attended the Brussels Fair. They were quite disappointed that we did not have an agricultural display from Ontario. Could the hon. Minister give me anything on that? Is that a true statement?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I would say that the determining factor, in the places to which the exhibit is directed, is based on the potential market for our agricultural products, as far as The Department of Agriculture is concerned.

Mr. P. Manley (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the hon. Minister, through you, who the personnel of the economics section of the research council are and what is their main function?

Mr. Chairman: What item is that?

Mr. Manley: It is in vote 101.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, yesterday, Mr. Chairman, we dealt with this matter of \$7,500. Is this the item the hon. member is referring to?

Mr. Manley: That is the item. I wanted the personnel.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, our representative to that research council is Dr. D. N. Huntley, who is the director of the Ontario Agriculture Research Council. The council itself on a national basis is made up of appointees from the various zones and there are five zones across Canada. Our share is \$7,500, as is the share from the province of Quebec. The contributions depend on the size of the various provinces, or the various zones.

Mr. Manley: Well, why is it called the Ontario Economics Council? Oh, I am sorry; it is the Agriculture Economics Research Council.

Mr. Innes: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman, what vote are the exhibits under?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: 109, I believe.

Mr. Chairman: Information branch.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In the information branch.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Item 5, the apiary inspection service; was this in the estimates last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I think it has been for years.

Mr. Thomas: I could not find it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it is supposed to be there.

Mr. Thomas: All right.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It has been in The Department of Agriculture for years and years.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, one other question. I want to refer to the public accounts for the fiscal year ending March, 1962. On page A-2, it gives the appropriations of the main office—ordinary expenditure, \$497,500; capital, \$450,000. That is a total of \$947,500, yet the expenditures for the department's main office for that year was \$1,006,902. Treasury Board orders were for \$237,700, and at the end of the year there

was an unexpended amount of \$178,297. I wonder if the hon. Minister would explain that one?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If the hon. member will let our auditor figure that one out, we will go on to the next question. I am quite happy to explain it, but he is looking for the figures now.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, the next question is directed to the hon. Minister. I notice quite a number of grants to various associations, such as the Canadian Hunter and Light Horse Improvement Society, and swine and cattle associations among others; are these grants to the associations for shows? For example, the Canadian Hunter and Light Horse Improvement Society?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I would say that these are for shows, generally speaking. Some of them are, some of them are not.

Mr. Troy: There is another animal that I suppose you find around the farm; it also is a domestic animal. I think there should be grants to the association of retriever groups; there are quite a number of retriever associations and they have dog shows. The government is giving grants for horse shows—this is quite serious, I notice the hon. Minister is smiling—but might he consider that next year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are always pleased to take these kind of sound requests from the Opposition under advisement.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister is so lenient with us, and is going to take under advisement many requests from us, I would like to ask a question on the unemployment insurance. He has an item there of \$6,000. That is for his employees, throughout the agricultural group that work under him, I imagine; \$6,000 on 2-A, under main office. What I was trying to get at is down the page a little farther—farm labour service, salaries, and a figure is given of some \$25,000. Farm labour service—just what do these people do?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In the first instance, with regard to the first question of the hon. member; that is on the \$6,000, the unemployment insurance figure. As I understand it, all people who come to us from other sources, once they are on unemployment insurance, carry on with the unemployment insurance.

With regard to the hon. member's second

question, having to do with the farm labour service, this question was dealt with yesterday. It has to do with the setting up of a camp in the tobacco farming area of the province during the month, I believe, of August last. We set up the camp to take care of the itinerant workers who come there. The salaries are not great but the cost of providing the services there were rather great. While it may appear to be out of relationship there, as far as salary is concerned with maintenance, there is a very good reason for it.

Mr. Bukator: That was not the point I was trying to make, Mr. Chairman. Are these men on unemployment insurance like anybody else working in the province, these farm labour service people?

The point I am trying to make—I believe the hon. Minister knows what I am leading up to—is that farmers in the Niagara Falls riding—believe it or not, we have quite a few there, it is not just a tourist or honeymoon centre, we have many people in the farming business—who would hire elderly people to help them in the summer time, cannot get the services of these people simply because they do not have to provide unemployment insurance for them. They are seasonal workers. It would appear to me—and I know what I am going to be told, it is a federal matter—but the administration of unemployment insurance is done by the province, even though the federal government provides money from sources which at the moment they do not have.

In the meantime, the point that I am trying to make with the hon. Minister is: Is it possible that the employees, who work for farmers during the season when they are needed very badly, could be put on unemployment insurance? The reason that I ask that question is: On many occasions you will find that a man who is going to work for three or four months prefers working at one of our summer establishments, tourist establishments or summer beaches rather than for the farmer, and the farmer finds himself with a lot of produce and nobody to harvest it for him.

I believe the hon. Minister should look very closely at the possibility of having farmers' employees on unemployment insurance; he does not have that. He seems to have two laws for the same people. There are some in the hon. Minister's department who are collecting unemployment insurance. The farmer's employee does not collect unemployment insurance when he is through the season of work. He would much rather work in another department, for the tourist

homes, for the summer beaches, rather than on the farm, because they are cut off from unemployment insurance. I think this would be a source where the hon. Minister could possibly put more people to work and give these people the necessary security to put them through the winter.

I could continue a little further. I must make this one point though. A young lad was asked recently what political organization he belonged to, and he said he did not belong to any because he belonged to the Conservative party. I know that at the moment you cannot clear the problem up until after the election in Ottawa. But, your counterpart there should assist the farmers who need that help, especially the employees.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. Innes: Along that line Mr. Chairman—oh, all right, fine.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, under vote 101, item 5, Apiary Inspection Service; I noticed on this vote last year you allowed the same amount of money, \$26,500. I was wondering if the hon. Minister could give us an idea as to the production of honey whether it is being increased or whether it is decreasing at the present time through the province? And as far as the inspection service is concerned, approximately how many inspectors will be necessary, are still necessary, in the inspection service of honey at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would be happy to make that report, Mr. Chairman. This report of the apiaries branch is found in the Minister's report of the department. I would like to read to you for the record:

The total of 44,177 colonies of bees were inspected by Ontario apiary inspectors during 1961, in 3,171 apiaries. American fowl brood was found in 223 apiaries, or 7.6 per cent of those inspected. These diseased apiaries contained 702 or 1.5 per cent infected colonies—a very low ratio. In 1961, there were 2,731 bee keepers registered, 5,315 apiaries, with 120,865 colonies. During the year approximately 76 diseased samples were diagnosed. Two hundred and twelve permits were issued for selling and moving colonies and equipment. Fifty-seven permits were issued for moving 3,065 colonies for pollination of orchards and greenhouses for cucumber pollination. The Ontario honey crop for 1961 was 8.4 million pounds, an average of 70 pounds per colony.

I have not got the exact figures for 1962 for honey production, but I am told by some members of the beekeepers' association, and I am subject to correction on this, that it was a heavier yield this year than last, that there was a better crop of honey.

Mr. Chapple: You did not say how many inspectors.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I can get you that.

Mr. Bukator: I would like to get back to my question. We are all so anxious to talk on this problem that we do not get our answers. Are you considering the possibility of farmers' employees being put on unemployment insurance? As far as you are concerned, do you think this would be a good idea, or have you given it any thought?

This is not a loaded question. I think these people are at least entitled to your opinion. I have the right to ask that question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, if I may answer the question from the hon. member for Fort William first. He asked me how many inspectors there were. The number of inspectors in 1962 were 69, with 50 assistants.

Now, then, in relation to the question from the hon. member for Niagara, Mr. Chairman, as to who received, or who was covered, by the \$6,000 mentioned here for unemployment insurance coverage. The \$6,000 covers all casual employees of the department, and this unemployment insurance coverage is dropped when they become permanent employees. If they become permanent employees of the government, then they are dropped and do not pay any more insurance or contributions.

Mr. Bukator: This is revealing to me. I did not want that particular bit of information, but I am glad to have it.

The question I was concerned about was how does your department feel—maybe your answer to this question would answer what I am going to ask you about the farmers' employees—do you not think that they should be covered by unemployment insurance, as the Minister of the government who has this problem to contend with, or on which to make recommendations to his fellow beings in Ottawa. Do you not think that employees of the farm owners should be covered by unemployment insurance, as far as you are concerned?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a matter that is entirely in the hands of the federal government and I do not make any comment on it

whatsoever. I have heard representations expressed both ways.

Mr. Bukator: You are running true to form.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: At our federal-provincial economic farm conference of the Ministers and deputies, this recommendation has been made to Ottawa: That these people should be included under unemployment insurance.

Mr. Bukator: This, Mr. Chairman, is what I was wanting and we are very glad to hear it. The recommendation has been made.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): May I ask my friend, the hon. Minister, are these inspectors full-time employees?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, just part time. The reason for the number of them, and it does look like a lot, is because inspection has to be done practically at the one time. They are hired on a part-time basis.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments about the selling of loss leaders by various retailers. This was drawn to my attention by the fact of an advertisement in the Toronto *Daily Star* yesterday. Specifically, it advertises turkey at 33 cents a pound. These turkeys are from four to ten pounds, obviously broilers, and average two to a customer. As I said before, 33 cents a pound.

Now the particular section that I am referring to under the vote is the Ontario Turkey Association and I think that as far as the members of that association are concerned, I think they vary in their opinions of this particular method of retailing. Some of them feel it should not be carried on. On the other hand there are a good many members that feel that it should be allowed, because in the long run they feel that it does increase the consumption of turkey.

However, there is one point I think that should be made for the people that do not feel that this should continue and that is the fact that they feel very definitely and very strongly about this. They have misgivings about it because it establishes in the minds of the consuming public that they should continue to buy a particular product, namely turkeys in this case, at this selling price.

Certainly this is bad for the industry. You cannot make money at this price, obviously, at 33 cents, by the time the grower obtains a fair price, fair return for his work and his labour, and the processor on the other hand obtains a certain margin for his work and his equipment and so on, when he enviscer-

ates these birds and then in turn sells them to the retailer.

The specific questions I was going to ask of the hon. Minister are: first of all, where are these turkeys coming from? I ask this because obviously you cannot continue forever to lose money on any particular product.

I realize that it is not always turkeys. Here is another item here, butter, at 39 cents and certainly that is a loss leader item again.

Secondly, the second question, who is eventually taking the loss on this and is the legislation governing the selling of loss leaders being strictly implemented?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In the first place, there is no legislation governing loss leaders. In the second place, the turkey growers' association have made no representation to The Ontario Department of Agriculture that I know of for any type of marketing plan or any type of organized bargaining. I have no idea where the turkeys are coming from. They may be coming from western Canada, they may be coming from Quebec or from plants in Ontario. This is something that we have no control over, as far as I know, in any way.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one final comment. I will admit, sir, that the turkey association has not made representation to you—but I do believe that the federation of agriculture has mentioned at various times in their briefs over the years about this situation.

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, I am interested in the inspection department and the number of inspectors. As you say, it is seasonal.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What vote is this under? Is the hon. member talking about bee inspections or apiaries, or what vote is he talking about?

Mr. Gordon: Inspection department!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What inspection department?

Mr. Gordon: Am I not on the right one?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is a farm products inspection service later on.

Mr. Gordon: That is the one I want.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I thought it was.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, where do we discuss the family farm situation and the study that

is being made of it? Would it be under this vote?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not hear what the hon. member said.

Mr. Innes: Pardon me. Where do we discuss the family farm situation, what vote? Can it be discussed under this item?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I can see no reason why it should not be. I suppose it is all right.

Mr. Innes: The hon. Minister has, on various occasions in public, made mention of the great contribution that the family farm has made and of encouraging its existence. I notice in the United States that a study has been made by The United States Department of Agriculture; a sub-committee was appointed and it reported to the Secretary Mr. Freeman, not too long ago.

I would like to just tell you of a few of the findings they have found and I would ask the hon. Minister to think about these very seriously and I hope that he would in some way study these recommendations and at least make a step towards offsetting the integration problem that is currently existing in the Ontario farm markets. Some of the recommendations are listed.

A family farm was defined as a family enterprise operated by and for a family. The sub-committee rapped vertical integration and gentlemen farmers who used farm losses to reduce business taxes. It also was critical of extensive services for neglecting too much of the job they were intended for, and it scored giant farming operations.

One of the major recommendations made was to limit the amount of price support, credit, conservation, crop insurance and other monetary and technical assistance for large and family farms. Another proposal was to institute statutory provisions against the use of operating losses in farming for an individual or corporation to offset profits in non-farm business enterprises. The sub-committee recommended that feed companies—now, I would ask the hon. Minister to take good note—hatcheries, chain stores, packing and canning companies, and other food processors be prohibited from financing farm operations or entering into restrictive contracts with farmers which would place management, in whole or in part, of the farm operation in the hands of non-farm individuals or corporations.

Concerning extension services, the report said extension people should shift their thinking and programmes from too great an emphasis on production to more on market-

ing, problems of the family farm, and to checking vertical integration when it is harmful to the family farm. It went on a little bit longer.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister, in view of the ever-growing need—and he has mentioned it himself: Vertical integration is currently growing and expanding in the province and actually enveloping farm after farm, day by day, almost hour by hour; will the department continue to sit back and watch it grow without doing anything to alleviate the situation?

I had a letter just two days ago where a farm group has asked assistance, in an individual area which had been producing cash crops. They are going to lose upwards of \$.25 million because this plant is being closed, indirectly through a large corporate company taking over. I think it is only fair to assume that we—who are representing farmers, and who have people asking us continually what can we do—should ask: How are we going to compete? I would remind the hon. Minister that when they go out of a cash crop their only alternative is to go into some other endeavour, whether it be dairy, beef or poultry; but it only indicates that they are going to increase the surplus in some other commodity group while the corporation itself continues to get bigger and bigger, and the farmers' income continues to dwindle.

I think it is very serious, and I think that the time has come when he must—the department, while it takes credit for everything, and the hon. Minister indicated yesterday that the great advances are made because of his Ministry in the department—take a really serious look at this situation. I do not like to be complaining, but on the other hand I do not like to see this department—and I say this truthfully, that you have some very competent men in your department but they are not co-operating with you the way they should—continually lag, when there are other jurisdictions that seem to take the lead. The fields are obvious, very obvious; we should be stepping right into it, laying our hands on the real root of the problem. I would like to ask the hon. Minister sincerely: What is he going to do about this growing cancer that is cutting off the income of every farmer in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question; he has raised some great questions in my mind when he refers to certain people in our department who are not co-operating with me. I think this is an aspersion against the 1,700 employees or more that are in The Department

of Agriculture; and if he has reference to any specific persons then I think he should name those persons.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why does the hon. Minister not reply?

Mr. Innes: I think the hon. Minister is evading the question.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the reply to the question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will get around to that, without any encouragement from the hon. member for York South. I think also that if my hon. friend says there are areas that have taken the lead in controlling vertical integration I would be very happy to know about it; because I can assure him that as far as we are concerned we are as interested in control of vertical integration as anyone else is.

An hon. member: What are you doing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have heard you and your party, and your people from that side of the House, saying various things about control of vertical integration, but I have heard not one suggestion as to how it should be controlled. And after all, if there is some easy answer to this problem of vertical integration, then it would seem to me that our hon. friends in the Opposition would be only too glad to advance that solution. This is what I would like to suggest.

Believe me, we are looking at it through the eyes of the vegetable growers' association, the vegetable growers' marketing board. Every attempt is being made to find a solution to vertical integration, but I am telling you it is a very difficult thing to solve. But we have never given up and we will not give up; I can assure you on that.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, that is a very weak statement coming from the hon. Minister. I ask you, in all sincerity, last year the hon. Minister gave us the same statement: We are looking at it. Surely this department can move ahead and take some direction, at least one step, to correct this growing situation.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): What would the hon. member suggest?

Mr. Innes: Well, I can suggest plenty.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 101 agreed to.

On vote 102:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, before we leave vote 101, I have hesitated to

enter into the debate on vertical integration too vehemently because I am one who has suffered personally from it and it is not my place in this House to get up and criticize the government about a personal matter. Nevertheless I do feel that when the hon. Minister says that he and his 1,700 advisors, competent though they are, can think of nothing along these lines except to appoint a committee that never reports as far as we are concerned, they are not taking hold of the problem satisfactorily.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister, as a private member and one who has been put out of the vegetable-growing business by this nefarious habit of the larger industries to rent land so that the bona-fide farmer is put out of the primary production business, that he should seriously consider one of three or four obvious possibilities. There could be a regulation prohibiting these processors from getting into the primary production business. This is a suggestion that I am sure he has examined carefully and he might want to comment publicly on the reasons why this would not be a good idea. He might also continue on the idea that all of these processors who are getting into the primary production business, when they have to deal through the various marketing boards, might through these marketing boards be limited to a very definite acreage so that they could not take over whole townships and whole counties. On the other hand, it is quite possible that there might be some system whereby the government, through licensing, could control it. There are many possibilities. We do not have 1,700 excellent advisors here, but we do want to know what the government is going to do about it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the hon. member's comments, because that is the first constructive suggestion I have heard for a long time from that side of the House.

An hon. member: At least we have one; the hon. Minister does not have any.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I want to suggest this, Mr. Chairman, that I did not suggest we had 1,700 people in The Department of Agriculture all working on vertical integration. But I did say that I opposed the idea that was advanced by the hon. member for Oxford when he referred to the fact that there was someone in The Department of Agriculture who was not co-operating with the Minister, and unless—

Mr. Innes: That was not my statement.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And if this inference is left, then I think it is only fair that it be corrected.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I said that he had very good people in The Department of Agriculture. And I said that the co-operation in the department could be better.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That was not what the hon. member said.

Mr. Innes: I certainly did.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, before we come to vote 102, I wonder—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The answer as I understand it—and I have just these notes to go by here, which were forwarded by our auditor, and if this does not answer sufficiently for the hon. member I will be happy to get it for the hon. member and put it in writing and send it to him. But as I understand it, the Treasury Board's orders were for items for which it did not have sufficient money to pay all accounts. Now then, this was represented in the Treasury Board's orders for borrowing to make loans to co-operatives. And the amount of the Treasury Board orders was not completely used up at the end of the fiscal year. In other words, there might have been a carry-over because as I understand it, the loans might not have been processed to the degree that the cheques were sent out; the legal papers not completed. I think that is the explanation of it. If that is not sufficient, we will make it that way.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, further to that question of the ordinary and capital appropriations for that year. Compared with the expenditures you had a deficit of \$59,402. Would that \$59,000 be taken out of the Treasury Board orders amount?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Thomas: It would. I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, before leaving this vote, the hon. Minister was kind enough a moment ago to say that the suggestion that had come from this side was constructive. It was given with the intention of eliciting some comment from him on this. What does he think about these ideas, are they practicable or not, and if they are not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I would like to say this, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question, which is perfectly reasonable, that we are definitely considering the very terms of legislation which were referred to through the federation of agriculture briefs. They have come in to us, they have asked us—and I am sure this has been conveyed to the hon. members of the Opposition, I am not arguing with this at all. Certainly this is being considered and very definitely considered. It has many, many ramifications to it. And I can assure the hon. member that if there is any possibility of implementation, then we are going to try to do everything we can to do the things that have been suggested. But it is not an easy problem of solution and there are many, many things that can happen that we are very definitely concerned about. Things that I think are far-reaching in what their net effect might be, as far as the province of Ontario is concerned.

Mr. Oliver: May I ask the hon. Minister two questions? The first one is: Has he ever heard from the committee that he appointed to study this matter? Has it made an interim report? Has it made a final report?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There were recommendations made and introduced in three amendments last year to The Farm Products Marketing Act. Those three amendments were the direct result of the interim report.

Mr. Oliver: That, I presume then, is the government's answer, is it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, that was the report of the committee.

Mr. Oliver: Oh, I see. Well then, for all intents and purposes, that is the hon. Minister's answer to the charge that he is allowing vertical integration on the part of processors. Is that right? The legislation has been put on the statute books?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, that is not the case at all.

Mr. Oliver: Then might I ask one further question? The hon. Minister said he has studied the proposal made by the federation of agriculture—which was, after all, in my judgment was quite a reasonable proposal—and he is giving it very serious study. Can I ask the hon. Minister if he can tell the House this afternoon, does he intend to have legislation presented at this session, bearing on the recommendations of the federation of

agriculture and the other angles of this problem that he has studied? Does he intend to have legislation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I would say this to the hon. member, through you, Mr. Chairman, that when the legislation is introduced, dealing with amendments to The Farm Products Marketing Act, if such are introduced, it will then be revealed what the intention of the government is. And until the government makes up its mind, I am not going to say.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I have a letter—if you would not mind my reading it, rather than asking the question, I think it is much briefer than I would make it—pertaining to the Ontario Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. And I will read one paragraph:

A veterinary recently told me that none of the tin-canned dog foods are fit for pet consumption.

I hope they are wrong about this.

I would appreciate it more than I can say if you will provide me with an authoritative answer I can pass on as to whether the meat that is unfit for human consumption is considered fit and is used for tinned food for cats and dogs.

I think that is a very fair question. Is the food that is tinned for animals—and a lot of people think more of their animals than a lot of people do of their children—inspected before they can it, or even after they can it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To my knowledge there is no inspection made of dog and cat food.

Mr. Bukator: I thought it was about time, in the hon. Minister's opinion, that it should be inspected. This is a fair question. This is the hon. Minister in the proper department of government. Who in the heck are we going to take it up with, the Minister of diamonds and mines? I sometimes think he does not have any more in his head than he has on top of it. I will retract it; I can still think it.

I think this is a fair question, and there are thousands of people in the province here who think a lot of their animals and pay a lot of money for them. I think their food should be inspected, and if your department knows, it is about time you smartened up. If you said that is not being done, then you should consider it. I think this is a problem that should be taken to the hustings. There are many departments where you people come short of the mark and this is one. I am getting fed up by being heckled by

people who know nothing more than heckling in this House. Read *Hansard*, if you will, and you will read nothing but heckling and nothing constructive. I am not coming here from Niagara Falls to be abused by anyone of those supposedly intelligent people who carry Ministers' portfolios. The question was: Do you not intend to do anything about this? This is your department and you should.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the dog and cat food that is prepared, as I understand it—and I must say I am not very familiar with the preparation of dog and cat food in the province of Ontario—but I would say this, that all products that pass through interprovincial trade, relative to human food, are inspected under the federal Department of Agriculture. We have never, as far as I know, instituted any inspection for such purposes as the hon. member for Niagara Falls has outlined. But, he has raised a point here: it is a point he believes in, very definitely, obviously by the determination of his stand on this matter, and I would suggest that it is something that is worthy of consideration, although I find myself somewhat at a loss to know whether or not one should be continually providing inspectors for every facet of trade in this province. It seems to me that we can sometimes put ourselves in the position of having so many inspectors we have almost inspectors inspecting inspectors.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, getting back to this committee that the hon. Minister set up that was going to look into this vertical integration. Now it has been appointed about a year and a half. When the question was asked by my hon. friend if there was a report made to the hon. Minister, he got up and he said yes, that he had a report and there were amendments coming from that report to be introduced into the House. I want to ask the hon. Minister, what direct bearing had any amendments that he introduced into the House on curtailing vertical integration in this province. I would like to know what they are.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: One of the amendments, and I have not got The Farm Products Marketing Act before me, I hope the hon. member will appreciate this, I am speaking entirely from recollection, but as I recall the three amendments that were introduced, one of them had to do with suggesting that all processors who were growers of any particular vegetable commodity that they were processing must pay the licence fee for that particular commodity.

Now this was not being done in the past. We felt this was one of the things and this was the direct recommendation of the committee.

Another of the recommendations was that there should be none of this pressure put on certain farmers to sign a contract with processors under duress, if I may so explain it, that pressures should not be brought to bear. A contract is a contract that should be signed willingly by both parties without any particular side considerations being taken into account.

Then I believe also there was a third: marketing the products through the agencies established to market that particular commodity.

Those were amendments that were brought in and it seems to me that the committee felt quite definitely that this was a step in the right direction.

Now obviously it has not curtailed this development, there is no denying this at all. Vertical integration seems to be progressing and it is a matter of doing everything that possibly can be done from one year to the next to try to determine what is the best method to handle this whole situation.

Mr. Manley: If I might comment on that, Mr. Chairman. I think that under The Farm Products Marketing Act, in the different marketing boards that are set up across the province, you have regulations in regard to the operation of this marketing board. I think what you have suggested this afternoon was varying regulations. Now apparently the regulations had fallen down. You then amended the Act and you have admitted this afternoon that even with the amendments of the Act, it is not workable either.

I cannot see, with your committee operating for a year and a half, that they have been able to come forward with something sound and substantial to curtail vertical integration in this province.

Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister not going to reply to that? Is the committee continuing to investigate vertical integration? How often does this committee sit? Have there been any resignations? Who are the personnel?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I informed the hon. members and the House a few moments ago that the matter was under consideration. I cannot see what more I can say than that. It is under consideration.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Why do you not tell us the dates of the meetings?

Mr. Chairman: Order! If you have a question address it to the chair, please.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This will be discussed and can be discussed under vote 108—which vote is that, the farm products marketing board. This is when it comes up, under farm products marketing board.

Mr. Manley: We have been discussing it, Mr. Chairman, for quite a long while now. Why put it off now and wait until 108 comes up, why not have the answer now; we are just putting the questions off. When was the last meeting of this board? Are they endeavouring to solve the problem? When was the last meeting?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot tell you when the last meeting of the board was held. I can find out for you. I cannot tell you when the last meeting was held of this particular board, of this particular committee, that was set up.

But I did say, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Grey South that we are certainly considering the recommendation of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. Through whatever amendments are made to The Farm Products Marketing Act, then the determination can be made as to whether or not we have gone as far as the hon. member for Brant suggests we should go this afternoon. I am very pleased to have these suggestions, because this is the first one we have ever had from the Opposition as to how it should be controlled.

Mr. Manley: Let me ask the hon. Minister then, Mr. Chairman, has there been any change in the personnel of this committee from the time it was set up until this date?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No resignations of which I know.

Mr. Manley: Can you tell me how many meetings this committee had, how many days they have met? Can you tell me that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot tell you that right offhand. I would say this to the hon. member: I cannot tell you how many meetings they have had nor can I tell you the last day they met, I have not got this information here. I do want to suggest this to you, that the committee met and we brought in those recommendations, those amendments, that were made last year to The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Now then, we have, as I have suggested, we are continuing to study the brief that was presented to us by the federation of agricul-

ture and we are going to deal with it as we can see fit before the adjournment of this House.

Mr. Manley: I might ask then, another question of the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, through you. You say we are going to look into the recommendations of the federation of agriculture. When you say "we", do you mean yourself or the officials in the department, or you and the committee? Whenever you say "we", who is going to look into the recommendations that have been referred to by the committee—pardon me, the federation of agriculture—in regard to vertical integration? Is it you and your officials, or is it you and your committee?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I have any necessity of answering that particular question. With the greatest respect to my hon. friend, we are charged, as has been pointed out this afternoon, with the administration of the department and I will invite in whoever I like to discuss this particular matter. I can assure you it will be people who are interested in this particular field, if indeed we invite people in.

We have a very strong Department of Agriculture as far as administration is concerned. We have many people across the length and breadth of this province. Indeed, the members of this committee—that were appointed as a Minister's committee to look into this matter last year because of its urgency—brought in their interim report at that time. We implemented those recommendations last year before the House adjourned and I have told the hon. members that we are doing everything we can to consider the further requests of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. I think that is about as far as I can be expected to go today.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the attitude of the hon. Minister. He said that we in the House had no business to know. He set this committee a year and a half ago to deal specifically with vertical integration and I asked him the question: was he going to have this committee examine the brief of the federation of agriculture in their concern of vertical integration? And he tells me it is none of my business or the business of the House; he will look after that himself. I do not think that is an answer that is due to the farmers of the province of Ontario, because this is a very serious problem and the hon. Minister knows it. I think that this House is entitled to a better answer than that.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, I have just one further observation. My hon. friend says, and I listened to him carefully, that the committee he set up carried on their deliberations and finally made an interim report and, on the basis of that report, he carried some recommendations into legislation. And then he seems to stop there so far as the committee is concerned and he says: "Now we are studying the briefs submitted by the federation of agriculture."

Now, I want to know from him; has the committee he set up a year and a half ago been disbanded? Is it still continuing its study, or has he now abandoned that committee to go to another avenue to try to get information?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say that the committee has neither been abandoned nor do I intend to inform the hon. member whether I intend to use it to discuss the federation of agriculture brief.

Mr. Oliver: Well, that is some answer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, that is precisely what I intend to do this afternoon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting for some time for the discussion of this committee. Can you tell me, sir, the cost of these committees; the study groups; the cost to date?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: On the vertical integration committee?

Mr. Worton: No, there have been several appointed, I believe, sir; the vertical integration and the machinery one; several of these committees. Where does it show up? If it is not in this vote I would be willing to wait, sir.

Mr. Chairman: While they are trying to find that, have you any other questions?

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister suggested he is not going to tell us about this committee. I respectfully remind him, through you Mr. Chairman, that this Legislature is paying the bills for this committee and we would like to know what they are doing. I would certainly like to know. I hope that next week or the week after you finish these estimates, you will have that information for us: how

many meetings they have had and what it has cost—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have the cost for you right now—\$359 is the cost of the vertical integration committee. They were only paid their expenses.

Mr. Whicher: How many meetings did they have?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot tell you that; I do not know.

An hon. member: Did they ever meet?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of course they met. Did I not tell you that just a while ago?

Mr. Manley: Three hundred and fifty-some dollars, is it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Three hundred and fifty-nine dollars.

Mr. Manley: Here we have an expenditure of \$359 for a committee which was set up a year and a half ago to look into the problem of vertical integration in this province. It is something that has struck headlines all over this province; something that is affecting the farmers right across this province, and he comes up and says that they spent \$359 to bring in the solution for vertical integration. It is a shame.

Mr. MacDonald: I think it paid for the coffee.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton.

Mr. R. C. Edwards. Wentworth, sir.

Mr. Chairman: Wentworth.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to leave this subject. The thing I wanted to speak to the hon. Minister about was another problem. This point has been fully debated, has it?

Mr. Chairman: I expect so.

Mr. Whicher: We haven't got the answers but we have certainly been given the questions.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would seek the hon. Minister's guidance. I do not have a lot to say on this particular estimate but I do have two different matters which have been brought to my attention. One from the Wentworth County Federation of Agriculture forwarding a copy of the Hali-mand resolution dealing with the matter of

the livestock sales and the auctions which are being apparently severely affected by the resolutions dealing with meat processing which have recently been introduced. Where might I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That will be under the Livestock—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Livestock Branch?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Livestock Branch.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The other matter that I wanted to deal with, and perhaps there is a vote for it, deals with a resolution which was submitted, and I am sure the hon. Minister received a copy of it, from the Niagara Peninsula Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association dealing with the orchards and the care of neglected orchards in the area. Where might I ask with respect to that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It comes under Plant Products Inspection, I believe.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am sorry, I did not hear you.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Farm Products Inspection. That would be vote 108.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Thank you.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I am seeking some information. Would the hon. Minister tell us in his estimates where we could discuss the work and duties of the committee; to recommend to him the possibility of a farm machinery Act for the province of Ontario? Would this be the place?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would think so, I do not see anything wrong with that.

Mr. Whicher: Sir, right now, if you wish. Has the committee met since last year, because this had headlines in the paper, too, saying that the Tory government was going to study it. We would like to know what—after this 12 months of study—recommendations the committee has given to you, sir, and what recommendations you intend to give to the government so that our farmers can be protected?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would be very glad to answer this question. I answered a similar question yesterday. The farm machinery committee, to my knowledge, is still meeting. They have submitted no interim report to me. I set the committee up and only met with them on one occasion and that was on their initial meeting when they came together. I said to them: This is a committee that I want

to look into all aspects of the farm machinery business in the province of Ontario. The complete terms of reference were given to them. They have, I believe, done everything possible to explore all of the avenues in connection with these particular terms of reference and I have had no report from them, nor any indication that they wished to submit a report since they were established.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Have you asked for a report?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Wintermeyer: Have you asked for a report?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I have not asked for a report.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Not time yet?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Because I told them when I gave them their initial terms of reference that, when they were ready to report to me, I would be perfectly happy to receive their report.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right?

Mr. Whicher: Well, Mr. Chairman, then I must say I appreciate the views of the hon. member for York South.

He stated on numerous occasions, particularly in my own area, that I had either moved or seconded the fact that a committee be set up to advise the Minister about the possibility of having a farm machinery Act for the province of Ontario. Now, I did that, Mr. Chairman, and I must address my remarks through the Chairman to the hon. member for York South, because I really felt that this Minister with his new ideas and his new look would, after some careful study of perhaps three or four months, and not 12 months, bring forth to the Legislature at the opening of this session an Act that would protect the farmers of the province of Ontario against some of the things that our farmers, particularly members of the federation of agriculture and the farmers' union, feel to be unjust. I know myself that when the federation met with us last year, I think the agriculture committee and the farmers' union, the hon. Minister said that there certainly were faults, and he agreed with them that there should be a farm machinery Act. But he did not want to move with undue haste. Mr. Chairman, I agree that I fell in line with that viewpoint, but surely now, after all the headlines that we saw, particularly through the farm periodicals last year,

we should have some answer to this question. How long does it take you to make up your minds over there?

Now, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we can allow the hon. Minister to get away with this. I think that he should have some ideas about The Farm Machinery Act. Certainly he did last year when he was talking politics in front of the committee and agreeing with them. Now let him stand up here today and agree with them or disagree, whatever the case may be. You bring in all your high-priced help from these various committees, many of whom, of course, are just political committees, and I would like to know what the answer is; what has been said by—if the hon. Minister has not called them in, he has been negligent in his duties. That is all there is to it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, confession is good for the soul and I deeply appreciate the comments of the hon. member for Bruce. The only thing I would say is that any man who takes so long to find out that this government is always procrastinating on committees, has always procrastinated on committees, has proven that he is the spokesman for a party not worthy of replacing that government, because he takes too long to catch on, too.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact of this matter is, this matter came up in the agricultural committee. I moved a motion that was clear and unequivocal: that if this government considered it necessary to study the matter further despite the wide experience in many jurisdictions throughout the world, including one province of Canada, that the—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Where, which one is that?

Mr. MacDonald: Saskatchewan, of course, which always leads in farm matters and many other matters, since you asked for it. I said that if the government wanted to study this it should be studied in a five-week period between December and the resumption of the House some time in February. The OFA had come in and pleaded for urgent action, and it was this motion, Mr. Chairman, which I could not get seconded by anybody from the Liberal Party.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There is nowhere in the hon. member's resolution that he would give them a five-week period to study.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in the wide world that my resolution called for them to report back in February

for the second week of the session. Now, let us get this clear once and for all. They did not want to support a resolution because allegedly it was moved by me. So they brought in their own weaseling resolution which played right into this government's hands in terms of study in a very quiet-paced, long-term fashion. They got what they invited.

Now, let us get back to the problem of how we are going to meet—

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member has suggested that, because he brought in the resolution, that we would not support it. Mr. Chairman, I tell you that we are willing to support any legislation that he brings in any time when there is any goodness about it, but unfortunately that has never happened, and that is why—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this is clearly a facetious comment, because if they are talking sense at all they would acknowledge this was an important matter. Why did they not support my resolution on that occasion?

What is happening here, Mr. Chairman, and I want to leave this bickering—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: What we are doing here is that two of the leaders, two of the spokesmen for the Liberal Party in the standing committee on agriculture, gave this government what it was seeking, an opportunity to get off the hook and not bring in a farm machinery Act. Two or three people have been attempting to get them back on to the rails since, principally the hon. member for Grey South.

However, Mr. Chairman, let us forget about that and let us get back and fight the issue for the farmers. If you had the right kind of a government such as you have in Saskatchewan you would have had a farm machinery Act ten years ago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Because they did have it ten years ago and you cannot argue against facts. Facts are stubborn.

Mr. G. Laverne (Russell): Why are so many people moving out of Saskatchewan?

Mr. MacDonald: No, Mr. Chairman, they are not leaving—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: You've been lost in the oblivion of history and you do not know it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was very interested, if I can get down to the substance of this issue—

Mr. Laverne: You could not get down—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. Laverne: Now I will listen to you.

Mr. MacDonald: This is an Ottawa Valley affair, Mr. Chairman.

The point, Mr. Chairman, that I was very interested in, while listening to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, was his comment that he set the committee up and he asked them to report. Now, I think it was very significant, and I suspect accurate, when he did not indicate that he had asked them to report as quickly as possible. In other words, he ignored the whole urgency of the situation as presented by the OFA. Now, I suggest to you without any qualifications, that this committee was deliberately set up to postpone action on this issue, and the hon. Minister has succeeded. It is very easy to succeed when you have got the whip hand and you can set the pace, but once again he has ignored the needs of the farmers and the requests of the federation of agriculture. The tragedy, of course, is that the present champions of the agricultural community, the Liberal Party, were the people who set the stage for doing this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Quilty: Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the hon. Minister told us that the committee to study vertical integration had cost the province \$359. I would like to make a comment and it is that they must have been drinking milk.

I would like to know what has been the cost to the province of the committee to study a farm machinery Act.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I have not got the figures of the committee to study farm machinery. I have been interested in listening to these discussions this afternoon on this farm machinery committee. Many accusations have been hurled at me this afternoon for delaying these things, for tactics that are uncondusive to and incompatible with the Minister's job as far as agriculture is concerned. I want to suggest this to the hon. members of this House, that I have known of no committee that has gone into the matter

before them as thoroughly as has this committee. Indeed, my hon. friend from York South—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: The hon. Minister said he never heard a word—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not say that at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Wintermeyer: The hon. Minister has got a crystal ball some place—

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have had no interim report, if this is what the hon. leader of the Opposition is driving at. I think the hon. members of this House would be pleased to know that this committee, when they got into the discussion of this matter of farm machinery found that there were so many facets to it that they held public hearings across the province. They went all over this country, I think; indeed, the hon. member for York South would be interested to know that I believe a delegation of the committee visited Saskatchewan. I believe a delegation of the committee went into parts of the United States.

All I know about it is that a request came in to me from the secretary of the committee asking if we of the department would approve of the expenditure involved in the studies that the committee requested should be made in areas outside the province of Ontario and we acceded to this request. This is why I know that this committee has held these meetings. By pure chance I happened to meet the chairman of the committee on an occasion some time before Christmas, I believe it was, and he told me at that time that they felt they were reaching the end of their deliberations when lo and behold, they had representations made to them by a completely new segment of industry in this province who felt that they had a very just case to plead before this committee.

Now, this is the latest word I have had on the committee, and as far as I know they are still functioning. I have no idea as to what the report will be or when they will bring it in, but I believe that a committee that is dealing with a matter of such great importance as this committee is dealing with, should be given the time that is necessary in their opinion to deal with it efficiently and well.

If my hon. friend suggests, as was mentioned by some hon. member of the Opposition a moment or two ago, that I should have said, "You must have a report in here in three months' time", then would this committee have been denied the right to go into areas where this legislation is now in effect? This is what you expect me to have done. This is the thing that you suggested I do, and as far as the suggestion of my friend, the hon. member for Bruce—that I pleaded before the committee on agriculture when the federation committee came in there to talk politics to them—I was not even at the committee on agriculture when this matter was discussed by the federation of agriculture. I was not there.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am not going to get too deeply into this, but I am amazed at what I hear this afternoon. This is ostensibly a responsible group of people here to consider estimates of a department, and in considering whether or not this money will be voted, it is necessary to know a little bit about the way in which it has been expended. The hon. Minister did help it out a little bit when he got up and gave his second explanation. But, to suggest that he would accede to the request for more money, without any indication of whether or not an interim report would be forthcoming, and then stand in his place in the House and give the impression that he is acting in a responsible manner just is not compatible, sir.

The hon. Minister made a very good political speech. I commend him for it, because he has shown he can be quite political at times, and I suggest that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) is playing very well into his hands when he is more interested in damning the Liberal Party than he is—to use the expression that he used many times in this House—in coming to grips with the real problem.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that it is surely not unreasonable for us to expect the hon. Minister to have some indication as to when a report from this committee will be forthcoming. Now, surely he does not just say to the committee, "You go ahead and complete your study, and when you are ready to report back come and see me." This could take years unless there is some direction. The hon. Minister said he has no indication when the committee will be reporting, and then he stands up after he has been criticized and makes an elaborate report on what the committee has been doing across the province. I think it would be fair, and it would be

reasonable, to give us some idea when some action will be forthcoming on a matter which apparently this Legislature feels is very important. Apparently the committee on agriculture felt it was important enough to suggest a motion to deal with the problem. I think it is very unfair when the hon. Minister, of all people, plays politics here and gives evasive answers rather than approaching the thing in a straightforward business-like manner, I think this is the least we can expect.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I object strenuously to the statements made by the recent hon. member. That, to me, is a personal attack, and I do not like it one little bit. I think the hon. member has suggested that I have deliberately delayed the report of this committee; nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I made no such suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, if you did not, I do not understand the English language very well. There was a suggestion made by some hon. member of the Opposition, not long ago, that the committees we have appointed, and this committee in particular, are political appointees. Let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, as emphatically as I possibly can, that there is no thought of political appointments in any one of these appointments; not one, not a trace of it.

Mr. Whicher: How many committees is Gord Grear on?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He is on two that I know of. Do you want to know how many Bill Tilden is on? Your friend Bill Tilden, for whom you have such a high regard, is on the farm machinery committee. Do you think that is a political appointment?

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If you think he is a political appointee, then I would like you to give me an answer on that one. Right today, one of the members of the—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: One of the members of the farm machinery committee is Mr. Ernest Beaudry representing the northern farmers. Mr. Beaudry is in the hospital. I do not believe he is out yet; I believe he is very seriously ill and cannot possibly be out for a few weeks. Likely the committee is waiting

until he is able to be out and attend its meetings. I have no idea what his politics are. I have never asked a man yet what his politics are before I appoint him, and I think it is an insult to suggest it.

Mr. Quilty: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the hon. Minister saying that he is so non-political. I did not want to make this comment at this time, but I will make it under the vote covering his salary. He came down to Renfrew South last year during the summer; and if he is so non-political, as he maintains he is, why did he not contact the member for Renfrew South instead of bringing the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hamilton) and touring Renfrew South with him?

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, as a point of order, I think I would like *Hansard* to record that the hon. member for Grey South has said this: "And there will be another mass firing over there again soon".

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend the Minister of Economics and Development is sometimes accurate. In this instance he was not accurate. What I said, what I intended, and what will come to pass, is that in the fullness of time—and let it get full the sooner—there will be a wholesale dismissal on the other side of the House.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I hope *Hansard* will correctly record the hon. Minister on what he has said.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! We are on vote 102. Shall it carry?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, are we on vote 102?

Mr. Chairman: Right. Vote 101 was carried. Nobody here wants to question it.

Mr. Nixon: Considering the grants under The Community Centres Act, this is item 8 of vote 102, it has come to my attention in the riding of Brant, that on at least one occasion the department supported the community centre development; I believe in this case it was a community hall with the maximum grant. But the centre was adapted five or six years later, for ice hockey. They put in a rather expensive artificial ice plant, and they were informed they had already received the maximum grant. I would urge the hon. Minister that the regulations governing these grants be reconsidered and, I would say, amended so that these community

centres, when they might be expanded at a later date, can come back to this section of The Department of Agriculture and get further support. I wonder if you have any comment about that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know nothing about the case that the hon. member has raised in the House. Let me suggest this: If he would discuss this with me privately, I would be very happy to take the matter fully under consideration. It may well be there other avenues that might be explored, for the particular community centre to qualify, but if we were to amend all of the terms of the Act in order to expand our grant system, then I think we would leave ourselves open to a very broad expenditure right across the entire province of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: I submit that a broader expenditure along these lines would be a very excellent thing, that the development in this particular case of arenas for hockey, curling, and so on in the various communities through the province, is done very well by local participation. But there are a great many communities where this does not seem to be possible; perhaps under this section some leadership or some support along this line would be received very well and I would urge the hon. Minister to consider it. Believe me there is no suggestion in my first remarks that these people had not been treated fairly. They had received the maximum grant when the building was first erected. They had then decided, some years later, to expand it which required a tremendous capital expenditure; there was no support for them at all and I would suggest that there should be.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on this same item that my hon. colleague from Brant was talking about, I wonder if it has not occurred to the hon. Minister that there would be abundant good sense in moving this community centre branch into The Department of Municipal Affairs? Because really it escapes me what real connection the promotion of community centres, and the sort of thing my hon. colleague was talking about, has through agriculture. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) has to do with municipalities and grants to them, and their ability to carry on with the least possible burden to the local taxpayers; it would seem to me that there could be real progress made if we could gather into The Department of Municipal Affairs those arms of government service which relate to municipalities.

The connection between agriculture and community centres is completely vague. It

might have had some significance a hundred years ago, but to my mind it has no significance at all today. I would think that the hon. Minister, if he has not time to concern himself with the community centres, as he indicated to my hon. colleague from Brant, should be happy to offer it; and I would think the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs should be happy to accept it in his department. That is where it belongs and that is where it should be.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Might I ask, Mr. Chairman, through you, if the hon. member is suggesting that it is the policy of the Liberal party to have this changed?

Mr. Singer: No. I am not telling you about policy at the moment, Mr. Chairman. We have been trying, my hon. colleagues who have much more knowledge of agriculture than I have, for the better part of two days to extract from this hon. Minister, and it has been very, very difficult, some idea of what he thinks. All we can get out of him is that he is considering everything. I was wondering, in the process of his great consideration, if he has given consideration to something as logical and as reasonable as moving community centres into The Department of Municipal Affairs where it reasonably belongs?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the hon. member who has just spoken raised this same point and—

Mr. Singer: And a few years ago too.

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—and at that particular time the thought went through my mind: Is this the policy of the party which he represents?

Mr. Singer: You will find out later.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to add that as yet—

Mr. Singer: The fullness of time will tell you.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like very much, Mr. Chairman, through you, to ask whether the hon. member is referring to a policy of the Liberal party—as to whether or not this should be transferred?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is really an amazing exercise in logistics and there is very little of that that comes from this hon. Minister. He has avoided successfully for two days, answering any specific question that has come from this side of the House. If

this hon. Minister is going to be responsible, let him answer and tell us what is government policy. He does not know.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, now that we know that the hon. member for York Centre does not represent the thinking of the Liberal Party, let me suggest that I am quite prepared to stand before this honourable House and suggest that I believe the community centres branch is in the right department. I believe—whether the hon. member, the Bay Street/Richmond Street lawyer feels—that this should be changed to The Department of Municipal Affairs. This is interesting listening and interesting reading for the people of the province of Ontario who have considered for a long time that The Community Centres Act was something that personally belonged to the rural people of this province.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I have sat here for a while, but I think if ever there was a demonstration of political haggling, we have just heard it. What the people of Ontario expect of you is that you act in a responsible way.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am.

Mr. Wintermeyer: What they are wondering is: Is this the most efficient, practical way to serve the people of Ontario, in his opinion? What he was going to elicit, obviously, and you know it better than he because he has not made a very good demonstration of it, was that he was going to persuade us to suggest that we were going to take something away from agriculture. By no means. What we are going to do is to help the people in both the rural and urban areas to fill our community centres. I do not think it matters a damn—I am sorry for that—but it does not matter whether it is this department or the other, does it? All this foofraw is not worthy of the dignity of this House.

What we expect from you is to know what you are going to do about community centres; give us answers. It may well be that it is much more efficient to distribute the money under the other department. I am not sure that it is, but certainly it will not hurt the people in the rural areas one bit. The question is: Which is the more efficient? To try to suggest that we are going to deny these rural people money by switching this to urban or Municipal Affairs, is certainly a diversionary tactic that I do not think is fair for the hon. Minister to exercise at this particular time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that the hon. member for York Centre simply suggested that this be changed to the other department? He did not say that it was not being well administered. He did not say that I had denied any urban municipality through our department the rights or the access to grants under The Community Centres Act. What have we, in The Department of Agriculture, done wrong? What brings forth this plea from the hon. member for York Centre to transfer this to The Department of Municipal Affairs? If it can be better administered there, then let it be there. We have no quarrel. We can get along perfectly well, as far as I am concerned, with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, but we have had not a single complaint, that I know of, about the administration of this particular branch.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me say this. In The Department of Municipal Affairs, there is a substantial civil service which is trained in dealing with municipal officials on all levels. Insofar as municipal administration is concerned, I would doubt if that same sort of machinery exists in The Department of Agriculture. It would seem logical to me that people who deal with municipal officials every day, such as you find in The Department of Municipal Affairs, would probably be better able to deal with this sort of thing than those people in The Department of Agriculture who could well devote their attention to agricultural problems.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the hon. Minister this question: On these grants to agricultural societies and other exhibition associations for capital improvements, I would like to know on what basis you make these grants? I see one here as low as \$4.06 to Sydenham, and as high as \$17,338 to Prince Edward county. What is the basis for making these grants? On what basis do you make them?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Whereabouts do you find this, my hon. friend? I am perfectly willing to answer your question.

Mr. Belanger: On A-14.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Page A-14? I did not hear the first part of your question. Are these grants to agricultural societies and other exhibitions?

Mr. Belanger: That is right. That is correct. I see down here that Sydenham got \$4.06, and Prince Edward county \$17,338.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Might I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the reason for the variances here, in the amount of grants paid to these respective agricultural societies, is based on a percentage of the capital cost of the capital invested annually. The Department of Agriculture pays 25 per cent of the capital cost of any additions to, or capital expenditures I should say, for these agricultural societies. That is why there is such a very great difference.

Mr. Belanger: Twenty-five per cent, did you say?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is right.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, in looking over the public accounts there I notice grants to the Canadian National Exhibition in two different places. Is there a reason for a grant being found on page 813—under special grants under section 25, Agricultural Societies Act, total of \$2,500 for the CNE? Then again on page 814 there is another grant to the CNE of \$1,500.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will get you that answer.

Mr. Chapple: Mr. Chairman, on grants under The Horticultural Societies Act, I note in the list of those who get grants that there is no grant for either the city of Port Arthur or the city of Fort William. I was wondering if it were possible to get grants for these two cities and in what manner we would approach the government in order to get them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has asked about grants for the Lakehead exhibition; is that it?

Mr. Chapple: No. I was thinking of the horticultural societies; there are two of them. One in each city.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the horticultural societies qualify for grants under the agricultural and horticultural societies grants. They are based on membership; that is, the grants are based on membership of the various horticultural societies across the province. There are 40,000 members in the province of Ontario. There are 220 horticultural societies and I would expect that your horticultural societies in Fort William—is that right?

Mr. Chapple: One in Fort William and one in Port Arthur.

Hon. Mr. Stewart:—are very likely now receiving grants under the branch. Have you any reason to believe that they are not?

Mr. Chapple: I have not heard any word of it, but I suggest—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh well, I am satisfied that they are, because I believe that the president of that organization came from Fort William. I am quite sure that they are qualifying for grants under the Act.

Mr. Chapple: There is a qualification under Thunder Bay but that could be to the exhibition, the Canadian Lakehead Exhibition; but these are two separate organizations and I am pretty certain they do not get grants directly from the government.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, yes, they do. I am quite satisfied that they do. I will get that information for you and tell you exactly what they get; but I am satisfied they do because the president was in my office. She came in to see me once and I am satisfied, as she was there with the director of the branch. I can assure you that if they were not getting grants they would have been very apt to ask for them then.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, in 5-102 I notice that the grants to agricultural societies total \$426,600 this year. I believe it is down by the amount of \$18,400 from last year. Are there fewer societies in operation? Why this reduction of \$18,400 in this grant?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is based on the fact that the grants are paid out at 25 per cent on the capital improvements, so if the exhibitions do not make the expenditures then our grants to them are not required.

Mr. Manley: This would be on capital improvement where the difference would come in, would it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Manley: It would not be the grants to the society for—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: For prize money you mean?

Mr. Manley: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, no effect at all.

Mr. Manley: It is on capital improvements?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Capital improvement, that is right.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to carry on along this very same connection—item No. 8, The Community Centres Act. It

is my understanding at the present time that if an arena is built the municipality or the community involved gets a grant of, I believe, \$5,000. If a hall is put on to the arena they get a grant of \$10,000, and if the building happens to be burned down then the previous grants are wiped off and we start all over again. My question to you, sir, is: If the building had to be torn down because it was unsafe for public use, would the same apply?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would think likely it would. I think we have to be reasonable about those things, and it would seem to me that in the interest of public safety it would be only quite fair to favourably consider such an application.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has raised a very interesting point. He has talked about the interests of public safety. There have been some discussions in this House over the past few years about public safety insofar as community centres and arenas are concerned. There has been a suggestion put forward by myself and others that there should be some government system of inspection of these arenas; I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us, as he spends this \$315,000, whether he has any system of checking either plans or buildings after they are up? And if he has not, why not? He has to go to The Department of Municipal Affairs to find out—that is where it should be in the first place.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We make these grants on the basis of the construction of new buildings and it is assumed. Our people go over the plans to determine the reasonable safety of construction involved in all of them. As far as I am concerned, we feel that the grants that are made towards the community centres are always based on the thorough understanding that the building is so constructed to be as safe as can be reasonably expected.

Mr. Singer: Does the hon. Minister have engineers in his department who examine these plans and certify them as safe?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We do not have a staff of engineers. The plans are always examined thoroughly. If there is any consideration of doubt whatsoever they are referred to an engineering consultant.

Mr. Singer: I see. Can the hon. Minister tell us in the public accounts where he has ever referred a set of plans to an engineering consultant?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The plans are always submitted to The Department of Labour for their thorough consideration. The cost there would be in The Department of Labour.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister said that where there is doubt he would refer them to consulting engineers, and I would presume that was his department. I just asked him for an example of one instance where he had referred them to a consulting engineer.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If I may correct myself, if I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, with permission of the hon. member for York Centre, to suggest that the matter is referred to The Department of Labour.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Did you have a big win?

Mr. Whicher: We will have a win shortly.

Mr. Singer: Well, then, do I understand from the hon. Minister that the whole matter is referred to The Department of Labour, that he does not have anything to do with it at all? Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is not the case at all.

Mr. Singer: Well, could you tell us what you do have to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Where the directors are of the opinion that a community centre, for which an application for a grant is made, by reason of its size, design, accommodation or other reason, may become hazardous to persons or property, the director may require the applicant to furnish a certificate from the municipal engineer, a medical officer of health, or other municipal official or person as required by the director, that the community centre is fit for use.

Mr. Singer: Well now, has the hon. Minister been at all disturbed about the recent collapses of public buildings where there has been tragic loss of life and tragic destruction of public property, where grants were made?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Why, of course, we are always concerned.

Mr. Singer: And what has the hon. Minister done about it, or what does he plan to do?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Just the same as we have been doing.

Mr. Singer: Well, what is that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have already told you what I have been doing.

Mr. Singer: You have been referring it to The Department of Labour. Is that what you have been doing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the—

Mr. Singer: Well, it is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the point I made earlier has all the more efficacy because the hon. Minister does not do it; all he does is spend \$315,000. There is some sort of a reference apparently to The Department of Labour, some sort of a reference to some vague consulting engineer whom the hon. Minister cannot tell us was ever hired, and perhaps some sort of a reference to The Department of Municipal Affairs. This brings me back to the point I made a little earlier this afternoon that if the hon. Minister does not understand how these grants are administered, and I think it is obvious that he does not, that they should be in a department where they can be properly administered; where safety checks can be made, and where the public safety can be insured. It is not happening in Agriculture.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister again, on the basis under the grants for The Community Centres Act: Is it still 25 per cent and is there a maximum also to the amount that they may receive?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What was the first part of the hon. member's question?

Mr. Belanger: The basis on which the grant is made, is it still 25 per cent, like the grants to the agricultural societies for capital improvements? Is it still 25 per cent for the community centres?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, up to a maximum of \$5,000 for community centres.

Mr. Belanger: Well, if it is to a maximum of \$5,000, I see here that North Bay, for instance, got \$30,940. Toronto got \$10,000. For other places, I see there are amounts larger than that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is where there are a number of community centres within any municipality. All the hon. member is seeing here is the total amount of grants paid to municipalities in the province of Ontario. They are all listed here as towns, villages, townships, school boards and cities, to which grants are paid under The Community Centres Act. It is based upon the maximum grant, 25 per cent up to a maximum of \$5,000

—on a skating rink, on a community hall, on a swimming pool and on an athletic field.

Now, then, if one municipality had a community centre board. They did all four of those things and they qualified for grants up to 25 per cent of the capital cost, with a maximum of \$5,000 on each. That community centre would be entitled to \$20,000.

If they built two such centres in the municipality—and this is not at all beyond reason—then they would qualify for up to \$40,000, whatever it would happen to be. The hon. member will see there are some very substantial grants made here in the cities and in the larger urban centres. That is the reason for the amounts shown.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, there is one item there in townships, the township of Wicksteed, \$65. How big would that be, that community hall?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, be it to the everlasting credit of these people—

Mr. Singer: Of this government.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I was not going to accept the credit, but if the hon. member wants to give it to us, that will be fine. Be it to the everlasting credit, Mr. Chairman, of the people in these rural areas, when they make a capital expenditure they always come along, if they have not received the full maximum to suggest that they are qualifying for 25 per cent of the particular capital investment. This is what happens to be represented here. It may well be they come back next year with more or less, but this is what happened.

Mr. Singer: It costs more than \$65 to hire a consulting engineer.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a great contribution to the debate, but is typical—

Mr. Singer: It is a great contribution the way the hon. Minister runs the affairs of the province.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, could a local board of education qualify under this grant system? If they set up their swimming pool and/or gymnasium in a building adjacent to the school or have it constructed in such a fashion that it could be used for evening activities? Could they qualify under this grant?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is true.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 102 agreed to.

On vote 103:

Mr. Troy: Has the hon. Minister had any applications from the town of Sturgeon Falls for their community park and also their new arena? Of course the arena has to be built before you get a grant on that. There is in that town a park which originally was owned by the agricultural society and it is now administered by the community recreation board. Have they applied for any grants?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It has not come to our attention yet, Mr. Chairman. They may very well have applied and the grant may have been approved, but this is sent to our director of that particular branch. He would have the information for the hon. member. Mr. F. A. Lashley is the director of the horticultural societies branch.

Mr. Belanger: Under vote 103, Mr. Chairman, I see that we are appropriating \$47,500 and in the public accounts statement I do not see anything on how that money was spent last year, whether the amount that was appropriated was spent. I do not see anything at all in the public accounts.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Pardon?

Mr. Belanger: Last year there was appropriated \$43,800. In the public accounts statement it does not show anything on how that was spent, where it went. Now I would like to know how that was spent.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not realize it was not in the public accounts statement until this very minute. It may be or it may not, but I will give the hon. member a report on this.

The co-operators' branch last year conducted a survey or a census of all the co-operators in Ontario in collaboration with the economics division of The Canada Department of Agriculture and the economics department of the Ontario Agricultural College. Some 350 co-operative associations were actually visited and a questionnaire completed during the summer months. Tabulation of these returns is now proceeding. It is expected that a report on the survey will be published in May or June for 1963.

I am just informed that the co-operators' branch and the markets' branch were under the same heading in the report of the public accounts that are here listed. They have now been separated and that is why in the public accounts the markets' branch and the co-operators' branch appear under the same vote. They have been separated this year and that

is why the hon. member does not find it in that particular expenditure.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the hon. Minister, because under the estimates of last year the co-operative, I just read it a little while ago, was \$43,800. Under vote 112, it was 43,800, that was for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is quite right, but this report here is for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1962, and so we are really talking about the year before last's estimates. That is why they are not here. They were separated last year and this is why they do not appear under these separate votes, but they are both under that one particular heading today.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. Minister, in regard to this co-operators' branch, the farmers in Nipissing, in certain sections, who get permits to cut pulpwood on Crown lands some of them are desiring a form of co-operative; do they deal with The Department of Agriculture? Is there legislation in any of the agricultural Acts to permit them to form a co-operative? It is the farmer-settlers group who want to organize—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Pardon?

Mr. Troy: I am referring to those farmer-settlers who get permits to cut pulpwood on Crown lands. I know there is an agitation on foot, I believe in Sudbury district also and in Nipissing, to form co-operatives of these farmer-settlers who cut pulpwood. I believe in northern Ontario, further north in the Kapuskasing area, particularly Cochrane district, possibly in Timiskaming too, there are farmer co-operatives there. In fact those unfortunate people who were involved in the strike—well, they were not involved in the strike but they were members of co-operatives. I think it is of Quebec origin. Is there a provision in The Department of Agriculture to form a co-operative?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May I answer the question?

Mr. Troy: Yes sir.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the first determination would have to be whether this is an agricultural product or not. There is legislation now under The Department of Lands and Forests to deal with just this very matter that the hon. member has raised, and I think also that it would be wise for his group to consult with the Ontario Co-operative Union to determine whether or not they should come under this particular type of

legislation that he has proposed, or whether it should be under Lands and Forests. The legislative machinery exists in The Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask a question, about the co-ops. The hon. Minister—I do not want a long report necessarily—just explain. If a dozen farmers wanted to go together and start a co-op, what procedure would they go through, and how much capital does the province provide, and what percentage of capital?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The basis of the loans is 50 per cent of a first mortgage, and the maximum loan under the co-operative branch is \$100,000.

Mr. Whicher: Then five per cent is your definite interest rate or—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, six per cent. I am sorry.

Mr. Whicher: Can you, say, take a first mortgage up to 50 per cent of the value of the property?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is right.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, are we discussing the co-operative loans now, under this vote?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know if we have a special vote for co-operative loans.

Mr. Innes: Yes, we have; the last one.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Innes: The last one.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, the capital is the very last vote. Yes, that is right, The Co-operative Loans Act is the last vote—121. We got into this other discussion, but if you want to ask questions—

Mr. Innes: I would like to ask the hon. Minister, who are the members of the co-operative loans board at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will get you this; I am not exactly sure. I know that Mr. Bruce Teesdale is the chairman of the board and Mr. Bain Stewart is the secretary. There is a representative of Treasury on there: Mr. Browning, from Treasury. Those are the three, I believe. That is right.

Mr. Innes: Well, your deputy Minister has recently stated that The Department of Agriculture told the annual meeting of the co-

operative union of Ontario, in Toronto, that the applications for new loans would be scrutinized more carefully than in the past. This is not government intervention or interference here, sir; the bank would do the same. Now, I actually agree that a lot of these loans certainly should be scrutinized to some degree, but on the other hand what actual co-operation do you give the managers and the co-operatives to the extent that you would encourage loaning them money with respect to their individual operations? Would you give them some extra knowledge on how they could market their produce?

I actually feel that while you are a little bit reluctant sometimes to loan co-operatives money in various aspects of the agricultural industry, you do not give sufficient help in letting them know how they can actually capitalize in marketing their end products to the best results. Now, I would like to know what guidance your department or this board gives to co-operate with them in this particular aspect. I do not know that the deputy Minister should be making such statements as this consistently. I would think that policy statements such as this should come from the hon. Minister himself or else from the government. This is a pretty strong statement coming from a deputy Minister, I would think. Has he any comment to make on this?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would think that the hon. member would be in complete agreement, that every consideration should be given to the granting of loans such as this. After all it is public money that we are charged with the responsibility of administering, and certainly I think this was only good sound commonsense and good business practice. I would support my deputy 100 per cent in the statement that he has made in this particular regard.

Now, as far as your second observation was concerned, relative to administrative or managerial advice, we have attempted in every way possible to accede to any requests for those kinds of services that have ever been made on us by any particular co-operative, and I am sure that the hon. member for Oxford would be the first to agree that The Department of Agriculture should not force its services on anyone who does not feel that they need those services, nor that a contribution could be made from the department. This is the attitude we have adopted.

Mr. Innes: Well, I agree to a degree with what the hon. Minister said, but on the other hand, when these new co-operatives start up,

suppose they are in a canning business or in some other business where they are marketing produce that they are producing themselves. Invariably they are not acquainted with the retail industry as such, and it has been brought to my attention on various occasions that some of the accounts that they run into right from the start when they are starting up in their co-operative business, are accounts that are not too stable and there are some people who do not have a very good rating at the bank. Some of these co-operatives have got into very, very serious difficulty because of the fact that they have not been guided properly in their first determination of how they are getting started.

I think this is—well, I know you do not want to be interfering in their operation too much—I think it is only fair to let them know they should be very, very careful about who they are dealing with, and the credit rating on all the people they are dealing with. Now, I understand, just recently that a co-operative has got into very, very serious **difficulty and that they may be forced to close** because of the fact that they did not have sufficient information on the credit rating of some of the customers that they immediately dealt with. I think that they should be guided by the department when you yourselves are loaning them 50 per cent of the money, that this difficulty should be pointed out to them. In all fairness I think it should be. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what his comments are in regard to this.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: First of all, as far as the membership of the co-op loan board is concerned, I mentioned Mr. Teesdale as chairman, Mr. Stewart as secretary, Mr. Browning of the Treasury Department and Mr. William Montcalm of Agriculture. Those are the four members. I omitted Mr. Montcalm's name. The point that the hon. member has raised, concerning the problem of bad accounts with co-operatives, certainly is one of great concern. It would be of great concern to the members of the co-op, I should think, who have very definitely invested their savings in the co-op to get it started and get it going. Certainly the department has a responsibility insofar as the trust of the public funds is concerned, which are invested in that particular co-op.

I feel that we would be going a long way indeed, if we were to come along to every co-operative in the province of Ontario and say to them: "Now, look, boys you better let us have a look at your books. We want to see whether or not you are doing a good job

here." Is this what my hon. friend suggests? Well, if this is not it, how are we to determine when there has never been a request made of our co-operatives loans branch nor The Department of Agriculture, to my knowledge, that has not been met 100 per cent with co-operation from our department, in every regard? But, I feel that the first move is surely up to the manager of that co-op to come to us and say, "Now, we would like your advice, and the benefit of the experience of your directors."

Certainly the people of the province of Ontario recognize the tremendous ability of a man like Bruce Teesdale who is recognized as an outstanding co-operatives man, as a manager in this province, before he came to The Department of Agriculture, and I think that any co-op in this province, feeling that there was any degree of a problem arising financially or at a managerial level would be inclined immediately to come to our co-operators' branch and say, "Let us have the benefit of your advice and your experience."

But I find it difficult, Mr. Chairman, to determine how we should go out and say to the great number of co-operatives there are in the province of Ontario, "Let us have a look and see if you are doing this as you should or not." I think that the members themselves would be justly critical of us if we were to so intrude into their private affairs.

Mr. Innes: Well, Mr. Chairman, that certainly was not my intention in any way, shape or form. I thought that it would be fair that the department and the branch point out the pitfalls that they should be looking for and protect the interest of the money and the money that you are currently loaning them. It is in the interest of the government of the province too, that you point to these pitfalls that they must invariably watch and be very careful about. It seems to me very regretful that some of these co-operatives have been possibly just taken a little bit too far. They are the ones that are going to suffer, while other firms are going to get out of it scot-free because they know the pitfalls.

Now, I just say this in passing and I would hope that the hon. Minister would take some precaution in the future that these pitfalls would be pointed out. I mean, I am perfectly in favour of co-operatives and the promotion of them under the best managing ability that can be had, but I think that it is most important that we have these points and guidance of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and of the department, because they have gone through

these difficulties before and can point them out more readily than anybody else.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I can see that the hon. member is driving at something here, but I would like very much to suggest to him that this service that he asks us to do is already available to the co-ops. Now, how are we to determine whether they want it or not? This is the thing that I think you should say.

Mr. Innes: The hon. Minister did not tell me that in the first place; that is what I asked him.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did tell the hon. member that in the first place. I told him that this service was available to the co-ops at any time they wanted to get it.

Mr. Innes: But the hon. Minister did not point it out to them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Never have we been asked to provide this kind of service that we did not meet this kind of service. It is available to them if they want to have it, but the point that the hon. member did not suggest is how we are to determine the co-ops that need it and those that do not. When they ask us, we provide the service, and I think it is only fair to suggest that we must always, always, regard every request that comes before the co-operative loans board with the utmost scrutiny to determine whether or not it is a sound request. There are very seldom times that political pressure is ever brought to bear on us to grant loans to co-operatives, very seldom indeed. In fact, only once do I ever remember an hon. member of this House ever calling me to suggest that I should take a lenient attitude towards the request for a co-operative loan.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 103 agreed to.

On vote 104:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, prior to the Christmas recess of this session of the Legislature there was quite a flurry, I think entirely from the government side of the House, on the very important and contentious issue of the colouring of margarine. I recall quite an eloquent speech on this subject by the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Lewis). I also recall a speech by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) who, unfortunately, does not happen to be in the House at the moment although he is usually here. My recollection is that the hon. member for Eglinton stated that he thought it was time the government took action on this

matter to amend The Oleomargarine Act so as to permit margarine to be coloured yellow. He said, as I recall it, that if the government did not act within a reasonable span of time he himself planned to bring in a bill on the subject.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that the hon. Prime Minister at approximately the same time stated that he would be very glad to see the hon. member's bill, and that after he had had a chance to look at it the government would decide what action, if any, they might be willing to take. I think that is a fair summary of what happened at that time, and I may say there was considerable publicity on the exchange.

Time is fleeting, Mr. Chairman. It is approximately two months since, or perhaps it is more than two months, more like three months, since this exchange took place. I would judge that in the normal course of events this House will not be in session for more than another five or six weeks, and I would personally like to see some action before those five or six weeks have elapsed. I was personally quite happy to leave the matter in the hands of the government hon. members because I am sufficient of a realist to know that measures emanating from the government side of the House are more likely to pass than those emanating from this side of the House.

However, I have been checking the order paper for today and I have been checking it periodically for—well, I usually take a look at it every day—and I have not seen any indication of a bill to amend The Oleomargarine Act or any indication of notice having been given of such a bill. I hope that the hon. member for Eglinton and the hon. Prime Minister are not now engaged in a sort of an Alphonse-Gaston act, each one waiting for the other to make the first move.

If the hon. member for Eglinton has a bill I hope that he has discussed it with the hon. Prime Minister, I hope the hon. Prime Minister has indicated to him what his views are, and I hope that if the views of the hon. Prime Minister are not considered by the hon. member for Eglinton to be satisfactory he will proceed with his original intention, as announced in this House, of introducing a private member's bill.

I would prefer to see this matter come in as a government measure because I am sure that a government measure will have substantially greater chance of success than a private member's bill even from the government side of the House. However, I do not particularly insist on that. If the hon.

member for Eglinton sees fit to bring in a bill I would personally welcome it.

I would make this plea to the government, that if and when such a bill comes in and I hope that it comes in soon—and if it does not come in soon maybe some other arrangements will have to be made—party discipline be lifted and a free vote of the hon. members be permitted. I think this is the kind of issue where a free vote is appropriate. I am not normally in favour of that procedure in a British type of assembly but this I think is a case where an exception can be made. This is unquestionably a highly contentious issue. There are some very legitimate differences of opinion on the issue.

I believe that a great many farmers in this province regard the colouring, at least the yellow colouring of margarine as a threat to their own economic interests. I believe experience may have proved that fear to be unfounded. I believe that the economic interests of farmers are threatened from many directions, but I do not think this is a serious threat to them. I think the threat comes from other angles and I think the problem of dairy surpluses should be handled in other ways rather than through an attempt to discourage consumers from buying margarine by a device that is not applicable to any other food product available on the market in Canada today.

I really do not think that is the way to approach the problem of dairy surpluses. Furthermore, I do not think the device has been effective. People are buying margarine and consuming it, notwithstanding the ban on yellow colouring. That being so, why continue this pinprick on the consumer? I may say, personally, I do not particularly like margarine but on the occasions I do eat it it does not make any difference to me whether it is white or yellow. I am probably not quite as colour conscious as some people—

An hon. member: You are colour blind, and don't worry about it anyway.

Mr. Bryden: No, I do not like it anyway, but the colour does not affect me, but it does affect a great many people. It really seems quite unreasonable that housewives should have to go to all the trouble of mixing colour into margarine in order to make it attractive in appearance to the members of their households. However, it is a very contentious issue. On the one hand many farmers are very concerned, on the other hand many housewives, and, from my experience of the telephone calls and letters I have received, a growing number of housewives are concerned.

I do not think that this Legislature in all conscience can continue to duck the issue and act as if it did not exist. I think we have to take a stand one way or the other. If the government does not consider the matter to be an appropriate area to be dealt with by government policy, all right, let us have it come in as a bill from the hon. member for Eglinton or any other hon. member who cares to bring a bill in. Then let the government relax its normal procedure in directing the affairs of this House to the extent of permitting that bill to be debated and brought to a vote. Let the matter be settled on the basis of what the majority of the hon. members of this Legislature decide, on the basis of their own individual assessment of the rights and wrongs of the issue.

I would suggest to the government, Mr. Chairman, that the Legislature can no longer duck the issue; we should face up to it. If the hon. member for Eglinton cares to bring in his bill, we will have an opportunity to face up to it. But let us have a vote on it one way or the other, and then let us report to our constituents how we individually voted and how the majority of the House voted.

The only argument against permitting margarine to be coloured yellow that I have heard, that appears to me to have any logic in it at all is this: if margarine were exactly the same colour as butter, it might be possible for restaurants and other similar institutions to palm margarine off on their customers as butter. I do not think deception of that kind should be permitted, but I do not really think that is a cause for genuine concern. Apart from the fact that in my opinion there is a quite noticeable difference in the taste, the fact also remains that Section 2 of The Oleomargarine Act provides that in any public eating place where oleomargarine is served the proprietor is required to have a conspicuous announcement on each menu, and also a conspicuous announcement on the premises, indicating that oleomargarine is served there.

However, if that is considered to be insufficient protection against possible deception by proprietors of eating places, I would suggest that another way of meeting the problem is to amend the Act in such a manner that margarine may be coloured yellow but a somewhat different shade from butter. The Act, of course, right now permits a minimal colouring of margarine but apparently it is so slight as to be unnoticeable. I understand it is quite possible to provide a yellow colour for margarine that is quite distinguishable from the

colour of butter but is still attractive and palatable.

As a matter of fact, when this legislation was first before this Legislature the then CCF group proposed that section 4 should be in that form. It should permit attractive and palatable colouring but of a somewhat lighter shade than that permitted for butter. At the time that proposal was widely misinterpreted as meaning the CCF was opposed to the colouring of margarine which it never was, but that is a possible solution if there is genuine concern that there might be deception in margarine being sold as if it were butter.

I think the time has come when the present hypocrisy of the law should be dealt with one way or the other. A bill should come before this House from some source and the hon. members should be permitted to vote upon it. I would say, Mr. Chairman, in view of the recent announcement of the hon. Prime Minister approximately three months ago that he was willing to look at the bill of the hon. member for Eglinton and then make a decision on it, it would be only fair for someone speaking for the government to advise the House as to just where we stand on this matter, and whether or not it may be expected that any sort of legislation will come in at this session, either from a private member on the government side or from the government itself.

Mr. Chairman: Is this vote carried?

Mr. Bryden: Apparently we don't get any announcement, eh?

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, before that vote is passed I would like to ask the hon. Minister, by what standards is this Act enforced, or what does the government do by way of inspection of this Edible Oils Act?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am informed that we have two inspectors dealing entirely with the administration of the policing of The Edible Oils Act in the province of Ontario and The Oleomargarine Act; and we have all of our inspectors of the branch advised to be continually on the look-out. In effect they are also inspectors, but two deal continually with this matter of enforcement.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, why I bring this up, as the hon. member for Woodbine has suggested, it is something that has varied in all parties—as to what they think of colouring of margarine. One of the things I think is becoming alarming is the fact that there is a

lot of margarine today that has been sold at a very cheap price. I noticed one ad. in our local paper the other day—I think it was 5 lbs. for \$1. Quite frankly in my business, the baking business, I cannot buy industrial margarine for that price let alone the retail price. We are also getting cheaper than pure vegetable shortenings so I think, first of all before any move is made on behalf of anyone to colour margarine, the public and the agriculture industry have got to be protected.

The people are getting a good quality product, and I fail to see that any product based on the price for which some of it is selling today can be coloured and sold as a substitute for butter. Therefore I urge, if any party suggests they are going to colour margarine, they should certainly bring in standards that this product has got to meet.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I have said this before on numerous occasions, and I want to approach this subject this afternoon as fairly as possible, but I simply cannot understand the fact that in the province of Ontario we have such a differential in the price of milk. Some farmers, about 10 per cent of them, have a high price, not necessarily a high price but a much higher price than the other 90 per cent; in many instances for exactly the same product.

I have told the story here before how farmers in our own locality come to us at the end of June; they have been getting \$2.50, or roughly \$2.50, a hundredweight for ten months of the year from a concentrated milk plant. They come to the dairy, and for the next two months, for exactly the same product, they get roughly twice as much money. They sell to us in the summer resort areas for two months and then at the end of August they go back again to half the price.

I compare this to two school teachers with exactly the same qualifications. I wonder how long it would last in the province of Ontario if two teachers had exactly the same experience and qualifications, and one of them got \$5,000 a year and the other \$10,000 a year? I suggest that the teaching profession would not stand for it very long. Therefore I would hope that this problem is faced in the immediate future.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sympathetic to the hon. Minister and his associates, his advisors, knowing how a milk plan can be put across to the farmers of the province of Ontario. But on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I say that this is a problem which must be faced and there must be some leadership given by the hon. Minister and by his

advisors. It is simply not right that in many instances, for exactly the same product, one man gets 50 per cent as much as the other one. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister would be able to assure us that he will, to the best of his ability, attempt to get these four branches of the dairy industry together and that something be done about this problem.

There is no fairness in it at all, none whatsoever. It is like one bakery selling bread for ten cents a loaf and another one of exactly the same quality selling it for twenty cents. Therefore, I would hope this afternoon, the hon. Minister would be able to assure us that just because he has not been successful in the past, he will endeavour to face this problem head-on, get the four groups together and in the next few years, starting immediately, this problem might be eradicated so that all dairy farmers in the province of Ontario might be treated equally and on a fair basis so far as the price for their product is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is five minutes to five. I think if one were to deal with the subject that the hon. member for Bruce has raised, we might very well be here on this one item for a very long time, I am quite sure. I think to deal with it in summary fashion, I might suggest that there is a very long historical background to the milk situation and the milk problem as it exists in the province of Ontario today, and indeed across Canada, particularly in relationship to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. It does seem to me that we have experienced throughout the years, in the development of the fluid milk markets in the province of Ontario, the establishment of an industry within provincial boundaries to a very large degree. There is little or no milk that passes back and forth across provincial boundaries in the fluid milk market. Now I agree that there is some, but not a great deal. But the unfortunate part of it is that as far as the other milk products are concerned, there is a free movement inter-provincially and this has always been a matter that then creates problems as far as correcting it within any one province is concerned. I think this is one of the things that may have contributed to the disagreement that might have existed or developed between the four dairy groups this summer, to determine how they might best come to grips with this problem.

But I am very much encouraged today, sir, with the fact that, in Ontario, the whole milk league have appointed a representative from among themselves. A processor or distributor

of whole milk has been also appointed to this committee, and the same applies for the concentrated side of the industry. We have gone so far as to appoint to this committee, as chairman, our dairy commissioner, Mr. J. L. Baker. Now the intent of this committee in the province of Ontario is to try to bring together those two very important segments of our dairy industry; the concentrated and the fluid milk shippers.

But along with this there must be the realization that this same problem exists in other provinces as well. And with this thought in mind, our deputy Minister consulted with the deputy Minister of Agriculture in Quebec. Between them they agreed that this is an interprovincial matter that perhaps affects Ontario and Quebec more than any other two provinces. And so the same type of committee has been set up in Quebec on the mutual understanding that the two groups would get together and try to work out these problems, along with whatever guidance we as a department might provide both in Quebec and in Ontario along these very lines.

Now this is the status of the matter at the moment, and I feel very encouraged with the fact that the government of the province of Quebec has now introduced legislation comparable to the legislation which exists in the province of Ontario, to enable the producers of that province to establish themselves under farm marketing legislation and comparative legislation under The Milk Industry Act which we have here in the province of Ontario.

Now I think this is as reasonable a summary as one can give in a short time to this particular problem. I feel that this should be dealt with on an interprovincial basis. I have high hopes following this meeting that was held in Ottawa last week, where we had the dairy farmers, the dairy council of Canada representing the processors, the national farmers' union, Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and every government represented but Newfoundland, I believe. This, to me, was an indication that there is a recognition that this dairy problem is a national one that we can only come to grips with on that type of basis.

On the other hand, I think we must recognize the fact that it is hardly likely that all the producers across Canada would accept some overall type of federal authority that would force on them at this particular moment certain things that might be done to correct these problems that are confronting us in the dairy industry. Now I believe that

they will accept the type of committee that was set up as of last week; this type of an advisory co-ordinating committee, that will work in each of the zones proposed. I feel, if we can approach it on this basis now, that we can move on to a very much better understanding and to a clearer solution of this milk problem as time goes on.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that before the hon. Minister got around to answering the question of my hon. friend from Bruce, he could have dealt with the question raised by the hon. member for Woodbine. But apparently he has no intention of doing that, nor apparently has the hon. Prime Minister any intention of commenting on the question of colouring margarine. My remarks on this are going to be very brief. I notice now, in their seats, the hon. member for Eglinton, who was not here when the hon. member for Woodbine made his remarks, and the hon. member for York-Humber who is back again. Both of these hon. members have on earlier occasions in this session of this Legislature commented on this question.

I will make this suggestion once again. I would urge the hon. Prime Minister that he should allow this matter to come before the floor of this Legislature and allow a free vote. There are differences of opinion on both sides of the House. For myself, I am in favour of colouring margarine.

This is a question of substantial importance to the people of Ontario and there is only one way to face up to it and that is to allow the hon. members of this Legislature to vote on it as they see fit. On the government side I know there are differences of opinion; on our side I know there are differences of opinion. But I urge the hon. Prime Minister that he should allow this question to be decided in a fully democratic fashion; allow the matter to come on the floor of the House and allow the hon. members to vote as they see fit.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, when I raised this matter and directed an inquiry to the government, it was received with a thunderous silence, but the hon. member for Eglinton is now back in his seat. I will not repeat all of my previous remarks, but I was wondering if he could give a progress report to the House on where his proposed bill stands. It does not seem to have reached the order paper as yet, and I would merely say for his information that, at the moment when he happened to be out, I had expressed some concern that time was running out on us. I am wondering if he is in a position in any way to allay

the concern some of us are beginning to feel.

Mr. Thomas: No progress.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the reply that the hon. Minister made to my hon. friend from Bruce when he brought up this question of milk marketing in the province. The hon. Minister, in his reply, mentioned that there was a committee set up with representatives of two groups; the concentrated producers and the fluid milk producers. I was wondering why there was not any representation from the other two groups in that committee. Is there a reason for it or would the hon. Minister care to—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised a point that I think we are all concerned about. There is no thought nor intent whatever that the other two groups are not important, and indeed I feel that they are most important. I believe it has been amply demonstrated that there appear to be great differences in bringing the four groups together at one fell swoop. It does seem to me that if we can get the two groups who are most vitally concerned today with this problem of milk production, then I think we have at least started in the right direction of bringing in an overall dairy policy for the farmers of Ontario and Quebec. Certainly we recognize this problem, and I feel that the expressions of opinion that have come to me from the members of the respective groups, show that in the light of what has happened in the last year, this is the next best step that we can possibly take to implement this type of a plan. It is certainly not with any thought of deprecating their importance in the overall dairy industry in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, or indeed in Canada.

Mr. Manley: I appreciate the comments of the hon. Minister. I want to ask him another question, then, in regard to this very matter. Is this the reason why the committee that was set up last year failed because of the other two groups being in on that committee at that time, that they were not able to get together? Was it because there was a barrier between the different groups that the committee failed?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I would suggest to the hon. member that I did not sit in on the deliberations of the committee, nor would I suggest, nor would I accept the inference that he has attempted to make here, if I am not mistaken, that I am suggesting that it

was because of the other two groups that the plan failed. I want to make it abundantly clear, Mr. Chairman, that I have no such thoughts that this was the case. The fact remains that the provisional board presented me with a resolution of their abandoning the proposal of developing a milk marketing plan.

Immediately afterwards the cheese producers came in and in a brief, suggested that the restrictive or the protective legislation which has developed around the milk markets—the fluid milk markets—in the province of Ontario should be abandoned, should be repealed, and the whole thing thrown on a wide-open basis.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister said that it should be at least an interprovincial matter between the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and it was also mentioned that four groups are involved—and also I certainly think that it should be an interprovincial matter, because we certainly should not just consider Ontario as one area. It should be thought of on a regional basis because, as the hon. Minister knows, there is a delegation here from northern Ontario. The hon. Minister knows the problem as far as it affects dairy producers, the whole milk producers, of northeastern Ontario.

And it seems to me that one of the solutions is that these concentrated milk products should have a different classification from the present one. As the hon. Minister knows very well, in my riding—and I presume in the riding of Timiskaming north of us—milk cannot be produced for less than about \$4.50 per hundredweight and in Nipissing it is something like \$5.20 per hundredweight as the sale price to the distributors and in Sault Ste. Marie it is somewhat higher. We cannot possibly produce it and make a profit and still compete with the concentrated milk which is now being sold almost generally throughout the cities of northern Ontario and probably soon will be for home delivery.

So that is our problem and I think it must be considered on a reasonable basis. We are not great producers of cheese, nor great producers of butter, but our dairy farmers are hard-pressed because of this competition from concentrated milk. It seems to me, sir, that the only solution is to help the dairy farmer out, otherwise they are going to have to go out of business and, as I pointed out before, if they go into the beef industry, it takes several years before it becomes a cash crop; and while I know that another complication is the fact that there are far more

consumers than there are producers, and one cannot expect a consumer to pay 26 cents for a quart of milk when he can buy this concentrated milk for 18 or 19 cents. Nor should hospitals be paying between 20 and 26 cents for milk when the concentrated people will sell them the milk at 15 cents a quart.

So there are two problems. There is the problem of the consumer to get a popular product as cheap as possible—particularly the families who have a large number of children—and then there is the problem of the dairy producer. Gradually, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs knows, in the riding of Timiskaming, there has been a reduction in producers. The same thing applies to Sudbury district. So we also have quite a problem up there and it is something that must be considered quite seriously, this problem of the competition between the concentrated milk producers and the whole-milk producers of northeastern Ontario anyway. I do not know just what the situation is in northwestern Ontario but I know that the hon. member for Fort William himself is a dairy farmer, and knows the conditions in that section.

Mr. L. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to hear words of support from the hon. member for Woodbine and also from the hon. member for York Centre—

An hon. member: How about government members? Did you get any support there?

Mr. Reilly: Yes, that is the part I am glad at this time to be able to report, Mr. Chairman. I have been in touch with the hon. Prime Minister and I believe that he and the members of the Cabinet will be able to give consideration to the removal of the ban on coloured margarine. I am hopeful that this will happen, Mr. Chairman, and this is why I have been waiting before introducing a private member's bill. The hon. member for Woodbine and the hon. member for York Centre will be glad to know I am a past president of the Optimist Club and that I still have faith in my group. I am sure that our government will continue to be forward-looking and will approach this problem in the same forthright way that they have with all their problems. Perhaps at this same time I might solicit support from other hon. members present. Anyone who would be willing to help, I would be glad to have his name.

Mr. Bryden: We will be happy to second your bill, if that will help.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a moment now of your time. I am very happy to announce to the House that last year the Dairy Princess came from the county of Stormont. Miss Caroline Murray competed with all those other lovely ladies at the CNE, and she was crowned Dairy Princess. Miss Caroline Murray comes from a family that operates a very progressive and good farm in the county of Stormont, and she has a background where she was a great worker in her own community. She has done a lot of work in the 4-H club. She has contributed a great deal not only to the dairy industry, but to the whole of the province of Ontario.

I was very happy and I want to say now how much I appreciate, and the people of Stormont, appreciate the help that was given her by the officials of your department, sir, and the way that she was looked after in her trip overseas. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in Miss Caroline Murray we really had an ambassador from this country to England, and to Europe. She is a very beautiful girl, speaks well, and certainly has made a great impression abroad. I think that this is a programme that should be continued. We should encourage this in every way we can, and I just wanted to take the time of the House to express my appreciation, the appreciation of the family, and especially all in the county of Stormont, for this very wonderful honour that came not only to the county of Stormont, but to the dairy industry in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, might I, on the note that has been sounded by the hon. member for Stormont, offer the congratulations of The Department of Agriculture to Miss Caroline Murray for having won this competition. We have been most happy, in The Department of Agriculture, through the fieldmen service, to carry on the various Dairy Princess competitions across the province in co-operation with the milk producers' co-ordinating board. I feel that it has done a very great deal to promote the dairy industry in the province of Ontario.

I would like at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, with your kind permission, to point out the fact that in the press gallery today we have the chairman of the CNE Dairy Princess competition, Mr. Don Fairbairn. Don Fairbairn has done an exceedingly fine job over the years in being chairman of this particular competition; and those of us who helped to fill the Coliseum on the nights of the Dairy Princess competition out there will agree that he has done a magnifi-

cent job in leading it. We wish him every continued success, as I know he will carry on this good job in future.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister some questions concerning the status of the milk pricing formula. It has gone through the mill in the last few months, and we have already discussed it under a previous vote.

Following the moratorium imposed by the government, I understand that the formula has since been put back into effect as a guide for the negotiations in the various markets, but that during the time the moratorium was in effect the milk pricing formula was fiddled with in some ways so that an increase in the price is no longer indicated. I would like the hon. Minister to explain this adjustment in the formula, and also whether or not it would be government policy to have it apply in the various negotiations.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not entirely clear, I must confess, Mr. Chairman, on what the hon. member has asked me at this time.

Mr. Nixon: Are you listening now? I do not mean to be insulting, but it is difficult to feel that I am getting—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is difficult to listen to two at once.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I know. I want to know the present status of the pricing formula. Are you recommending that it be followed in the various negotiations that I understand are taking place in the various markets for milk at the present time? And what change has been effected in the formula so that an increase in price is not now indicated?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, my apologies for having to ask the hon. member to ask the question twice. First of all, in relation to what has happened to the formula, the formula was suspended in order that we might take a good look at it and examine it thoroughly in the light of the problems that existed in the dairy industry. In this course of study on the formula, on the milk price formula, it was learned that a mistake had been made—and I must confess this—in the indices that were taken into consideration. In the first place the formula was made up of many factors, but one of them is the price that is paid for other milk going into other milk products. The federal government's subsidy of 25 cents per hundred, supplied on manufactured milk, both for concentrated and cheese purposes, was considered in the indices of the formula.

Butter, as you know, was provided as of the first of May with a 12 cents subsidy from Ottawa. This was never included in the calculation of the formula. And so when the 12 cents subsidy was not included, as had been the 25 cents subsidy, and to be consistent, the formula committee simply included the subsidy that was then paid on butter, or now being paid on butter, and has been since last May. This is consistent with what has always been done as far as the 25 cents subsidy for manufactured products; and when this was calculated it reduced the formula from 529 to 524, I believe.

Mr. Nixon: Would that be an increase in the price of butter? Are you referring to an increase in the price of butter?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, the 12 cents subsidy was taken into the same consideration as the 25 cents subsidy that is paid to the farmer. The same is consistent, and this was why the difference then occurred in the final analysis. As for my hon. friend suggesting that the formula should be considered in any price negotiations that might now develop, it has always been used only as an indicator as far as price negotiations are concerned; it has never been considered otherwise. Now there is no reason why that should—

Mr. Nixon: You withdrew the confidence of the government.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Nixon: You withdrew the confidence of the department in the usefulness of the formula, when the moratorium was declared. Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That may be your opinion, but—

Mr. Nixon: You said it was found wanting at that time. It indicated an increase in the price and you say you found there was something wanting. You say it is all right now, and it should then be considered by all these negotiators. As soon as it reaches the appropriate level there is no question about the payment of the farmer going up if it can be negotiated in that way.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This has always been the case.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, in that regard I would like to ask the hon. Minister: Is he aware of the fact that the milk distributors in the Toronto market, by reason of the fact that the moratorium was imposed and the

milk did not go up, the price of milk to the farmers, have asked the producers to take a reduction in price of 60 cents per cwt.? I would ask the hon. Minister if he is aware that this was the case and that the dairies would actually have received approximately one-half of the increase of 19 cents; that it was indicated that this would come and that some of their help was also more or less promised; that they would get an increase. In order to offset the moratorium they have, in effect, told the producers, and have negotiated to the effect, that they should take 60 cents less. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what his comments are on that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which is, of course, before the milk industry board. I have heard that these representations were made under negotiation. I understand that the Toronto milk producers requested that there be an increase in the price of milk, and that the processors or the distributors requested that there be a decrease. It is still a matter that is open for negotiation. There is no reason why there should not be an amicable solution arrived at between the two groups.

Mr. Innes: Well, let us clarify that in the hon. Minister's thinking. He said that the producers of the Toronto market thought that there should be an increase and the distributors thought there should be a decrease. I want to inform the hon. Minister that the producers thought there should be a decrease—I want to inform him that the producers felt that there should be an increase to the consumer and that the distributor thought that there should be an increase to the producer. There is some difference in that thinking.

Now, I just want to read a few figures to you, sir, on what has transpired in the price of some basic feeds that go into the production of milk, as of February 1, 1962, and as of February 1, 1963. Bran in 1962 was \$60, today it is \$68; corn was \$60, today it is \$64; brewer's grain \$62, today it is \$74; soy bean meal a year ago was \$90, today it is \$106; all grass seeds are up 5 cents a pound; molasses 9 cents a pound; fertilizer has increased \$6 a ton.

Now, I ask the hon. Minister in all fairness why the hon. Prime Minister of this province, and it must have been on the assumption that somebody prompted him because I do not think he is sufficiently informed of the dairy industry in this province to put a moratorium on; why in fact on all other, Coca-Cola, bread, cars, did he see fit to put a moratorium on? He must have had the instruction from some-

body and I would like to know where that instruction came from.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question I can certainly say that the hon. Prime Minister, I hope, has some confidence in his Minister of Agriculture. I certainly reported to the House yesterday the circumstances relating to the moratorium, the suspension of the application of the milk price formula, and these facts are as true today as they were yesterday.

Mr. Innes: Who gave the hon. Prime Minister the authority?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, certainly, the hon. Prime Minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I would think that the hon. member for Oxford would know that the hon. Prime Minister would certainly be acting on the advice of the Minister of Agriculture in this particular matter, and I was simply passing on to him the advice that had been delivered to me. This is the basis of what was said yesterday.

Mr. Innes: Yesterday the hon. Minister said that it was the Toronto milk producers who had given him the authority. Well, it is very confusing, I must admit.

In the public accounts we have an allowance to members of the milk industry board and we have a variance here. We have a name, Gordon W. Greer, \$1,225, and F. W. Jones, \$385. Now, I understand that the members of the milk industry board generally sit together, a committee of Mr. Greer, Mr. Jones and, I believe, Judge Currie. I can understand that he is not listed here, but I would like to know why the variance of Mr. Greer and Mr. Jones of almost \$900.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all Mr. Jones acted as chairman of the marketing inquiry committee at that particular time. Is the hon. member inquiring as to the amount paid as a member of the marketing inquiry committee?

Mr. Innes: No, I am inquiring as to the amount; the allowance paid to the members of the milk industry board only.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, is Jones a member of the milk industry board?

Mr. Innes: W. F. Jones.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, we are talking about two different Joneses. I was talking

about the Jones who was president or chairman of the marketing inquiry committee. But Mr. Jones, who was a member of the milk industry board; the reason that his salary is not as great as that referred to of Mr. Greer is because Mr. Jones was sick for a good deal of the time during the year and finally resigned from the board.

Mr. Innes: Who replaced him in his sickness?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Alex Thurston replaced him later on.

Mr. Innes: Well, that is not included in the accounts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bruce asked how many committees Mr. Greer was on, and I think the hon. Minister informed him that, as far as he knew, he was on two. I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that on the agriculture inquiry committee of Ontario, allowance to member, Mr. G. W. Greer, is \$250. I have already mentioned the allowance to the members of the milk industry board. We go over to the marketing department branch and we find him again, G. W. Greer, \$525; and I understand this is the same man who is chairman of the Ontario Progressive-Conservative agricultural committee. I just wanted to let the hon. Minister know he was on another board, in case he did not know. I do not know how many more he is on, but I would be interested to know.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to answer the hon. member. He refers to the fact that I said in answer to a question yesterday that he was on two boards. I was asked yesterday how many boards is Gordon Greer on, and my answer was: two. The hon. member is referring to the fact that he was on three committees two years ago, and this is quite correct. There is no difference of opinion between us.

Mr. Innes: Well, in other words, he is on quite a few, anyway.

Now, Mr. Chairman, two years ago when the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Goodfellow) was here I brought up the fact that several southern states were testing milk on the basis of solids, not fat. He told me at that particular time that he was giving consideration to it and that the college at Guelph was looking into the situation. Now, I understand that they are still looking into it. But, on the other hand, I know that in several states of the United States there are various dairy groups who are using this particular

test at the moment. Now, I certainly do not actually know the merits or demerits, but I do know this; that we must, in the dairy industry, start stressing protein or the total nutrients, not fat, in milk. I personally believe that we have been going the wrong direction in advocating the old Babcock test of percentage fat in milk, although it has been very accurate. We, in the dairy industry, have been prone to a lot of adverse criticism by specialists, regarding the incidence of heart diseases relative to fat. Now, I personally believe that as soon as we get a test for nutrients, for protein in milk, we should try to stress the value of milk as a food product. Then we are going to go a long way in selling more milk in this province and get away from the trend that has been so recurrent recently by some people, and I think, primarily, to sell other products.

I just want to bring to your attention—the House's attention—a recent article which has come forward from the American Medical Association which fires a withering broadside on those who think animal fats, such as butter, cause heart attacks. In a strongly worded statement the American Medical Association described the anti-cholesterol food fad as a wasted and dangerous effort.

The AMA statement should issue a warning, to do-it-yourself Americans and to food processors who have built big advertising campaigns boosting cooking oils, margarine and other foods derived from vegetable oils at the expense of animal fats. Over recent months some statements made by the AMA have been made use of by a number of companies in their advertising campaigns. Few medical subjects have aroused more interest among laymen than a discussion in connection with dairy products that lead to heart trouble.

The meat industry, and more especially the dairy industry, have been up in arms about the anti-fat campaign for some time. The American Medical Association says only laboratory tests would show whether an individual had excess cholesterol in his blood and whether a diet change would raise or lower the level. Merely substituting a few food items, without overall control of the diet, accomplishes little or nothing in reducing cholesterol.

What is more important is the elimination of certain foods that could be detrimental to health. I bring this to you because I know it is very controversial, but, on the other hand, Mr. Minister, I stress this very forcefully, that we must get on to a different basis for testing of milk and pricing of milk so that we may sell more milk in the province of Ontario.

I understand that in Great Britain they have a new test there and they call it a one-minute test. The new machine—I think it has a girl's name, Irma. This machine is apparently costing in the neighbourhood of \$5,000. I would sincerely hope that this department would make a trial test on certain areas in this province or on certain regions to see if we cannot come up with something, and not continually follow what the other jurisdiction does somewhere else. I think it is time that we take the lead on this particular attitude and make sure that we are one of the first this time to have something that will sell more milk in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I quite agree with what the hon. member has said. As a matter of fact, back as far as 1952 the dairy branch of The Ontario Department of Agriculture recommended that this very thing should be done, but there was no acceptance of this idea by the dairy industry generally in the province of Ontario. Right now we are on the second report of a three-year test period for doing just what the hon. member has suggested. It is now almost ready for release at the Ontario Agricultural College, dairy branch. Last year our dairy commissioner, Mr. Baker, was over in Great Britain and saw the machine that you just referred to. We think that there are great possibilities under the very suggestion that you have made. We are delighted to know that the dairy industry is behind this type of thinking now and I believe that it has received public acceptance. We hope that we will progress very rapidly along this line.

Mr. Innes: I thank the hon. Minister. I think that this deserves a real study and we must get at it right away.

One other problem that I would like to speak about—and I think it has to do with the surplus problem of the province. You know and I know that the dairy industry has been in serious trouble, primarily because a large amount of surplus products have been on the market. One of the reasons that there is so much surplus on the market, as the hon. member for Bruce has mentioned, is that there is a variation in prices to concentrated and fluid producers in the four groups. I do feel in all fairness that a lot of producers in the province of Ontario keep too many cattle and could get the same return out of a smaller number of cattle. In other words, they keep more cattle to get a greater production. If they kept pure cattle they would get less production and their costs

would be lower, and I will give you some figures to point that out. I do feel that in the province of Ontario the dairy herd improvement test, as it is named, has done quite a bit to eliminate this situation but presently I understand that there is a long waiting list and I do not like this. I know that the record of performance of the federal government is in a similar predicament, that they have a long waiting list.

I say to you in all fairness, this is not good for the people of the province of Ontario, especially the dairy farmers. In a recent test conducted by G. W. Cleveland, of the University of Idaho, who is an authority on dairy industry, it was shown that in one area 46 cattle, which produced an average 8,500 lbs. a year of milk and 328 lbs. of fat, gave the owner a net return of \$5,000. These cows produced 391,000 lbs. of milk. But 18 cows in another herd, which produced 13,700 lbs. of milk and 520 lbs. of fat, gave the owner a return of the same \$5,000 for a total production of only 252,000 lbs. of milk. In other words, the man who had the high-producing herd of 18 cows made the same money as the man with 46 cows of the low-producing herd and at the same time he did not add 139,000 lbs. of milk to the surplus market.

I think that we must take a real step forward in trying to help the farmers combat this serious situation where they do not have access to know what their herds are producing. It has been suggested to me if we do not have the available help at the moment and our budget does not warrant it, that there could be a programme set up whereby the farmers themselves could have a self-sampling system chart set up and possibly this could take place in the local agriculture representative's office. Incidentally, we have a large building in Woodstock which is currently in operation and I think the IDA testers do have access to it if they so want. At the moment I do not know whether they use it. I would like to know the hon. Minister's comment and I would stress very strongly that he should impose on the Treasury to put a few more people out on the road and help eliminate this situation and also not only reduce the surplus but make a better return for the average farmer in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am happy to hear the comments from the hon. member for Oxford on this very important matter. I must say that the points that he raised this afternoon relative to the DHIA programme in Ontario are under active consideration by the dairy branch in our department right at the mo-

ment. Frankly, we have felt for some time that the major contribution made by the dairy herd improvement association in Ontario has been in the determination of the good producer and the poor producer. This has been proved by the fact that all the co-operators in this programme have raised the average production per cow in their herds by over a ton of milk in the length of time it has been in operation. This is the proof of the pudding as I see it. Now, it would seem to me that perhaps we should explore the possibilities of extending the service, possibly as a cow-testing service, as my hon. friend suggested, and perhaps not put as much emphasis on the compilation of cost factors, which has taken up a great deal of the time of our dairy herd improvement association field men. This, I think, has real merit, and I want to tell the hon. members of the House through you, Mr. Chairman, that this is a matter that is under active consideration and I think we may get somewhere with it.

Mr. Chapple: Mr. Chairman, I find it apparent that the different areas of Ontario are faced with milk production with varying costs. Northwestern Ontario is one of the most difficult areas in which to produce milk. In order to solve the dairy problem, at one time we did have a cheese factory, but this could not continue to operate so we went out of cheese-making. We have never been in concentrated milk. But we do have a problem in the price of milk. The price of milk in our part of the country should actually be more than it is at the present time. We are asked to produce milk to the consumer at exactly the same price as milk is produced to the consumer in eastern Ontario, and this is a great problem to us.

I would like to read a paragraph from a letter I received from one of the most prominent milk producers in the Fort William area, in fact a neighbour of mine, who operates his own farm, does a very good job, and is probably one of the most prominent farmers as a representative of the family farm that you could find anywhere. He says:

One thing that I am very interested in, as I am sure are all milk producers in this area, is the fact that the moratorium has been lifted. As the dairies here locally were ready and willing to pay the 19 cents per hundred increase last fall, when the moratorium was placed on milk, I feel that we now should get that increase retroactive to the date of the freeze. I understand that the distributors of the Lakehead, along with other areas, are now in favour of a

decrease and are at the present time arbitrating with the whole milk league for something like a 60-cent per hundred decrease. Surely there is no sound reasoning behind this. As you well realize, our costs of production in this area at least is still rising. We, I feel, are deserving and in need of the 19-cent increase and there certainly should not be any thought of taking a cut in price.

Our prices of feeds are high, too. Our costs of operation and buildings and so on are out of line with other parts of the province. I think, when this whole subject is being considered, that special consideration of our area of the province should be taken real cognizance of. As far as your solids, not fat, is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I find that this is something that has been developing within the last couple of years. Within the last month one of the ROP inspectors gave me a demonstration of how this test is, and can be, made very simply.

He had a group of ten, what he called, beads. These are very sensitive beads, and they are placed in a sample of milk which is contained in a jar—about an inch of milk—and these beads either rise or fall. So many of the ten will rise and so many will fall, and the number on the bottom of the jar is counted. This indicates the density of the milk itself and from a table he estimates the degree of solids, not fat.

This is a very simple test that can be made and is being made by The Department of Agriculture on the federal level at the present time. The particular inspector who actually demonstrated the method to me has been doing it on a sample basis over the last two years. I understand the department has not got around to voting enough money to make it possible for all inspectors or another group of inspectors to test in this way. But I do not see any reason why this particular test could not be considered on the provincial level, possibly worked in with the plan B dairy herd improvement group, or possibly with the plan A, ROP development on the federal level. But solids, not fat, now is being purchased in one of the chain stores in Winnipeg, where the purchase of the milk is based on the quality of solids, not fat, not based on the butterfat content.

I think the hon. Minister understands these things and that he is doing his best to make a real effort to see that the dairy industry is put on the best level that it possibly can be.

Now, I think there is no reason why everything should be based on the same—what I mean by that is that the prices are on the

same level in all parts of the province because we are not equal as far as our costs and other factors are concerned.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one of my longer speeches regarding coloured margarine.

I would just like to say that the hon. Prime Minister knows my views, sir, the hon. Minister of Agriculture knows my views, the hon. member for Eglinton knows my views, that the Conservative caucus knows my views, and my own constituents know my views on it, so I thought I might as well say that I firmly believe that the government should allow the sale of coloured margarine in Ontario right now. Thank you.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question with respect to this? Perhaps the hon. Minister could tell us: Is it a fact that perhaps 80 per cent of the content of margarine is presently imported? While we are dealing with this, I realize the hon. Minister is concerned with the dairy industry, but since this subject has come up I would like some facts on that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, that is a difficult question to answer because I am not actually sure that any real determination can be made. In fact, I think in theory one could say that it was practically all imported, but certainly this is one of the things that we have to consider.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Do I understand there is no way, sir, of really determining how much of it is imported? It is all right for everybody to stand up in this House and talk about colouring margarine. I am in the unfortunate position, sir, that part of my constituency is in the country and part of it is in the city, so I do not know just which way I should talk. But I think there is a very important principle here; it would be desirable that maybe some of the hon. members in this House be informed. It seems to me that if it be a fact that 100 per cent of the content of margarine is imported, this could have a very serious effect on the whole butter industry.

An hon. member: On the Trade Crusade, too.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, does the chairman of the milk board—I ask through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister—does the Honourable Judge Currie get a salary from The Department of Agriculture or just his salary as a judge?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am told the honourable judge receives a salary of \$5,000 a year plus expenses from The Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Troy: It is not shown here in salaries—his name is not mentioned in salaries—that comes from another department, does it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it does not. It is under \$6,000, and so it is not shown as a specific salary. Any salary over \$6,000—

Mr. Troy: Anything under \$6,000 does not mean anything.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, yes, it does; it is all included under salaries in the main vote.

Mr. Troy: Right, thanks.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, at a recent milk producers' meeting in our area, some of the members were complaining that the figures worked out by the dairy herd improvement association were made available and were used not only by The Department of Agriculture but by some of the negotiating parties in attempting to prove certain points. I would submit to you, sir, that this is not the reason the dairy herd improvement was brought into being nor is it a reason it should remain in being. These results are far from average and are taken from situations where attempts are made to show the best possible economic results and are sometimes somewhat misleading.

Is it your belief that the figures coming from the dairy herd improvement association work should be used for this purpose?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May I say to the hon. member that we have never used those figures as absolutely basic figures for the determination of facts but they are public figures and they must be made available. They are provided through the expenditure of public funds and so they are available to those people who wish to use them. Other than that, as to how use is made of those figures, I would not be prepared to say; but I think consideration has been given to them. I believe that they have been compiled as reasonably accurately as possible.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but for one thing, Mr. Chairman, these figures are based on herds that do not contain pure bred registered cattle, at least not a large percentage, and this would surely have some effect. I can think of some other reasons why the people considering these as average figures should probably amend their views. They must consider the feeling of competition that enters

into the various county associations to show a very low cost per hundred production. They are not entirely realistic when we see some of the negotiators waving these figures before us. I believe that sometimes the department does not serve the farmers best by allowing them to be used in this way.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the opinion of the hon. member—and he does not need to answer this if he does not wish to; I am not trying to put him on the spot at all. Are you suggesting, sir, that the compilation of figures, as far as costs are concerned under the DHIA programme, should be abandoned?

Mr. Nixon: No, I am certainly not suggesting that because it is probably the most useful figure that is provided to a person participating in this. Easily as useful as the ability to cull the herd but—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But I am only referring to the cost figures.

Mr. Nixon: Are you? I think we are talking about two different sets of figures.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am referring to the cost figures, not the average production per cow nor the butterfat test and all the rest of it.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I am talking about the same thing, I believe. And I find that this information is extremely valuable to a person taking part in the association; I know precisely what it costs per hundred to produce the milk and precisely what I am getting on an average per hundred and this is very valuable information.

I would also like to ask a further question, sir, concerning the school milk programme, which, I believe, is jointly financed by the federal Treasury and the provincial Treasury. I would like to know how extensive use is made of this school milk plan and what it holds for the future?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a matter that is dealt with entirely by The Department of Education.

Mr. Nixon: Surely in this particular case The Department of Agriculture should take great interest in this.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They do.

Mr. Nixon: Well, if you do, I would like to know what your views are as to its future. I personally feel that a properly worked school milk programme in Ontario would go far to using up our surplus of fluid milk.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are simply on the same basis we have always been on. We are always ready to sell more milk and to promote the sale of more milk and this legislation providing the school milk programme is on the statute books of the province of Ontario today, it is available to any—

Mr. Nixon: That does not promote it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —any school board that wants to do it. I have publicly stated many times that I am in favour of the school milk programme and I would like to see a school milk programme in operation everywhere in the province of Ontario today.

Mr. Nixon: Well, why don't you get some of these 1,700 people out selling the programme so that the school boards take advantage of it? Not only would you use up a surplus product, which is certainly very important, but you would be contributing to the nutrition of the students. You say the legislation is on the books, that is fine, but I think it should be promoted in a very effective way.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It certainly is promoted as far as we are concerned.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Brant has a very, very fine point there—

An hon. member: Sure he has.

Mr. Innes: I would like to ask the Minister what percentage of the milk in the province of Ontario is used currently through the school milk programme?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say it is a very, very small percentage: I believe that figures were shown to me at one time, demonstrating that if all the schools in Ontario adopted this school milk programme it would increase the consumption of milk by something like 1.7 per cent, or some such figure, but it was a very small percentage in the overall total. But, nevertheless, I have seen these figures and I know they are available. I may stand to be corrected in those figures but I was impressed with the fact that it did not appear to be a large overall increase in the consumption of milk.

I think the most important thing that can be said for a school milk programme is the fact that it provides youngsters in the school room with a mighty good diet. It is something that nobody can deny is an acceptable product and I feel that every youngster should have an opportunity to drink it.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment on that. In the United States it has been proved that the school milk programme accounts for an increase of four per cent of the total production and in only very, very rare exceptions did it lessen it in the home. Now, I feel in all fairness this is something that you can really get after if you want to push it; the legislation is there currently; let's get after it! There are lots of people, the milk foundation people are ready and willing to get out and help you. I think possibly one of the drawbacks has been in selling it to the school boards in the province of Ontario, but with the advent of paper cartons and dispensers it certainly has a lot of merit at the present time. I think one of the drawbacks was with the handling of the old bottles.

Here is something for you people in your department. You come back here—oh, you will not be here next year, will you. I was going to this to you but you won't be here—there is something for you to really get after.

An hon. member: That was in the liquor stores, too.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question with respect to this because I have thought about it several times. There is an organization, one of the breeders' association—I think it is the Guernsey or some similar type—which puts a portion of its income into the promotion of the sale of milk. I have wondered whether any research has ever gone into such matters as promoting this on a universal scale, say, in summertime? I do not know how much pop is sold in the province of Ontario. I am told by dentists and doctors that many times it is injurious to the body. It is not nearly as beneficial as, say, milk would be. I have wondered why some enterprising organization has not promoted the sale of milk by making it readily available on the same basis perhaps as the soft drink manufacturers. Has any research gone into this? Is it something that could be developed? Perhaps it could be developed in co-operation with The Department of Economics and Development. It certainly seems reasonable that people would drink more milk, would use more milk if it were more readily available but generally they have to go into a restaurant or some other place to obtain it. Perhaps there could be some easier way of marketing it. I suppose the fact that it deteriorates very quickly is a problem but it seems to me that here is a field that could be developed, if the research went into it.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to hear the comments of the hon. member for Wentworth. Certainly I would be quite in accord with what he has said. There is, for his information, a June set-aside now of a cent a pound butterfat right across Canada, and at the recent dairy convention—the Dairy Farmers of Canada, that was held in London just a few weeks ago—I believe there was general agreement that across Canada they would try to work out some type of the year-around set-aside for this promotional programme. Certainly I think it has great merit, I would like to see our vending machine people institute some type of programme that would provide milk so that a person could put in whatever amount of money is necessary and get a glass of milk. I would like to see these things tried out everywhere if we can do it.

One of the things that has been brought to my attention in discussing this with the

vending machine people, is that there has been some problem in keeping a good quality product there always available. We would agree that unless a desirable product was always there and obtainable and available, that we might do the industry some harm if somebody put in a coin sometime and withdrew a glass of milk that perhaps had been there too long or something else had gone wrong. But these are things that I believe we should be able to deal with through scientific research.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, is any research done by your department? Do you wish me to wait, sir?

Mr. Chairman: It being 6 of the clock, I shall now leave the chair and resume at 8 o'clock, p.m.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Stewart, continued	1231
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1264

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1963

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 104:

Mr. P. Manley (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, coming back to the formula price, as far as the dairy branch is concerned there is a feeling within the cheese producers in my part of the province that probably they should have the power to go to the manufacturers of cheese, especially some of those larger companies, and have the opportunity of getting the formula price from them in regard to the price the farmers should obtain. It is the feeling that a number of those large manufacturers of cheese watch some of the smaller cheese factories pretty closely regarding the payment which they are able to make.

Naturally, some of those larger concerns that are into it in a big way have more than cheese; they have other branches of food products into which milk and cheese enter; they consume part of their output into some of those other cheese spreads and other types of that kind. It is the feeling of the shippers to those plants, that those larger plants could pay a much better price than they do.

It is the feeling of the shippers to those plants that possibly the Cheese Producers Association should be put in the position where they could bargain for a formula price in those cases, as the concentrated fellows do. They have the opportunity of having a formula price and they know what they are going to receive; but the shippers into these factories do not know until they get their cheque just how much they are going to get per 100 lb. of milk, or what the price of butterfat is.

I was wondering, that if the department were thinking of giving the cheese producers a little leeway, they might be in the position to bargain, or to look into the problem that is confronting the cheese producers at this time. The feeling is, Mr. Chairman, that

even though cheese this last summer went up to 36 cents and 37 cents a pound, the net price per hundred to the producer was not a bit better than what it was when cheese was selling at 33 cents. That is the feeling of the cheese producers. I am wondering if the department looked into this matter at all or if they have considered the possibility of having the Milk Industry Board set a formula or a base or a floor price, which those plants would have to pay for cheese milk going into their plants.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, I welcome the fact that the hon. member for Stormont has brought this matter to our attention. Might I suggest that I would be happy to do this for him if he wishes, mention this to the dairy commissioner; but I would like further to suggest that the cheese producers, that is the producers of cheese milk, might very well discuss this problem with the Milk Industry Board. It seems to me this is the proper approach to take. I think the hon. member's point is well taken. I have heard this matter discussed before, and there is a great variance in what is paid for cheese milk in certain factories. I think this is a very legitimate point and I would suggest that the producers of cheese milk be encouraged to present this matter before the Milk Industry Board.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, again about this formula price; we were interested really in this 19 cent increase to the fluid milk fellows. We have a number of these, of course, in my area; and I wanted to ask the hon. Minister: Was it the Milk Industry Board which recommended this increase of 19 cents? I am sure that if they did that they must have taken cost of production into consideration; they must have looked into the whole dairy picture; and I would think that whenever they properly assessed the situation, it was their opinion that there should have been an increase of 19 cents a hundred to the whole milk producer. I am wondering if that is the case. Am I right in suggesting that it was from the Milk Industry Board that this increase was recommended?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member, the 19 cent increase which was indicated was simply the automatic working of the milk formula based on the indices that go to make up the formula. The Milk Industry Board have nothing to do with that. All they would do is automatically—as they had done in the three previous occasions when a milk price increase was indicated by the automatic working of the formula—send out a letter. The letter went out under the date of October 4. I believe it was almost identical wording to the letters which had gone out in previous announcements that the milk price formula indicated this type of an increase.

Mr. Manley: How do they arrive at the decision to send out these letters that in their opinion the 19 cent increase was fair, or equitable?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is an average increase indicated at 19 cents for a three-month period. When that is indicated, and the economic factors indicate that this is true for a three-month period, then the letter automatically goes out. The Milk Industry Board does not say that it must go out or it must not go out, it simply goes out automatically. This is a matter that is dealt with in that respect.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Well, if that is the case, Mr. Chairman, why was the moratorium imposed? Tell me?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Simply, Mr. Chairman, to allow the dairy industry to assess the whole matter of the increase. Yes indeed, the dairy industry; and this is the third time repeated. That representation was made to us; and the very fact that 31 markets, between October 4 and the last week of October, indicated that they did not wish to accept the milk increase of 19 cents a hundred was to me ample evidence there was great disagreement in the milk industry itself as to whether or not this automatic increase should take place. The formula was simply suspended in order that the dairy industry might take a look at the situation.

Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, while this letter was sent out on October 4, a letter was sent out on October 12 to the whole milk league, and to the Milk Distributors Association.

Mr. Oliver: From whom?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: From the fluid milk division of the dairy branch. Indicating that

the two groups were as free to negotiate at that time, as they had ever been, for a higher price. There was no ceiling placed on milk whatever. The formula was suspended, but this did not mean, nor did it ever mean, that the price of milk was frozen at that particular level.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, was it the request of distributors, or was it at the request of the producers?

An hon. member: The producers, he said, which is an amazing thing.

Mr. Manley: It was at the request of the producers that their price would not go up by nine per cent.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I emphasized yesterday, and I emphasize again today, and there is no secret about this whatever, that the Whole Milk League, as a Whole Milk League, did not approach me. But representatives of the Whole Milk League did approach me and suggested that because of the disagreement within the Whole Milk League itself on this very matter, and the very fact that we understood and knew that there were at least 31 markets who had indicated the fact that they would not accept this increase and did not wish to have any part of this increase in the price of milk; this to me was ample evidence that we should declare the moratorium until the whole industry could assess the whole matter.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, of the 31 markets, what percentage of the overall producers does this represent?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I understand that it is a very, very small percentage.

Mr. Innes: I would like to know the total number of markets and whether the 31 markets are the lower marketing groups as I understand. I would like that information, please.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, might I suggest—I cannot tell the hon. member exactly how many producers were affected by those 31 markets. I cannot tell him that exactly. But out of 120 markets in Ontario; it seems to be a sizeable number of markets that were affected. But I would like to point out also to my hon. friend that there were many other reasons that might also have been attached to this moratorium. For instance, we are faced with the fact that very shortly it appeared from things we had heard that the provincial

board were unable to reach any definite conclusions as far as the milk marketing plan was concerned. And indeed, very shortly after the first of November they did present us with the fact that they had broken up. Along with that was the brief presented to us by the cheese producers of Ontario, by the president of the cheese producers with members of his executive, asking that this protective legislation that surrounds the whole milk industry in the province of Ontario be completely repealed and that it be thrown open to anyone who wanted to sell milk for any price that they wanted to sell it.

Now it seems to me that when we look at those kind of things and when we recognize the fact that the competing substitutes that everybody knows are a real factor in the amount of fluid milk that is being sold and consumed and produced by the farmers of this province; when we assess those kind of things, it seems to me that we should be very cautious in moving ahead into a situation that could further aggravate the problems that already exist.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Minister, you are actually admitting that the reason that the moratorium was put on was because of the fact that you did not want to aggravate the other group. Is that in essence—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I would not say that in essence at all. I have never even suggested that—

Mr. Innes: You said cheese producers.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not and I do not wish to have motives imputed to me whatever. I have simply said—I have been heard by the hon. members of this House—that the cheese producers came in with this brief and asked us to repeal all of this legislation and surely the hon. member for Oxford is one who would hardly appreciate repeal of that legislation. And I do not say that in any way to be personal about it whatever. But he understands, perhaps better than anyone else in this House, the extent of that type of protective legislation. And I make no apologies for the fact that when that legislation was drafted, it was drafted with the very best of intentions; drafted because it was believed that the fluid milk shipper in the province of Ontario was entitled to a degree of protection at the time the legislation was brought in, for the simple reason that the whole milk producer has to produce on a quota basis the year round.

Now, surely, there must be some favourable consideration given to the man who has to

maintain that quota. This legislation, I think, has offered protection to the fluid milk shipper. It would appear today that there is a wide variance between the price paid for manufactured milk and that received by the fluid milk shipper. But I think we must recognize the basic facts that are behind all of these reasons for these very things. Certainly we feel that there is something that can be done and this is why we are moving. And I feel we are moving very definitely towards the time when we will find an ultimate solution to this very problem that confuses and perplexes and aggravates all fluid milk and all concentrated milk shippers in this province today.

Mr. Innes: Well, I appreciate what the hon. Minister has said, but I do not think there was one fluid group in the province of Ontario that had power, presidents or secretaries, who agreed with the action as taken by the hon. Minister. And I think that I would appreciate knowing the 31 markets and the percentage of the overall milk in the province of Ontario who objected at that particular time. I am not in a hurry right now but I would appreciate it if you could give it to us before the estimates are over. Now, mention has been made several times, but I would like to just quote from your Dr. H. L. Patterson with an article which just recently came out headed "The Ontario Government Farm Economics Branch", where he states that dairymen can do well even without fluid milk prices. There are a lot of people who automatically think that a fluid milk producer receives a large portion of his milk in the \$5 category, where the rest of the people get a \$3 price for their milk.

This is completely erroneous, as Dr. Patterson has intimated. I am just going to read this to you: "The account books have shown that many shippers of manufactured milk have quite high incomes and I would mention this, and underline it, higher in fact than many of their neighbours who ship fluid milk." So it just is not as simple as has been intimated by some of the hon. members here that automatically the person who is shipping fluid milk is in a better position than the person who is in another bracket, whether it be concentrated or not. I know in my area, particularly, there are people shipping fluid milk who are only shipping somewhere around 30 or 40 per cent of their milk in the fluid contract; the rest is going in at a surplus price and it can go down to \$2 a hundred by the time they have their hauling paid.

But there are other elements in the dairy

business that certainly can be looked into and can be looked into immediately by this government, and that is certainly the bootlegging that is going on throughout the various markets in this province. I am very sure that the hon. Minister must know about it from the Milk Industry Board which has not fulfilled its duty in laying down some of the implementations that are currently existing in legislation, and enforcing the Act as such. I can give you perfect examples of bulk truck loads of milk that are destined for the Toronto market where producers are paying upwards of 50 to 60 cents a hundred for hauling milk that is supposed to go to the Toronto market, and it ends up in a market 10 or 15 miles from their homes. Now this is actual and I can prove it. And this is something that the Milk Industry Board has not taken a hold of and acted in the way they would be expected to. Fines have not been imposed and, as an example, no action is being taken. The people that are responsible for these infractions are continually doing them, and I think it is high time that the Milk Industry Board of the province of Ontario looked into the infractions or else they should be replaced. I say that sincerely.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If I may answer that remark, I think this is a very serious charge that has been directed towards the department and the Milk Industry Board. I have to confess that I have never heard this before. I have asked my deputy if he knows of this situation and he says he does not. I do not know whether our dairy commissioner—our dairy commissioner, Mr. Baker, says that he does not know about it. In the light of this might I ask through you, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Oxford be asked to give us the complete details of this and we will promise a full investigation of it. We feel that the Milk Industry Board has a duty and an obligation and, I make no bones about it whatever, I would like to see this thoroughly investigated.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, this is not a thing that can be handled lightly; it is not in one area alone. There is milk going from different markets throughout the province in bulk loads continually, from market to market, and if the hon. Minister's commissioner and deputy do not know about it it is pretty near time they got out and found it out for themselves.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is a great piece of information. We have charges laid here. We have confessed that we do not know of the

specific charges the hon. member made. Will he give us this information?

Mr. Innes: I will be very happy to give the hon. Minister any information in confidence, on whatever he would like.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well now, in confidence; this is quite another matter.

Mr. Innes: I have asked the hon. Minister to look into the situation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If the hon. member will let me turn the matter over to the Milk Industry Board and let me provide the information that he provides me in confidence to the Milk Industry Board this is a deal, as far as I am concerned. Is this what the hon. member means?

Mr. Innes: I will be very happy to let the hon. Minister know of the instance, and he can do his investigating himself.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there are some aspects of this I would like to explore, but may I at the outset first ask the hon. Minister: When was it that the 12 cent subsidy was put on by the federal government, approximately when?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May 1.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, the thing that puzzles me is this: Without reading in detail the release from The Department of Agriculture when the moratorium was lifted, the explanation for the moratorium was that there was a need to inquire into what impact the federal subsidy had on prices. At the bottom paragraph on page one of the release the conclusion was, and I am quoting:

The Milk Industry Board stated that the formula calculation had now been adjusted to give recognition to the 12 cent federal subsidy. As a result of this the formula does not indicate a price increase to the producer.

In other words, the excuse advanced by the government for the moratorium was that they wanted to explore the impact of the 12 cent subsidy on prices to the producer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the thing that puzzles me is that the 12 cent subsidy was put on on May 1, and the appropriate body, namely the Milk Industry Board, got around officially to serving notice early in October that another increase was due. What conceivable explanation has this hon. Minister got for the fact that on the 11th hour of the 11th day, just when the formula was to go into effect

with the increase, they suddenly woke up to the fact, after six months, that perhaps they should examine the impact of the 12 cent federal subsidy? I am puzzled about it. You see, my heart bleeds for the problems and the wasted monies of our poverty-stricken dairyman from Warton (Mr. Whicher) who is not with us here tonight. He spent—he and his friends, so he said—\$1 million on advertising the increase and then found it was all wasted, because after they had advertised, it was not put into effect.

My first question to the hon. Minister is: What conceivable explanation is there by the hon. Minister that between the period of May 1 and November 1 they had not been at least alive enough to have come to the conclusion that they should examine the implications of the 12 cent subsidy on the price formula and let the public know or let the industry know literally a few minutes, before it should go into effect?

Well, that was a question. If there was not a question mark at the end I will get up and put it there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I admitted yesterday that this was the case. There was no question or doubt about it; there was a mistake made, there is no doubt about it. To be consistent, as I said yesterday—I confess to this. I confess this: The milk formula committee had not taken into consideration the fact in being consistent in the indices. The indices were the same, but the fact remains that the 25 cent subsidy paid on manufactured milk had always been considered in the arrival at the figure of the formula, but the 12 cent subsidy that had been introduced on butter on May 1 had not been considered.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is this: I do not know who the members of the committee are who were responsible for this, and therefore I can make this comment without any reflection on any individual: They should be fired! Any committee that went to sleep for six months and then caused the chaos and the consternation that was created in the milk industry by not being alive to the fact—there is just no excuse for it.

Mr. Chairman, there is no excuse for it for another reason. If this had been a completely new kind of development—the calculation of a federal subsidy in the prices—then conceivably they could have been excused for being caught short on this occasion, but it was not a new development. The hon. Minister confesses that they had previously taken into account the calculation of the 25

cents on the concentrated milk, but they just went to sleep and did not act in this instance.

All right—maybe confession is good for the soul and the hon. Minister with some degree of embarrassment and anguish now admits they went to sleep and there was a mistake. But let us proceed one step further.

This kind of action is characteristic of not just this department; it is characteristic of this government. When they have an important decision to make they do not take into their confidence the official organization with which they should be co-operating. I do not want to digress too far, but when you have such far reaching developments, for example, as the institution of the so-called Robarts plan; the teachers now proclaim that nobody approached them to take them into their confidence, and suddenly like a bolt from the blue this was presented to them. Here in this instance the hon. Minister has now conceded that apparently, up until yesterday, he was living under the illusion that the request had come from the Whole Milk League. He apparently has now—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is not the—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, yes, he had to check with his deputy to find out, when I told him and challenged him that it had not come from the Whole Milk League, and did not come from the Whole Milk League.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, that is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Chairman; and the hon. member, with the greatest of respect, knows that very well.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He may be labouring under a misunderstanding but it is not right and he knows it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, yesterday when I said to the hon. Minister that he had never had a request from the Whole Milk League, right in front of my eyes, he checked with his deputy as to whether that was the case, and he learned for the first time apparently that it was not the case. What happened, Mr. Chairman, was this—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is not correct.

Mr. MacDonald: It is correct.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is not correct.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am sorry. Either you are a liar or one of the top officials of the Whole Milk League is.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I ask the hon. member to retract that statement. I ask the hon. member to retract that statement.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister is not a liar I will take his word for it, and then I will write a letter to the member of the Whole Milk League who told me that they had not communicated with the government and I will ask him whether he is a liar.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): On a point of privilege of this House I think there is no need for the hon. gentleman to speak that way. He has been asked to withdraw it. If later he wishes to reintroduce that charge that is the time to do it. Does he withdraw that statement?

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder if the hon. Minister who has just risen in his seat listened to what I was saying. I said if the hon. Minister wants me to retract it on his behalf I shall, but I insist that either one or the other is the case because I have had the assurance from a top official of the Whole Milk League that the Whole Milk League as a body did not communicate this to the government.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I completely agreed with the hon. member yesterday that that was the case and always has been the case, and I have never at any time indicated that the Whole Milk League as a Whole Milk League ever came to me. That is right in *Hansard* and will be there to be shown to whoever wants to read it.

Mr. MacDonald: It will be interesting to read what was in *Hansard* yesterday and find out.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is the truth.

Mr. MacDonald: I watched the hon. Minister yesterday double-check with his deputy when I challenged him on this, and he got confirmation of the fact that the Whole Milk League had not approached him as a body.

Mr. Chairman, this is the point I want to proceed to. The hon. Minister a moment ago confirmed what in effect we are discussing, so let us not argue any further, that some people in the Whole Milk League—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Exactly, and that is what I said yesterday, and that is what *Hansard* says.

Mr. MacDonald: This is what the hon. Minister has learned since yesterday. This is the point, Mr. Chairman. If you were going to take a step, whether it be the institution of the Robarts plan or the imposing of a moratorium on an established procedure for an implementation of milk prices, it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, to be elementary that the government should sit down and discuss it—not with their friends in the Whole Milk League—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, come on. Who is playing politics now?

Mr. MacDonald: —but with the Whole Milk League as a whole. The fact of the matter is that the Whole Milk League deliberately did not make a decision because they could not come to a decision. So this government intervenes or is willing to act on behalf of their friends in the Whole Milk League, and they decide that they would impose the moratorium.

I just want to point out simply, Mr. Chairman, that on this issue, as on many issues, it would seem to me to be plain commonsense as well as a simple procedure whereby the government can keep itself out of this kind of trouble, that you will discuss any proposed action frankly with the official body in the field and not just with your friends within that body. In other words, you decided without a request from the Whole Milk League as a body, that you were going to impose a moratorium. At least you should have officially communicated with the Whole Milk League and said: "We have come to the conclusion for this reason, that we must impose a moratorium." Then at least you would not get yourself into the kind of trouble you are in now. Really I am on your side, I am trying to keep you from getting into trouble next time, if you will only learn this lesson.

However, Mr. Chairman, I have a further point to make on this business of the milk formula. I think this milk formula is a very good idea. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a desperately necessary kind of mechanism in agricultural circles because one of the problems in agricultural circles is that the prices farmers get do not keep up, they do not keep in step with their costs of production. And this is what creates the cost-price squeeze that the agricultural industry is facing with such dire circumstances. Now the only way in which you are automatically going to come to grips with this kind of a situation is a formula, a formula that will indicate that, when the costs of production

have risen a certain amount, automatically the farmer will get an increase in his revenues and his income. And what puzzles me, Mr. Chairman, is that having established in one sector of the community, the agricultural industry, this mechanism of a price formula—why the readiness, almost enthusiasm, with which this government was willing to act, not on a request from the Whole Milk League as a whole, but from a few of their friends in the Whole Milk League, to abrogate the formula? In other words, this formula is a sort of belated device to come to grips with this problem of keeping parity in the agricultural economy. And yet this government is so uncertain—its enthusiasm, its conviction with regard to it is so precarious—that they were willing to throw it out the window because part of an organization came to them and made such certain plea.

Now, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion on this particular point that what we need is essentially the same kind of mechanism in other sectors of the agricultural community so that you can get some automatic way of tying their costs of production to their income. And I think it would be a good thing to try to develop and duplicate this procedure in other sectors of the industry instead of undermining and bringing the formula into disrepute in the one sector where you have it. And this is what the hon. Minister did, by the way he handled the situation with 11th hour decisions this past fall. That is all by way of a bit of free advice to the government in the hope that they will not get themselves into such a mess the next time.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): But the hon. member wants them to get into a mess, does he not?

Mr. MacDonald: Honestly, I do not. We spend millions of words on this side of the House trying to plead with you people not to get into a mess and you are so insistent that you want to get into another.

Mr. Oliver: It bothers him.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, it really bothers me. Now, Mr. Chairman, since I am on my feet I have another question I want to ask the hon. Minister if I may leave this particular point.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Was that a question, that other one?

Mr. MacDonald: It was a question to begin with, and then I was commenting on the question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May I make one comment?

Mr. MacDonald: Fine.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to inform the House through you, Mr. Chairman, that the fluid milk price formula for the province of Ontario was developed by The Ontario Department of Agriculture and this government and was developed and put into action against very serious opposition. It was brought in and has been in effect only for the last eight years over strenuous opposition and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the real thinking farmers of this province—who have sent me letters on end, commending us for the action that was taken to save the whole milk industry in this province in the face of what might very well have happened.

Mr. MacDonald: This is the very thing that has happened. Instead of getting up and bragging about the whole milk formula—I have acknowledged that the milk formula is a magnificent device. I have praised you for it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Just a minute.

Mr. MacDonald: Let him speak for himself afterwards if he disagrees. Mr. Chairman, of all people in this House I would hope that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development knows that I am not going to be tied to what the Liberals said on any occasion.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Hear, hear.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Watch them, they are going to tie you in.

Mr. MacDonald: Look, any time they tie me in it will be because I am asleep.

Mr. Oliver: There will be no effort on our part.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am just a little bit puzzled as to the intervention of the hon. Minister who boasts about the creation of the milk formula and how they put it into effect over the opposition of a good many people. He is really on my side. I said that the whole milk formula is a wonderful device, and what I have said—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Come on over here.

Mr. MacDonald: The red carpet is out for any intelligent person who wants to join the New Democratic Party and most of the time I am convinced the hon. Prime Minister is

intelligent enough to be eligible. So the door is open, but it is a one-way street, I assure you.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not know whether that is a compliment or an insult but I will read it in *Hansard* tomorrow.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, as a matter of fact, you will have to read a lot of things in *Hansard* tomorrow to find out what the hon. colleagues have been saying and then wondering whether they have said it. Let me leave this because I think we have made our point. Another question I wanted to ask the hon. Minister is this: In the introduction to the estimates I spent a considerable length of time in using the cheese aspect of the milk industries as an illustration of the problems faced in the industry at the moment and the difficulty with which the people in the industry, whether it be at the producer level or the industry level, have been getting the government to move to do something about it. Surely if one reduces the problems of the milk industry to a simple summation, at the moment it is this: If we have surplus milk which is being channelled into increased surplus butter production when we have the prospects of a shortage on the cheese front, surely the objective of government policy should be to devise something which will result in the channelling of milk from the production of butter, of which we have surplus, into the production of cheese in which we have a prospective shortage?

My question to the hon. Minister is this: Let us forget about Ottawa; I know this is what you want to do. Let us forget about Ottawa; you cannot get action from them. What can this government do, or what does this government propose to do by way of either economic incentives that might result in a rechannelling of milk from butter into cheese, or secondly, a direction programme that would direct milk toward the area where we have shortages?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a very simple answer to this. We —

Mr. MacDonald: I have talked to a lot of people in the industry who have been looking for a long time so they are going to be waiting breathlessly for this simple answer.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, my hon. friend has suggested that he knows that we agree with him in what he is saying in the very fact that we have made the very strongest representation to the stabilization board at Ottawa to develop and prepare an early announce-

ment on the cheese programme for the province of Ontario and for all Canada. I think the hon. member will be the first to recognize that anything this government might do to increase the flow of milk into cheese through subsidization in order that more cheese might be exported—and admittedly there is a great market for cheese—would simply be subsidizing cheese milk producers outside the province of Ontario who automatically ship their cheese production into the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: I agree, Mr. Chairman, that, notwithstanding the interjection and the certain validity in it that was made by the hon. member for Grey South, I agree that basically this is a federal matter. So my questions now to the hon. Minister are this: Does the hon. Minister agree that the representations of one of the bodies involved in the milk industry—I have forgotten which one—for a national organization—that presumably is what this interprovincial committee that you announced a week or so ago is headed toward—has as one of its ultimate objectives, in effect, a national marketing board in the milk industry? That is one question; my second question is: You say you have made representations to the stabilization board in Ottawa—have you had any reaction? Is there any prospect of them moving in a fashion that might result in the redirection of surplus milk to cheese, rather than to butter? Two questions there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not sure whether I understand the first one very well. The second one: we have had no firm commitments from Ottawa, but I will say the matter is very definitely under consideration by Ottawa and I feel confident that they are going to move in this particular direction. Now, in relation to your first question, what did you say?

Mr. MacDonald: What I am saying is this—let me put it in simple, one-syllable terms: Representations have been made to Ottawa for the establishment of a national organization that would give direction and make recommendation to the government with regard to marketing of milk. Now my interpretation—and I understand from consulting people in the OFA that this is their interpretation: This is, in effect, asking for a national marketing board. Now, if I may just elaborate a bit more here, my guess would be that this committee that the hon. Minister announced a week or so ago, with its counterpart in Quebec, and the prospect of the two of them working together as an interprovincial

committee might be the first step towards building the equivalent of an interprovincial and ultimately a national marketing board. Am I correct? Is this what the government is thinking, that the answer lies in developing a national body?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It very well could be.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, perhaps if they did not have it in mind I put it in their mind. My final question, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, on this dairy branch estimate, is that I have heard rumours that there is some consideration on the part of the government to amalgamate the Milk Industry Board and the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board, partly because their functions overlap to a considerable extent, and partly because their personnel also overlaps. Is it the intention of the government to amalgamate the two, and have one body?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, now that we have got into cheese I think that I should come to the defence of the cheese producers in this province because I am a cheese producer myself. There has been some suggestion here that possibly we should direct more milk into the production of cheese. I agree that the production of cheese is a good way to take care of surplus milk, but I do not know why the cheese producers of this province should be the dumping ground of the surplus of all the other dairy branches in this province.

I want to make it quite clear to the House that we in the cheese producers' organization, in shipping milk into cheese factories, have taken from off the top of our return a cent a point in order to take care of the export of cheese to Britain. The situation is, Mr. Chairman, that in Ontario we consume just about as much cheese as we produce in Ontario, and it seems to me that we, who are producers of cheese and sending to cheese factories, are subsidizing the cheese that is made in other provinces. That is the situation that is confronting us at the present time.

We are exporting from Ontario to Great Britain about 20 million pounds of cheese a year, but that is top quality cheese. Whenever our consumers go to the stores and to retail outlets they find that they are purchasing a poorer grade of cheese. I wonder how far we can carry on in this way. We in the cheese producing business do not mind taking care of the surpluses from those other branches of the industry, but I think it has

got to the time that we should have some help from them in order to take care of their surplus milk. And they have not been making a very big contribution up until now, so I feel very strongly about this, Mr. Chairman.

It goes to show that we should really have some sort of a marketing plan and I realize that this can go into more of a national problem than just a provincial problem. But there are very many things to consider in this marketing situation as we have it, and I say to the House in all sincerity tonight that the cheese producers of this province are carrying an extra burden which should not be their responsibility; that they have no right to carry. And I think it is time that the other branches of the industry woke up and realized that we are in the position that we are taking their surplus and we are making a great contribution to those other branches of the industry in this province.

Mr. MacDonald: Fair enough, fair enough!

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, just one more question on the moratorium, and it is going to be short. This is what the hon. member for York South brought up and it led me to ask one question of the hon. Minister. When did you first know that there was a proposed increase to the formula price?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I knew it was coming several weeks before the announcement was made.

Mr. Innes: How much further? How many weeks?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot remember the hour or the day, sir.

Mr. Innes: Well, it was proposed in May.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Several weeks before.

Mr. Innes: It was in May or June that it was first—the hon. Minister says it was only two weeks before he knew about it.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 104 carried?

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention on various occasions that while we do have some very good inspectors who are going around the various farms in the province—and I think in all fairness are doing an exceptionally fine job in bringing up the grades in the milk throughout the province—we do find there is considerable need for improvement primarily in

the concentrated area. I think last year a survey was run in June and approximately 90 per cent of the fluid milk was Class A and about 40 per cent of the concentrated was Class A. So there certainly is a real need for more scrutiny and more sanitation in respect to the concentrated field and I would hope that this would be brought into line and we would do everything in our power to try to get our grades up in all classes of milk. I think the time has come when we should possibly set a time limit on some of them, give them two or three years so they should be in at least Class 3. Class 4 and lower should be discouraged. I think we in this province must raise our standards and try to compete.

I feel, sir, that it is the quality products in the long run that pay off regardless of whether they are milk, eggs, beef or pork.

I just want to say that while these inspectors are out at the moment there is no way of checking our bulk tanks throughout the province and it has been brought to my attention that something should be done to try to run a check on the calibrations on the various tanks. It has also been recommended on very many occasions that there should be a move made towards more check testing stations throughout the province. I think this has been a prime effort on the part of the Toronto whole milk producers that there be set up by the government a check testing station in the city of Toronto to try to regulate and check on the butter fat tests that are currently being taken solely by the dairies.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the hon. member for Oxford and I have not set up something equivalent to perpetual motion: I remind him of something more and he reminded me of something that I want to raise. But now that he has reminded me, it really puzzles me. On January 10, the *Globe and Mail* carried a story entitled:

ONE FARM IN TEN FOUND UNCLEAN
INSPECTOR SAYS

Datelined London, it said:

One in ten Ontario farms is not clean enough to produce dairy products for public use, an Ontario government official said. The milking machine at one eastern Ontario farm last summer was so dirty it was almost entirely plugged and the milk could hardly get through, said J. F. Robinson at Toronto, head of the cheese operations, eastern and central area, in talking to the Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario. Yet this farmer was selling his milk for processing into cheese.

And then the final paragraph of the story is what I really want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister:

Under department regulations, farmers found with bad conditions after three visits are prohibited from selling milk, he said. The regulations are not enforced strongly enough, he added, because the government had insufficient staff to make all the needed visits.

Now the hon. member for Oxford has made a plea that we should get standards raised so that you have more and more in grade A category; this I think is a commendable kind of plea. But my query to the hon. Minister is, how long is the department going to tolerate what one of their own inspectors says is milk being produced under such conditions that it should not be sold for public consumption? His explanation is that after three visits they are usually prohibited. A specific question I would like to ask the hon. Minister is: In how many instances, for example, during the past year, as a result of inspection, were farmers prohibited from selling milk because of uncleanly conditions?

Secondly, is it accurate that the reason for the continuance of this kind of a situation is a shortage of inspection staff?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I may frankly confess to the hon. member I do not have the number of times this was done. I would like to suggest that our policy, as far as our inspection branch is concerned, is certainly to improve the quality of milk produced on Ontario farms. I am sure the hon. member for York South would be the first to agree that you do not carry a big stick out and knock a man over the head and say, "You have dirty milk today, you are through!" I think the policy of our inspection branch should be that we go out to the farmer when some complaint comes from a receiving station, from a manufacturing plant, where they say, "We have run into a problem with this producer and he is not producing milk of the quality or of the standard that we feel that he should." I think it should be our policy to go out to that farmer, try to determine what is wrong, try to assess his situation in a technical way. We might be able to find some little thing that is wrong that would help him get his milk product up to the standard that he himself wants to produce and wants to ship.

It seems to me this is what we should be trying to do and this is the programme that we have embarked on right across the line and I feel that the additions to our inspection

service throughout the years has contributed to this very end. Indeed the fact that over 95 per cent of all the milk received now at our fluid receiving stations across Ontario is grade A milk, is a great tribute to our fluid milk shippers. We have reached this because we have all worked together and I think the same thing is true of the other shippers of the manufacturing milk as well. Their classifications are rising continually. Indeed, I have letters here from receiving stations, we have letters here from the concentrated milk producers association commending The Department of Agriculture and our dairy branch for the job that we are doing, working with them to achieve the results my hon. friend has mentioned.

This is the purpose of our inspection branch, to help farmers to do the job. We are working with them to achieve the results my hon. friend has mentioned. It seems to me this is the purpose of our inspection branch, to help farmers to do the job they really want to do rather than to put them out of business.

Mr. MacDonald: I would agree with the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that this should be, as he has stated, the purpose of the inspection branch. I think it is commendable that you have 95 per cent who are grade A in terms of conditions. However, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has really evaded the point I raised. If you got to 95 per cent this is fine. But is it really accurate, as is pretty closely implied in the statements of one of your own inspectors here, that some of the remaining 5 per cent is not fit for human consumption? Is it correct that your regulations now say that if a person is approached three times and is found not to have responded to the inspector's advice that he still is permitted to continue production?

I am not being critical here, because this is the detail that I would not expect the hon. Minister necessarily to have at his fingertips, but is he aware of anybody having lost the right to continue to produce as a result of an inspector? The serious thing, Mr. Chairman, is that by the admission of one of the government's own inspectors, the problem arises because they have not got enough inspectors. The inspector is stating that if you visit them three times, at the end of the third time they have lost the right to continue to produce for sale for public consumption. But the next sentence is that there are not enough inspectors to pursue this. This is really what I am asking the hon. Minister, and this is not in contradiction or in conflict with the overall statement.

We do not want to go around with a big

stick and, if we find somebody once with a dirty milk machine, he is out of the industry altogether in terms of production. But your regulations say three times. Perhaps we can leave it here but again, by way of some kindly advice to the hon. Minister, it might be interesting to check and find out whether anybody was denied the right to continue to produce and sell for human consumption during the past year. If they were not denied this right, then it might be well to have a confidential check with this inspector and find out whether it really means that you do not have enough inspectors in the field to be finding out those few, the few among the 5 per cent, who are not likely to come up into the category of the other 95 per cent, and therefore should be eliminated. I will leave it as a suggestion for your consideration.

Mr. L. Quilty (Renfrew South): Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we heard a great deal of talk in favour of margarine, and the colouring of margarine. As a representative of rural people and representative of an area where there is a great number of butter producers, I want to tell the House, through you sir, that the rural representatives are not taking this lying down. If this bill is introduced we will have plenty to say; and that is all I am going to say tonight.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, I want to make some comments on what the hon. member for York South said earlier, because I would not want the impression left that producers are sending a poor quality of milk into the cheese factories. I know this inspector to whom he referred; I know him personally. I want to make it quite clear to the House that under his supervision the grade of cheese in that part of Ontario has continually, continuously, come up over the years.

I am willing to admit, Mr. Chairman, that we will have a few poor producers, a few moon-lighters if I might use that word, who are settling on farms but their main occupation is somewhere else. Naturally you will get a very few who will farm in a poor way; they will produce a poor product, as you will have in any other business in the province of Ontario. I would not want the impression left here that those who are engaged in the business of producing cheese and obtaining their livelihood from that particular business do not want to produce the very best quality that they can; to send into the cheese factories the best quality they can in order to produce a 93 or 94 point cheese. I think that is the objective of every cheese producer in this province.

My hon. friend from York South should just go into this problem a little more. Naturally sometimes something can happen to a producer's milk which is no fault of his own. Whenever it is noticed at the plant, the inspector will visit his farm and give him an opportunity to right whatever is wrong. I think that that is a good procedure, and I am backing up the inspection staff in that regard at this particular time. I want to say that I certainly object to any inference left that those who are engaged in the production of milk for cheese in this province are not doing their very best to put on the shelves of the stores of this country, and for export, the highest quality of milk that it is possible to produce in the province of Ontario.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the hon. member for Stormont on this particular question. As a milk producer for many years I have great respect for the inspection services with which the province has come forward. Your milk is graded in northwestern Ontario in any case. You are allowed your Grade No. 1, but if your grades start to fall and you have one or two or three in a row you are in real trouble. The thing to do is to get after that, find out what the trouble is, and remedy it.

One other thing I would like to say, too. There have been instances I have known where the inspector has stopped a producer from producing because his grades have been too low, and made it impossible for him to ship any milk until he got his conditions back in the proper manner in developing clean milk in the dairy. Not that it makes your milk pasteurized; we all know this. But there is no real harm in milk if it is properly handled. We want the best product we can produce; we want the help of the department; and, as a milk producer, I can assure you that every milk producer makes this his aim in the production of milk.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the hon. member for Stormont correcting what might be a reflection on the great majority of the producers, particularly in milk for cheese purposes. I only quote and this is the quotation. I will let the matter rest there. It is from Mr. J. F. Robinson, an inspector respected by the hon. member for Stormont, as reported in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, quote:

The regulations are not enforced strongly enough, he added, because the government has insufficient staff to make all the needed visits.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 104 agreed to.

On vote 105:

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): I may not be a farmer from Nipissing, but I am speaking on behalf of my constituents in Nipissing, some of whom are farmers. I am interested in this extension branch.

I notice, sir, that, as far as northern Ontario is concerned, there has been a reduction in the grants in 1962; I think it was \$212,000, 1963, \$200,000—this year it is \$180,000. Surely, it seems to me, that there should be an increase in these grants to help out farming in northern Ontario.

As you very well know, we are a very new area and many of the areas north of our section, too, are marginal land. The question is: Should this land be used for farming or should it be used for forest? For example, in the Parry Sound area there are all kinds of acres and square miles to which people, immigrants, came in the early years of this century; and they have long since gone because they should never have been allowed to settle there. There are sections of the Muskoka region where people settled on farms. These also, I think, should never have been farm lands. So is it to be farm or forest? Is your department working hand-in-hand with The Department of Lands and Forests as far as the land use is concerned? Those are the factors with which I am quite concerned.

As I pointed out earlier, in our section of the province we have 105,000 square miles of farm lands. Our problem is, of course, that we have only about half a million people; yet down here in southern Ontario you will find that the cities are sprawling out into the country areas. They have taken more and more of the good arable land in southern Ontario. It is not going to be too far in the future when the agricultural land is going to be the important thing in this province; so I fail to understand, Mr. Minister, how you are reducing the extension grants, particularly in northern Ontario. It is for the development of agriculture.

You have done a very fine thing so far in the demonstration farm at New Liskeard, particularly showing farmers how they do not have to stable their cattle in wintertime with the demonstration that you have there to show that the cattle can remain out regardless of conditions—that is a very fine thing, but the thing is that the education is most important to these to show what can be done. I know very well, too, that in that section of the province it is a good area for forage crops, a fine area for potatoes, in the Cochrane section. Just this year a farmer

from the Charlton area, I think it is Mr. Ryan, was the grand champion of North America, so we can grow the products. At the present time the bulk of our potatoes have to be imported from either New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island.

In my own riding of Nipissing a New Brunswick farmer who had left New Brunswick some years ago because of the decline of prices there and worked in Mattawa for a time, went into potato farming last year, through the help of the former Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Spooner). He was able to get some extra land, and had 185 acres of potatoes last year with 85,000 bushels; so we have good potato country. But in order for him to compete with the New Brunswick and the Prince Edward Island producers, it was most necessary, in order for him to sell to the big chain stores or the markets, that they be graded properly. So all these factors are important in the development of agriculture. I say again, sir, that I cannot understand why you are reducing grants for the development of agriculture in northern Ontario. The grant for soil improvement and land use is again, I think, down. I have another question, later, on community centres and farm safety, but I will just let somebody else—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may answer the hon. member, in regard to the reduction in the amounts shown in the estimate from \$200,000 to \$180,000—is this what you are concerned with, sir?

Mr. Troy: Yes, and from the year before.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The reason for this is that the figure that is shown in this year's estimate is based on last year's demand. We are not withdrawing the service. It is there, abundantly evident and obvious for them to use, and the \$180,000 is an estimate in this year's budget for northern Ontario work that will be carried on on the same basis as other years. If this amount is not sufficient, I will make application to the Treasury board to make it sufficient, but this is based simply on the demand from last year.

In relation to your suggestion that there should be close co-operation between The Department of Lands and Forests and our own, there is indeed a joint committee which sits periodically and discusses many of the things which you have brought to our attention today. The private lands committee and the public lands committee are two committees representing respectively the two departments and work out and evolve these policies

that meet with such wide acceptance in northern Ontario. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to offer the congratulations of The Ontario Department of Agriculture to the winner of the world championship potatoes that did come indeed from Charlton in northern Ontario. A very great tribute.

Mr. Troy: I also endorse that, but I cannot say he is from the riding of Nipissing because he is from Charlton in the riding of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Hoffman).

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, then, let me congratulate both of you from northern Ontario.

Mr. Troy: Yes, that is right. Some of the time we are brothers.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): What are you now?

Mr. Troy: In community centres in unorganized areas, sir, may these unorganized areas receive grants from your department as well as from The Department of Lands and Forests, in parks assistance? I refer to the number of unorganized areas, and unorganized townships in my riding. Possibly they may get grants for community centres of some kind; now may they get a grant in addition to the provisions under The Parks Assistance Act, under The Department of Lands and Forests?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, is my hon. friend referring to grants on community centres?

Mr. Troy: Well, it says—yes, sir, it says grants to community centres in unorganized areas.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, we would be quite prepared in The Department of Agriculture, under the community centres branch director, to consider any application for community centres in unorganized areas. This is the first year that this has been done, if I remember correctly.

Mr. Troy: And, as you said in your explanation this afternoon about community centres, are playing fields with hockey rinks and so on also incorporated in that regulation?

The last point I would like to make is in the farm safety programme. My particular request is in view of the fact that in north-eastern Ontario a great many of our farmers, particularly in the ridings of Cochrane North, Cochrane South, and Timiskaming, are French-Canadians. I have seen the bulletins and the posters and the other information you

send out—all very desirable, also very effective—and I would recommend, sir, that you send them out in the French language as well, because it is most important that this farm safety programme be expanded.

There is a considerable amount of money spent on it. I notice one firm, which I believe gets a very large grant—at least not a grant but a very large payment, and it is an effective programme—but it would be much more effective, however, if you did also send out the posters and bulletins and information on farm safety in the French language.

Mr. Chapple: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out one thing to the hon. Minister in connection with northern Ontario. It is divided into two parts—northeastern Ontario and northwestern Ontario—and there is no similarity between the two. I would suggest, sir, that you separate the grants here—the amount of money that is spent on these different votes in northeastern Ontario and the amount of money that is spent on the votes in northwestern Ontario. Separate them. These are vast areas. There is no connection between the two and I feel it would be much more coherent, as far as we were concerned and as far as northeastern Ontario is concerned, if we knew where these amounts went in these particular votes, separately rather than collectively—

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Chairman, I see under the public accounts here the promotion of junior farmer work which you have—this is on page A-16. The 4-H clubs, members and leaders, \$36,631. I was always under the impression that the 4-H club had the junior farmers, that the leaders were giving their time for this promotional work to encourage the youth to remain on the farm; but here I see that you are paying the clubs, the members and the leaders. I am wondering whether this is a way that the party has to indoctrinate the people out in the rural areas to vote Conservative consistently—you start very young, apparently. So I would like to know what it is that you are doing here, paying members and leaders.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Whereabouts does my hon. friend find that?

Mr. Belanger: At the bottom of page A-16, public accounts, promotion of junior farmer work, 4-H Club members and leaders—\$36,631.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The best programmes carried out.

Mr. Belanger: I agree, but I do not see the fact that you have to pay leaders. My goodness, people who give their time for scout work, they are not getting paid for this; but here you are paying the leaders and the members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the misinformation that my hon. friend has provided to the House, because I am sure he has done it because he does not understand.

Mr. Belanger: Well, I would like to get some information.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What is shown here is the cost of bringing the 4-H members and the leaders through transportation. Transportation is provided for a trip here to Toronto for the 4-H club leaders of the province of Ontario. They do not get a red cent for the work they do, and frankly I know of no group of people in the province of Ontario that do more for rural young people than do our 4-H club leaders.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Belanger: I am not disputing the fact that they are doing fine work; I know that they are doing fine work, and all I can say is that they should extend their work.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): What has he got against the 4-H club?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Belanger: If you people will just keep quiet for a minute I will let you know what I have done.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, what is your question?

Mr. Belanger: Why do you not just keep quiet and attend to your business?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I am not disputing the fact that they are doing fine work. I have been interested in youth work longer than has the liquor commissioner. I have been giving my life to youth and that is more than he has done. But I will say this: I wanted to find out—apparently the only people who ask questions are over here—you people representing areas throughout the whole of the province never question how

this government is spending money. It has to be the Opposition. Everything that you spend apparently is fine because nobody gets up to ask questions: it is just the Opposition over here. So therefore I would say that you do not know what kind of a government you have, I do not know what kind of representation you are giving to your riding.

The reason for the expense is that you brought 44 club members to Toronto for some exhibit, is that it? This money that was spent?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, they come to Toronto on a trip once a year, and that was, I believe, at the time of the Royal Winter Fair.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you very much, that is all I wanted to find out.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, in the public accounts there is an item: rural youth centre. Where is this rural youth centre established, and could the hon. Minister tell us something about what it does? \$7,365.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is the Kohler youth centre at Cayuga.

Mr. Innes: What does it do there; can the hon. Minister tell us?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What does it do?

Mr. Innes: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it provides a place for the organizations and clubs of the county and surrounding districts to hold meetings. It is an old, converted airport hangar, I believe, at the air force station there, that was taken over by the department and is providing a youth centre for that whole area. It is used for many, many purposes. I have a list of the meetings that were held in it if the hon. member would like to hear what they are.

Mr. Innes: Well, I just wondered where it was. That is fine.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: For instance, it is used for 4-H club meetings, used extensively for this, and there are very good facilities. Has the hon. member ever been there?

Mr. Innes: No, I have not.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it is worth your while to go and see it. It is an excellent place. Judging competitions are held there, achievement days for the 4-H clubs from the surrounding districts, the crop improvement

association meetings, the ploughmen's association, junior farmers use it extensively, the farm safety programmes from those areas use this place, the women's institutes, the Holstein county club for that particular area, the beef and swine auction sales are held at that centre, and night schools. And this, I think is most important for the adult education programme we carry on in co-operation with The Department of Education. Night schools began November 22 last when 12 classes were held weekly right through the winter months. I think this is a remarkable record of activities.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question. Did the department provide this centre for that area of the province?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was taken over by The Department of Agriculture at the time that the air force station was abandoned there. We got it for very little, I do not know what the initial cost was, but we did take it over and we keep it in repair for the people who use it.

Mr. Manley: I believe in something like this, Mr. Chairman. I am wondering if we could not provide equal facilities in other parts of the province. I am sure that we in eastern Ontario would be very happy to have some place like this as well, and I am wondering, why provide it for one part of the province and not provide the same facilities or give us something to provide in other parts of the province for this very thing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, my answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is simply this, that there does not happen to be any community centres in that immediate area at all, and this serves the purpose exceedingly well for this very reason. Now, there are community centres all over the province. We have several of them in our area and I know that this is the case all over Ontario, but there is no particular community centre in this immediate area, and this serves the purpose of a community centre and does it exceedingly well.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, is rent charged for the hall when the meeting is under the auspices of some group other than, say, 4-H or an agricultural group?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To the best of my knowledge, rent is not charged. It is a community centre for the use of the community activities there and these services that I have listed here, I think, are indicative of that very thing.

Mr. Nixon: This is not particularly important, but I feel, sir, that the hon. Minister should know that the use of the hall was refused to a reputable political party for a nomination meeting.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Nixon: Now, take it easy. I would just like to find out about this. I understand that this was refused for a proper community affair, while I also understand that it was used by another quite reputable party the year before. Now, I would like the hon. Minister to look into this. He is talking about what a marvellous service this hall renders to the community. Surely this is a bona-fide community activity, particularly when the thing is up for rent, and I think they should be instructed to allow the hall to be used for these activities.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has said that in other areas you have community centres and grants are given to them, but that is just one grant. Apparently this community centre gets continual grants.

This year, sir, \$7,500, it was \$7,300 the year before and so on, so that not only do you provide the facility but you also provide the operation of it. In every other place where there is a community centre they operate it themselves, and they have to pay for them, you give them a certain grant, \$5,000 and that is all. If there is an addition you will give them another \$5,000 probably, but you also pay the yearly upkeep of this particular centre. If you are going to do it in one area, to be consistent—we are talking consistency here many times tonight, so I think we should be consistent and give some help to other sections, too, in that regard.

Mr. Chapple: Seeing so much is done for this particular area, we have an area called Quetico Park up in northwestern Ontario and I notice in one of the latest issues of the *Daily Times Journal* of February 26, that this hall burned down there, and they are definitely in need of some sort of recreation set-up there. We have other types; maybe agricultural instruction could be done up in that area in order to help the development of Quetico Park.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be unduly provocative but if I might ask the hon. Minister without being that way, I still am not quite satisfied with the reason why this particular centre we were speaking of a few moments ago, gets this special grant. Is it an operating grant

and is it a recurring expense year after year? And if it is, I am sure there are probably good reasons for this exception. But I wonder if the hon. Minister would just elaborate on why they do get this recurring grant each year. Is it sponsored by the government?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is a recurring grant, year by year. It is operated through our extension branch for the services that I have outlined here. I think the fact that these night schools are provided there in this particular area, we could, of course, if you feel it is the right thing to do, close the place, if this is what you want done. But if it is not what you want done, then I want to suggest—there is certainly an inference here that this money is being expended unwisely. Now, we could very well operate these night schools out of some high school; we could do this if it had to be done. But these facilities are set up at Cayuga and I fail to see why any person would question this expenditure here; to me it is a very reasonable expenditure for the type of service provided. I have gone out there and I have gone through the whole place from one end to the other. The shops that are set up there are remarkable; there is nothing elaborate about them but they are functional. And I feel we are providing an excellent service in that particular area. It is, I admit, something that is perhaps unique in the province. We have to say that we have been complimented on the provision of this particular facility by groups from outside the province who have on occasions been there for particular functions such as I have just outlined for others. So while it is a recurring grant, I feel that it is not an excessive one and certainly we are getting full value for our money.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am sorry if the hon. Minister took it I was trying to infer that it was not a proper charge. Would any other group in the province qualify for it, and if some other rural group would not qualify, is this a pilot scheme? It just does not seem reasonable that we would pick one part of the province and subsidize it and leave the other, perhaps just as deserving, areas without any assistance. Or do the other groups get their assistance from some other source perhaps? I am not suggesting the hon. Minister close it up; that is the furthest thought from my mind. I think the purposes are good ones, but it just does not seem reasonable that we pick one particular part of the province out to give it a special grant.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will be glad to answer the hon. member's question. I can see his

concern in this. I have been informed here that we got the buildings for nothing; they were donated to The Department of Agriculture for the purposes we have suggested. Our costs in upkeep: a man and his wife live there. They have a small apartment; a couple of rooms or suitable quarters in the hangar. They look after the heating service, and water for the winter months; look after the maintenance through the summer. I would say this, that this particular grant stands out by itself. I admit this, but I think also we should recognize the fact that through our extension service we provide essentially the same services in many other areas. For instance, we pay grants towards the rent of community halls for short courses, for night schools; we pay grants in co-operation with The Department of Education. This is a special service that is pinpointed here and specifically outlined as one project. Nevertheless, we do these things in other areas where we do not happen to own the buildings, but pay rent. And the costs are all in here under the amounts that are outlined in the extension branch.

Mr. Troy: One of the deterrents to expansion of agriculture in our area is lack of—when I speak of our area, I mean northern Ontario—lack of proper drainage facilities. Northeastern Ontario, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member for Fort William reminds me; he has already told me that they have not that problem in that section of the province. But we have a very definite problem in north-eastern Ontario. I know at the government's demonstration farm at New Liskeard there is a demonstration of tile drainage but, of course, that is a pretty expensive proposition for a lot of our farmers and the capital cost is another deterrent to our expansion of it in northern Ontario. Does that particular project, drainage, come under the department of the hon. Minister, or is it Public Works or Municipal Affairs, or has the hon. Minister the subject of drainage under The Department of Agriculture?

Mr. Oliver: Drainage should be under this, except tile drainage. Is that not right?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, well, what we provide is engineering services, as far as The Department of Agriculture is concerned, for drainage surveys. This is provided through our engineers under the extension branch, which we are now discussing. I believe it is The Aid to Drainage Act that is provided by The Department of Public Works. And I believe that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) has recently introduced a new tile drainage Act which will bring all

of these particular Acts under one; they will be administered through The Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the extension work of the department in Brant county is ably looked after by our agricultural representative, Mr. D. N. Graham, who certainly has the confidence of the farmers there, and with good reason. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if his responsibility would extend into the Indian reserve?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, my deputy, Mr. Biggs, tells me that this is the case. When he was the assistant agricultural representative in Middlesex county, his work extended into the Indian reserve in that area. I have heard, as he points out, there is work being done there, and I would feel this is the case. Now, maybe the hon. member suggests this is not the case, but I would see no reason why we should not provide service if it is requested or the need is there and there is co-operation between the residents of the reserves and the agricultural representative.

Mr. Nixon: I did not mean to imply that this service was not extended; I was simply asking for information. Actually when one drives through the reserve, one gets the impression that, although the land is fertile, there is a tendency to leave it in an undeveloped state, and I was hoping that the facilities were available and I was not sure that they were.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, can I have an explanation of the two votes of \$25,000 on farm safety? Are they part and parcel of the same thing?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is simply a breakdown. I thought when I looked at it twice that there were two votes there myself, but it is just a breakdown of that particular service under that vote.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I just want to make one comment on the farm safety programme, \$25,000. Of this amount, \$13,302 went to Foster Advertising. Now, would the hon. Minister mind telling us what that was for?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am told by the auditor that was for the campaign on advertising for the farm safety programme when it was initiated. You are referring to the public accounts, is this right? This is 1961 that these accounts are for.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): On item 5, land clearing and breaking subsidies to

farmers and settlers, I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us how loan or grants are paid out; assessed.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There was the amount of \$112,000 paid out in 1962. The applications are made through the local agricultural representative for land clearing purposes and then he recommends that this loan or grant be approved or rejected. Then it is forwarded to our extension branch in Toronto for final approval and clearance.

Mr. Thomas: Is there a maximum?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is a maximum. Fifty per cent of the cost of clearing, up to a maximum of \$25 an acre. That is the maximum.

Mr. Innes: Vote 106; I suppose the agricultural representative service comes in this vote. I believe they are doing a very commendable service throughout the province, and I would like to know how many—what, in fact, the agricultural engineering extension service is doing in the province? I know they are running a good service. Are they getting through to the farmers who are building new buildings and how many new buildings have they engineered? Is that their main purpose, engineering new buildings? Or, what is their main purpose?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The agricultural engineering extension service is not entirely devoted to the supervision, or laying, or drawing of plans of new buildings. It does apply also to farm drainage, and organization of farm layout and that sort of thing; better equipment and buildings, and dealing with farm machinery, too, with the advice as to particular types of machines.

Mr. Innes: They are allocated in districts, are they? Are the various members of the extension service in engineering allotted to districts?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, they are allotted in districts.

Mr. Innes: Each man has possibly four or five counties?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, whatever their particular area, where he is designated, needs.

Mr. Innes: How do you get this information through to the various farmers that this service is available?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, there does not seem to be

much problem of getting the information through to the farmers at all, for certainly the service is in great demand for these agricultural engineers, and I would think that there would be a general knowledge of the service so available, certainly through the agricultural representative's office in those counties where there does not happen to be an agricultural engineer, but who works in co-operation with the agricultural engineer in the neighbouring county. The farm organizations certainly know about this. We have made it clear as often as we can that this service is available, and I think it is general knowledge among farm people.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question here? The home economics branch: Does that come under the Ontario Agricultural College or does it come under the department itself?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I did not hear the hon. member.

Mr. Belanger: The home economics branch. Does that come under The Department of Agriculture or the Ontario Agricultural College?

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): It comes under vote 105.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It comes under the extension branch of The Ontario Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Belanger: There is no connection with the Ontario Agricultural College?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would not say that. There is a connection certainly between the two; they work together. It is under our extension branch.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 105 agreed to.

Vote 106 agreed to.

On vote 107:

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, I spoke about this inspection branch last year when the estimates were up. A lot of this large amount that is spent for farm products inspection, I know, is spent during the season when the fruit and vegetables are coming on the market. These inspectors are part-time; some of them are school teachers who do this work in the summer. I question the training they get because the results show that their

training is very poor. For instance, I inquired after speaking about this branch last year, as to the qualifications for these inspectors. I was told that, first, they must not be colour-blind. Now, when I see the product come into our area—the first product of the field tomatoes, we will say, for instance—the price will probably be around \$4.50 for a 15 pound basket. You will buy ten baskets, and you will get 25 per cent out of them that are not really saleable, but because they are the first field tomatoes people have been looking for, they will buy them; they are nothing to be proud of. Anyway, three-quarters of them you cannot sell; you have to keep them because they are as green as grass.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): What about the rhubarb, George?

Mr. Gordon: It looks as if you were weaned on a stick of rhubarb. Now this is what I want to get at, to make my point here. This 75 per cent of the tomatoes for which we have paid \$4.50 a basket: by the time they get ripe and are saleable, the things are down to \$2.50, you see. So that your inspection at the source is very, very poor; those growers are getting good money and not giving good value. I think you should look into that. But, anyway your inspectors, I think, should have more instruction than to go out in the field and be given a book just because they are not colour-blind. That is my little speech again on this.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are you for or against the growers?

Mr. Gordon: Well, we are for rhubarb, anyway.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 107 agreed to.

On vote 108:

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister told me that this was the vote that I should speak to with respect to the matter emanating from the Niagara Peninsula Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association. I hardly think it is but perhaps you would call me out of order if I am, dealing with the matter of neglected orchards.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think that your comments apply to the vote just passed, but go ahead.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will not delay. I wonder whether or not the hon. Minister did receive

a copy of the resolution. To refresh his memory I would like to read it as it is short:

Whereas the present legislation in the province of Ontario is inadequate to deal with the problem of neglected orchards in Ontario and in the Niagara Peninsula in particular, the Niagara Peninsula Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association resolves that every effort should be made by the association to obtain satisfactory legislation to remove the problem of neglected orchards in Ontario.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know a lot about it other than that these people took the trouble to write to me, and I thought I would bring the matter to the hon. Minister's attention, and perhaps he would like to comment on it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think I got a copy of that letter; it seems to me I did. It certainly is a matter of great concern, there is no question about this. I think I have referred it already to our chief of the plant products inspection branch of our department for comment and as yet I have not heard what he has done about it, or what can be done about it. I do know that there are regulations pertaining to the proximity of abandoned orchards to those that are in full production. I cannot describe the accuracy of the limits there but I do know this is a fact and certainly this is a problem that the hon. member has raised.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Of course I would assume that the hon. Minister is not fully aware and I do not wish to belabour it. I would presume that part of this trouble is being caused by the fact that, possibly, speculators are moving in and buying up this land for purposes other than that for which it was formerly used. As a result I would guess that they would have no interest in preserving the orchards. If I might just ask one further question; I realize it is a very acute problem. Is The Department of Agriculture concerned with the fact that these orchards are disappearing in this area and can anything be done about it? I know it has been discussed in this House before; I just wondered, now that we had a new hon. Minister, whether he was proposing to take any action to preserve these orchards.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I am told by the director of the branch that the industry decided that The Plant Diseases Act covers the specific diseases related to these abandoned orchards and this refers to what I suggested earlier in this method of control. However, it

does not refer specifically to the general problem that the hon. member has raised. I think that the main problem insofar as these abandoned orchards are concerned, is the appearance of the blessed things all over the province. It is not a very attractive sight, Mr. Chairman, to see these orchards in areas that are reasonably built up, yet you see these abandoned orchards just growing wild and as long as the limitations under regulations are adhered to as to their proximity to other healthy orchards, and other orchards that are being well cared for, that is really all the authority we have.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Of course we could change the legislation and enlarge the authority; I believe that would be deemed advisable. I am sure that there are other circumstances which would have a bearing on any such decision. I will leave it at this: Some very well regarded authorities are speaking out a little more positively each year with respect to the disappearing of these orchard lands, particularly in the Niagara Peninsula. I was hoping that the hon. Minister would indicate that at least some studies and research were going on, or some consideration was being given by The Department of Agriculture to preserve these lands. It is my understanding that there are not many lands in Ontario suitable for the purpose that has been developed in the Niagara Peninsula. I was hoping—and I know that the hon. Minister has discussed it privately several times—that the department would do something to save these lands.

Mr. Innes: Some years ago in the province the individual counties, I do not think it was every county, but I know our county made a very extensive survey in trying to eliminate some of the shrub trees in various districts. A spray was used to try to combat the thorn bushes, for instance, and various brush that had been growing wild in various areas. I would like to know if the department makes a special grant to the county organization for this, or do they do it on their own. Where does the inspection come for the need, that is so evidenced throughout the whole province of Ontario, for a clean-up on this shrub which you see as you go through any district in the province?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As I understand it there is a grant available for the destruction in counties of buckthorn and barberry. Those are the two that are host to oat rust. There is a grant made available to the counties for the specific purpose of the destruction of these two brushes.

Mr. Innes: Yes, but does the department itself encourage the elimination of this, or is it on request of the county only?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, we certainly would encourage this by all means.

Mr. Innes: Well, how many counties actually have made requests for grants for that purpose?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot tell you, but we can find it; it will be here some place or other.

Mr. Innes: Well I think it would certainly be a worthwhile effort. We should encourage this as much as possible. You do not need to go to many places in the province; ride on a train anywhere at all. I suppose the ARDA programme will have some bearing on cleaning up some of these unsightly scenes throughout the province.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, when the fruit season rolls around quite often you buy cherries that still contain the spray that is used when they are treating the tree. Does the marketing inspection branch have any powers to control that, or require the producer to clean the cherry before it is sold to a consumer?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not in the open-face baskets, but I believe that any cherries that are processed—that is, pitted cherries—are all washed, Mr. Chairman, before the pitting process takes place.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on vote 108, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he would be so kind as to explain the procedure whereby the government is assisting the Flue-cured Tobacco Marketing Board in the removal of no-sale tobacco from the market. I do not want to labour the thing but I would like explained just what the relationship is between the 2 cent levy and the government's undertaking to back the marketing board note in the removal of this no-sale tobacco.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the levy of 2 cents applies to all tobacco which any producer brings to the auction and sells. This is all tobacco carrying a grade and a specific price. The tobacco goes through the auction and any tobacco that is not sold to the buying companies is then taken off by the board, the flue-cured board; and the bank guarantee, plus the 2 cent levy, is used to pay the producer the grade price for his tobacco, less the 2 cent levy.

Mr. Nixon: Could the hon. Minister tell me what the estimate would be of the backing that would be required for this year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No. The tobacco crop is not as yet sold and it is very difficult how much will be required.

Mr. Nixon: There is no estimate then as to what the backing would be, assuming there is an agreement, that the government will undertake to back whatever is required. It has been recently announced that the marketing board has imposed a 40 per cent cut; that is correct, is it not, in the acreage allotment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No cut, Mr. Chairman, has been imposed by the Farm Products Marketing Board. Is this what—

Mr. Nixon: No, the flue-cured marketing board.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The flue-cured marketing board agreed among themselves by resolution that they would at least reduce tobacco acreage in 1963 by 40 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: Now this reduction of 40 per cent, Mr. Chairman, applies to all the farmers who market their crop under the flue-cured tobacco marketing board. Beginning two years ago some of the farmers, beginning with a small number and I understand increasing numbers, have seen fit to market their crop by a method other than under the board: could the hon. Minister tell me how many farmers might be involved in this sort of marketing this year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: During this past year? I am not sure how many there were in this last year that grew outside of the growing rights of the board. Is this what you mean?

Mr. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not exactly sure of this figure, I have heard various figures used.

Mr. Nixon: Could you tell me what some of the figures are? I have heard 50, is this reasonable?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: How many?

Mr. Nixon: Fifty farmers.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have never heard over nine or 12; I think it is nine, is it not? I believe nine is the correct number, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. Nixon: Some of these farmers then have seen fit to grow outside the jurisdiction of the flue-cured tobacco marketing board and evidently there is nothing in the regulations to prohibit them doing this, is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say this, that certainly the flue-cured tobacco growers' marketing board believed that they had the power to limit this.

Mr. Nixon: Did you say "have" the power?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Had the power to limit this!

Mr. Nixon: I am sorry, is that the present tense? Have or had?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I said had, h-a-d, the power to so limit this production. But this has been challenged, obviously, by these people who have grown this tobacco without growing rights.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the right has been challenged. Is the government through the farm products marketing board advising the flue-cured tobacco marketing board how to proceed in taking up this challenge or to ignore it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not quite sure what the hon. member is driving at.

Mr. Nixon: The flue-cured tobacco marketing board is doing nothing about this challenge. The farmers are growing outside the marketing board and evidently there is no legal reason why they should not. The flue-cured tobacco marketing board has announced a 40 per cent decrease in acreage rights. If there is nothing illegal, nothing wrong with growing outside the board, they can sell their product at the minimum grade price outside the province, does it not seem that the board's jurisdiction is going to disintegrate unless something is done about it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member knows that we have given an undertaking to the flue-cured tobacco growers' marketing board that if their legislation is not presently strong enough to do what they thought they had the power to do, then we shall certainly have to amend the legislation at this session of the House, or at least present legislation to the House, that will give them the power to do what they thought they had the power to do previously.

Mr. Nixon: May I ask the hon. Minister if the tobacco marketing board has indicated to the government that they require further powers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: So that means then that we are looking forward to strengthening legislation. May I ask the hon. Minister further: There is a feeling among some of the tobacco farmers, many of whom are my constituents, that the agreement the government made to back the purchase of the no-sale tobacco had coupled with it a proviso that the tobacco marketing board would have to bring in some realistic acreage cut so that the surplus would not build up from year to year.

Would the hon. Minister tell me if there was such a proviso, not necessarily a specific number, that is the 40 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I would be very glad to, Mr. Chairman. The basis of the agreement—and this was acceded to readily by the flue-cured board because they felt that it was certainly in their interests—certainly was that if the government would see fit to back the guarantee to take this tobacco off the market this year then when next year's—that is the 1963 acreage—was allotted that every pound of tobacco so taken off the market would be considered in acreage the allotment as a carryover. It would definitely affect next year's market.

Mr. Nixon: So they must have made some estimate of the amount that would be carried over next year when they have come out with their 40 per cent decrease. You have no estimate of what it will cost you to help the board buy this tobacco, but evidently they have been able to make an estimate so that they could propose this 40 per cent decrease.

Mr. Chairman, there is considerable history having to do with tobacco marketing that I am not fully acquainted with, but it is well known that in the granting of acreage rights in the tobacco industry over the years, from the very first beginnings of market control, that some fortunate farmers have had large acreages assigned to them which in fact they have never fully used. A farmer then might have a hundred acres of rights but in fact grow considerably less than that.

This is reasonable when you think of crop rotation requirements. But in fact these acreage rights, known as cold storage rights, are always in the background when the marketing board proposes an acreage cut. So it is quite possible that some farmers, particularly well-

established ones with these cold storage rights, can look at this proposed, actually enacted, 40 per cent cut with some equanimity because it will mean in fact that they will not have to grow less tobacco acreage at all but they will simply cut a little further into their cold storage rights.

I would ask the hon. Minister if, in the new legislation that we can expect, there would be any suggestion that this inequity might be corrected?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As far as the legislation is concerned, it is not finally drafted as yet. These are things we will have to determine as we go along. I would like to remind the hon. member most respectfully, Mr. Chairman, that there is a tobacco inquiry committee examining many of the things which he has raised here this evening. I think it goes without saying that anyone who has been associated with the tobacco industry at all in the province of Ontario recognizes the enormous complexity of the whole problem. I feel that the tobacco inquiry committee that has been established is looking into this very thoroughly and I would feel that this committee certainly will be made aware of the situations that the hon. member has suggested do exist and we would be expecting to have their recommendations accordingly.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if this committee was appointed with the usual terms of reference that the department has been making use of, there is no final date for their report. In fact when I inquired about this on the announcement of the committee, I was told by the hon. Minister that in fact he did not know when he would expect their report. So if they live up to form we would expect it probably 18 months after the committee was first formed. It certainly means that their findings will not be available for the coming season; it appears that their findings will not be available for this session of the Legislature.

The tobacco marketing scheme is in great danger as far as the continuation of the board is concerned and I know that the hon. Minister is accepting full responsibility for the very delicate balance between waiting for the committee to report and then acting to save the marketing scheme.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might elicit from the hon. Minister some comment on another point I dwelt on at some length in the introduction to the estimates, namely, the injustice to the subject's rights arising from the conflict of interest in both administrative and quasi-judicial functions of

a board. I say this is an injustice to the subject's rights, because this was the comment of Mr. Justice Dalton Wells in his report on the Royal commission on milk in 1947.

As I mentioned yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I was extremely interested to note that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Cass) is moving to separate quasi-judicial and administrative responsibilities in the Ontario securities commission. I suggest that he is doing it for precisely the reason that Mr. Justice Wells, some 15 years ago, said that they should be separated in the milk industry board. Fifteen years have gone by, do we have to wait for another 15 years before there will be action in this connection after having had such good advice?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, and this may surprise the hon. member for York South, I would be inclined to agree that he has a valid point. But as far as the milk industry board is concerned these judicial powers have been removed from the administrative powers—yes.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, you are right. I was referring to the farm products marketing board.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I thought you were referring to the farm products marketing board, yes. As far as the farm products marketing board is concerned, we are aware. The hon. member raised this point last year and I think he and I had a bit of an argument over this last year. I must confess I have read *Hansard* a time or two since.

This is a real problem, no question or doubt about it. But I think it is fair to say this: when negotiations break down on price between a producer group and a processor group and they cannot agree on the price for a commodity under a negotiated plan, each appoints a representative and then the farm products marketing board appoints a judge from the bench of Ontario to act as an arbitration board in the matter of the award of the price. Now this, I think, comes somewhere near to what the hon. member is suggesting.

This matter of the administrative and the judicial responsibilities of the farm products marketing board is a very real concern. While we know of the learned judge's findings on this and of his statement on it, I think it goes just a bit deeper. I believe that the producer groups themselves, with whom I have discussed this particular matter, have a very great confidence in the present composition of the farm products marketing board. I have

heard nothing to the contrary anywhere, and I admit that it does put the administrators of the farm products marketing board in a bit of a spot in some instances, having made a decision and then having to carry it out. I think that since we enlarged the farm products marketing board to take in the other members—and I am referring to the additions that were made a year ago—these men are really not particularly involved with the administrative function. And I think also the fact that we have just recently brought into the department an associate commissioner of marketing, in the person of Mr. Arbuckle, greatly removes the administrative details from the actual head of the farm products marketing board.

I admit this is a problem, but frankly it is not easy of solution. Oh, it can be done, I agree, with one fell swoop, and we can set up a judge to be completely independent, but I am wondering if actually this would serve a very real and useful purpose. I think this is something that requires an evolution in thinking up to this particular place. As yet I am not convinced in my own mind. I respect the hon. member for what he has suggested because there is some very real merit to this idea. I believe concern exists in the minds of other producer groups, that we have yet reached the place where we want to say we are going to leave this entirely in the hands of an independent judge to deal with all these particular problems. This is the status at which it is today.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not minimizing the difficulties here, but with respect, I think the hon. Minister has confused a number of points. For example, when he said that the board has the power now—when there is a breakdown in negotiations between a commodity group and the trade—to set up an arbitration board. They each appoint a representative and an impartial chairman is appointed. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, this is completely irrelevant to the point we are now discussing. We are discussing the proposition of the impossibility of men who are engaged in what might be called conciliation work, also being able to fulfil the quasi-judicial functions in an impartial way, if those same people are going to have to be sitting on a board and render judgment later.

Now, perhaps I can draw an analogy that will illustrate the point. If, for example, the people in The Department of Labour who are acting as conciliation officers, and who went out for example, into Sudbury or up into northern Ontario or down into Hamilton

when there was an industrial dispute, and tried to settle the difference, and then if it is not settled, it either goes to an arbitration board or conceivably some aspects of it come before the Labour Relations Board, the people who are acting as conciliators are not the people who are sitting on the board and sit in judgment later.

This, in effect, is what the hon. Minister is arguing as necessary here. Now, the hon. Minister's plea is that the farmers have confidence in these people. Well, this may be true, but it is irrelevant because, let me take one instance: The chairman of the board, for example, in a number of instances—and I will not cite them specifically—during this past year as I have moved around the province I have found that he has been out, sitting down with the farmers, sitting down with groups who are in conflict, trying to conciliate the issue. Two weeks later it is quite conceivable that one of these bodies, this commodity group, has to come before this board and the man who was their conciliator last week and was on one side or the other in trying to get a solution, is supposed to be sitting on the board in a quasi-judicial capacity. As Mr. Justice Wells said, this is an impossibility. You simply are asking the men to do an impossible thing.

If the hon. Minister's plea is that the farmers have confidence in the present personnel, the answer is that you must have two sets of personnel—the personnel who are going out to do conciliation work—and this may be the function of a person like Herb Arbuckle, who is brought on as an assistant to the chairman in this capacity, if I understand the appointment correctly. The hon. Minister may be moving in that direction, but there have to be people in that job and it has to be separated clearly and distinctly from the people who are subsequently going to be sitting in a quasi-judicial capacity.

I do not think that it is an impossibility. In fact I would guess that in the future the hon. Minister is going to need a growing body of experienced personnel in the conciliation work. Whenever that collapses and it has to come to the board, it will be dealt with by different people. Otherwise you are in the same position that the Ontario Securities Commission was in before the courts this past year. Now the hon. Attorney-General has indicated that he is going to amend the legislation so that people who are rendering judgment at one stage, would not be sitting there dealing with the appeal. This is a fundamentally unacceptable kind of approach.

A layman can see it; and I think the hon. Minister can see it. Certainly those in the

legal profession, including Mr. Justice Wells' report, claim that if you want to protect the subject's rights, to use the legal phraseology, you must separate administrative and quasi-judicial functions.

Mr. Innes: I wanted to ask one question relative to what the hon. member for Brant was asking on tobacco. I have it by pretty good authority that the tobacco companies previous to the opening of the auctions last fall, had on hand approximately 15 months' supply of tobacco, and this had some bearing on the slowness at the market. Is this correct, that they would have that much ahead?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That could well be correct. I do not know for sure. I have heard varying amounts. I have heard less than that and I have heard more than that. I do not know what the exact amount was that the tobacco companies had on hand, but I think we recognize the fact that a good deal of tobacco, of necessity, must be carried over by the tobacco companies for aging and processing; indeed, in some instances, carried for as long as five years. So I think it is only reasonable to suggest that there would be a considerable amount of tobacco carried over from time to time.

Mr. Innes: On that particular subject, I believe there is a storage, is there not, in the Leamington area? A building that is rented by the board? Does the hon. Minister of Agriculture know how many pounds are in that storage?

I understand there is tobacco that has been in there for several years.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I cannot answer the hon. member because I do not know anything about that particular matter that the hon. member has raised. There may well be tobacco in that Leamington warehouse, but to my knowledge I do not know whose tobacco it would be. Does the hon. member suggest that it belongs to the flue-cured board?

Mr. Innes: No. I just wondered what amount there was on hand.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not know if it belongs to the flue-cured board. Some company may be storing it there for all I know.

Mr. Innes: I thought it was the board's.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 108 agreed to.

Vote 109 agreed to.

On voté 110:

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, a question to the hon. Minister. In The Treasury Department accounts, the public accounts, there are grants to the Standard Bred Horse Society, the Thoroughbred Horse Society and then advanced to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I imagine, sir, that these things should come under your department.

Cruelty to animals refers I presume to domestic animals because the cruelty to the wild animals, I guess, comes under fish and wildlife.

My reference to this is prompted by the fact that in item No. 5 there is an amount this year estimated at \$10,050—Expenses and Premiums for pure-bred stallions. Last year it was \$9,300 and some odd dollars for pure-bred stallions. I do not see any horses nowadays up in the bush country, but the draught horse is found there—you will not see them on the farms, not even in the old days. You would see the black horses of the brewery companies, you saw the beautiful horses of the various dairy companies, but you do not see them any more. What is this particular grant for—pure-bred stallions—are they for export to foreign countries?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, do you want me to answer the question?

Mr. Troy: Yes, I would be quite curious to know if this is the same grant that has been made year after year for premiums.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, this is the grant that has been made, and I have a complete report here. Last year, there were 96 premium A stallions—that is, heavy breed stallions—inspected in the province of Ontario. There were 23 premium B horses in service in the province of Ontario, standing at stud. Now then, the grant paid here was on the 96 horses; the total amount was \$9,331.

There are quite a few horses in the province of Ontario. I know there has been a tremendous reduction in the horse population, but nevertheless there are many here, in the province. There are many areas where horses are used almost exclusively, and other areas where a good many horses are still in existence.

Mr. Troy: My attention was drawn to the national stud down at Oshawa the other day. But I suppose it has nothing to do with that at all.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This vote has nothing to do with the national stud. I can give you

the breeds of horses and the various stallions for each breed if you wish to have them.

Mr. Troy: Oh, no, no. I just thought that if there was such a change in the industry there might be a reduction in the grant. Not that I am in the market for them.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, on The Community Sales Act, I think we had an outbreak of hog cholera a while back. This started in Quebec and then spread into Ontario through feeding a bunch of hogs raw garbage. This disease was spread by people taking hogs from one sale to others—jobbers if you like to call them that. I thought I might ask the hon. Minister if he had anticipated, or at least envisaged any legislation to cover this particular situation to prevent it from happening again.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I am sure my hon. friend recognizes that hog cholera is the responsibility of the Health of Animals Branch at Ottawa and compensation is paid for hogs lost through cholera. He has raised the point of the transportation of hogs from various areas in the province of Ontario. It is a very, very difficult problem to cope with. It is all very well to say that a hog shall not move a given number of miles, but who is to determine this? In many areas of the province hog feeders depend on hogs coming from great distances to their respective communities where they are sold through the sale.

Established channels and outlets for many brood sow outfits where these young pigs are raised to weaning age or little chunks are taken to these community sales and sold. This is a real problem and I feel that while it certainly commends the attention of everyone interested in preventing the spread of disease, it nevertheless still rests upon the individual farmer concerned. If he is willing to take the chance of going to a sale and buying these hogs, it is really up to him.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I realize that, sir, and I do know that this is a problem, but you do get people who cart these hogs from sale to sale and this is how they make their living in a lot of cases. This has resulted in the spread of various diseases. I have mentioned hog cholera before, but certainly there have been other diseases that have been spread through this practice of people carting these hogs from sale to sale. I thought that in my own area—certainly the hog cholera epidemic did not get up that far—but it could have very easily because I read in the paper at the time that one particular man had taken hogs I think it was a distance of

about 70 to 80 miles to a sale. It would not take long for this thing to spread over the province at that rate. It is a very serious matter.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You are quite right. Community sale records are being kept of the entry of hogs into a sale—who brings them in and the consignee and who it is that buys them. I think this is one way that the operators of these sales can deal with this problem. We have had the operators of the community sales come to see us on numerous occasions to deal with this very matter, and incidentally there are hogs travelling a lot more than 70 miles in the province of Ontario.

Some of these sale operators told us that they felt that it was almost impossible to legislate this problem out of existence. But they did suggest that they themselves knew of certain dealers who were just trucking hogs around and who were not concerned with the quality of the hogs they were delivering to the community sale barn. They were stopping these dealers themselves by telling them that their business was not wanted any longer in that particular yard. To me this seemed a very effective way of them doing something to clear this situation up themselves.

Mr. Chapple: Mr. Chairman, a number of the different areas have been concerned about The Brucellosis Control Act and the administration of this; how it affects farmers and so on. I know that only on the request of the department does an area get the type of supervision which the department gives. But I have found personally that it has been very costly. I lost three sows myself, and in one or two cases of farmers in our area herds were wiped out entirely. This is something that is very hard to determine.

The calves on my farm have been vaccinated for brucellosis for 15 years and yet when the herds are tested you find—I have found that at least one animal goes down and it generally happens to be one of the best cows in your herd.

I do not know the answer to this, but I do feel it is a very important problem and I was wondering just what the hon. Minister would have to say along these lines—his suggestions as to what should be done in the future and what methods he sees now that this testing of herds has been in effect over the period of about six or eight months.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As far as we are concerned, vaccination is the best method of prevention and elimination of brucellosis in

cattle. You of course realize that brucellosis testing is done under the federal Health of Animals authority, and the remuneration is paid from that source as well. Our programme only deals with vaccination in the province not brucellosis testing and remuneration for cows that go down in the test. Last year there were 351,217 female calves vaccinated in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chapple: That is why I wondered about this vote. It did not seem to be large enough to look after the cost.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This only deals with the cost of vaccination. The cost last year of this particular item was just under \$400,000—\$398,000.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, in the public accounts there is a figure for compensation—for loss of calves. It is under the brucellosis control for \$3,700. What is this for?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The compensation is paid for any calf that happens to die within 24 hours of vaccination. This does happen occasionally from shock. As a matter of fact, about one calf in 7,800 died. That is a pretty low ratio.

Mr. Innes: I am glad to have heard that. I did not know that was available. I guess I may have inquired.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if I can ask the hon. Minister if this is the place where he might report on the mastitis control experiment in Kent county?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is a programme on there all right.

Mr. Nixon: Has it been going a full year? I do not see anything in the estimates covering it. I would like to know how successful it was.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The programme has been going about nine months, as a pilot project. Certain figures have been made available and, I believe, published through the periodicals, press reports and news media of one kind or another. We feel we would like to take a real look at this programme for a while yet, to determine whether or not it is actually going to work out on a long-term basis. It has very encouraging results to start with.

Mr. Nixon: Is it paid for through the research grant, or where would it appear?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This comes through the veterinary college, the OVC.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this item I would like to say a word. A little while ago the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich was complimenting those on that side of the House for all the questions they were asking.

Of course, one of the reasons why we do not ask questions so often in the House is that we quietly confer with the hon. Minister from time to time and get our answers. It is not necessary for us to get up and make a speech every time we want to ask a question; but believe me, we have asked many, many questions. I would like to clear you up on that point. We ask the questions.

In the great riding of High Park, which I represent, we have the finest packing houses in the world, I guess. We also have the Ontario stockyards, which are owned and operated by our government. It is a very successful operation. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that he might like to take some of the hon. members out there before the House completes its work, particularly those who have not had the opportunity of seeing how this thing operates. In that connection I was going to ask him if he would say a word about the Ontario stockyards board, and the tremendous job that they do for the farmers of our province. That is the question; that is it.

Mr. Troy: On section 7 of this vote—

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I finished it off. So let us have a little word about the Ontario stockyards board. I had not finished. I want you to know about it, this great operation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the hon. member for High Park's question here on the Ontario stockyards. I believe it would be safe to say that it is the most successful livestock yard, and the largest by all means, in the Dominion of Canada.

An hon. member: Great fellow was George. Great man.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: A great man, Mr. Drew. The genius of his foresight might be determined by the fact that the livestock yards, through the livestock board, have developed an auction system for selling cattle that has been very widely accepted. This is the place where more cattle are being sold every year. I believe it is indicative of the demand for this auction selling that the rings they had there in the past were not enough; they had

to have more rings. It certainly is a successful operation. It is going along well and providing a tremendous service to the farmers of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Troy: The compensation under The Brucellosis Control Act; is that just compensation for animals lost only? Is there any compensation to a farmer who contracts the disease?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Are you referring to the \$7,800? What is the amount?

Mr. Troy: I am not referring to any amount; but does the compensation only apply to animals?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not sure to what you are referring.

Mr. Troy: Brucellosis Control Act. It says expenses of administration and vaccination, and compensation payments. The compensation is only to a farmer for the loss of an animal, not any compensation to him if he contracts the disease.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is just for the loss of the animal. This is the question answered to the hon. member for Oxford for the loss of calves which happen to die after vaccination.

Mr. Troy: In the 1962 public accounts I find that you had approximately \$44,000 for veterinary services and assistance, and livestock shipped to northern Ontario. This item is deleted completely in this year's estimates; what did you ship in 1962?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am waiting for the auditor's statement on this but I believe it would likely appear under grants and subsidies, under the livestock branch, item 4, on vote 110.

Mr. Troy: Oh. It will be included?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Very definitely.

Mr. Troy: Last, have you made available indemnity payment for rabies to the farmers in Nipissing? Would you have available indemnity payments for rabies? Do you have them?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not by district.

Mr. Troy: Okay.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I should like to ask a couple of questions with respect to items 10

and 11 in the estimates, and I should like to precede them by reading a resolution that has come to my attention. I understand it has already been endorsed by at least two county federations of agriculture. The resolution read, and I would quote it:

Whereas the enforcement of proposed regulations, in regard to meat processing, would seem to force smaller packers out of business, whereas many of these same packers are trying to conform to existing provincial regulations and inspection, whereas the importance of the service performed by the smaller packers in the community through custom killing is recognized, whereas the existence of many relatively small packers and butchers in Ontario is very important in our auction system of selling cattle, if it is to continue to be effective, therefore be it resolved that the Haldimand Federation of Agriculture strongly recommend that some method of inspection, which will allow these packers to continue in business without being forced to spend an excessive amount of money in changes be investigated.

Now of course this is the result of the legislation which was recently passed. I noticed several items in the press at the time, particularly coming from health inspectors, medical health officers I guess you would call them in some municipalities. I noticed that Dr. Clarke from Hamilton had something to say. I have in front of me a clipping which quotes the London medical health officer and the theme of both of these gentlemen seems to be the same, generally that the system was ineffective and would not perform the purpose which was intended of it.

I just quote here:

Dr. Hudson told the board of health Wednesday the public is being sadly misled into believing that the government had instituted an effective system of meat inspection whereas they have only brought about a system of ensuring the prohibition of the use of dead stock for food.

Now the reason I bring it up, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if in fact the legislation as we have passed it is not sufficiently effective to absolutely confirm that the meat being sold is fit for human consumption; if on the other hand it is working as much hardship on the agricultural industry as the resolution from Haldimand county—and which has been supported, I might say, from the Wentworth Federation of Agriculture—indicates, then is it time to reassess this matter and find out whether or not the legislation we have

put on the books is effective. Would the hon. Minister care to comment on it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has raised two very important points as far as I am concerned. First of all I would like to say that as I explained—and it certainly was explained during the introduction of The Meat Inspection Act—we felt that The Meat Inspection Act was designed to protect the interests of the small slaughterhouse operator. Indeed I said this yesterday, and I believe I said it earlier today. We feel that without this type of inspection certain markets will be denied to the operators of small slaughterhouses, because they have been shut off because of municipal by-laws, that municipalities quite rightly drew up to protect their own citizens.

Now this provides overall inspection. In two years time the slaughterhouse operators will have time to come up, in this two-year period, to the standard of regulations that are presently being drawn up—they are not yet established, but are being drawn up. Bearing in mind the fact that these are small operators, that they are rendering a very real service to the farming community, we want them to continue in business and to maintain an outlet for the livestock that they have so ably handled in the past.

Of course there will be exemptions under the regulations. For instance, the matter of direct sale from a producer to a consumer. Then there are also the religious organizations that wish this particular exemption as well. These are things that are being considered in the drafting of the regulations that is now going on.

In relation to the item which has been read to us from the London *Free Press* attributed to Dr. Hutchinson—and a similar concern has been expressed by other health authorities—I would like to say that I believe it is due to a misunderstanding of the federal stamp "Canada approved" that will appear on all inspected meat following the implementation of this Act. The Act does provide for ante-mortum inspection—this is the inspection of the animal before it is slaughtered—but the "Canada approved" stamp cannot be applied to any piece of meat or any carcass unless that piece of meat or carcass has been inspected during the period of slaughter, and immediately following, for health inspection standards. Now this is what "Canada approved" means. And I believe that if the medical health authorities understood this fact, they would not have the apprehension that they now express. And I regret exceedingly that

this has gotten out. It is purely through a misunderstanding, and when this matter, I would go so far as to suggest, was discussed with Dr. Hutchinson, by telephone, personally by our deputy Minister, Mr. Biggs, he quite agreed that he was not fully informed on the matter before this particular statement was made. And I assure you and the public of the province of Ontario that there is no thought whatever that there is any loophole in this type of legislation. "Canada approved" means post-mortem inspection.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is a problem and I am sure that the hon. Minister is trying to deal with it fairly and I realize as well that no matter what decisions are made with respect to the regulations which I understand are not completely drafted yet. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is correct.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I realize that no matter what regulations are finally drafted, they are going to be a problem, and I just wanted to get on the record again this opposition, particularly from these federations of agriculture. I would guess there are probably other agricultural federations of various counties who are concerned with the problem, and when this whole problem broke a couple of years ago, it was extremely emotional, and I think that the problem is probably a pretty knotty one as far as the department is concerned. I would like to commend the hon. Minister for trying to deal with it. I hope that when the regulations are finally drafted that we will inconvenience as few people as possible, at the same time guaranteeing a standard to the people who are consuming the meat in Ontario.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, can I just speak along the same line as the hon. member for Wentworth? It has been brought to my attention that some of the people who are currently supplying poultry to various markets have been forbidden by a local by-law that has been passed, and as you know, The Meat Inspection Act is supposed to supersede the local by-law. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Innes: Well, in the intervening time, it is creating a little bit of difficulty with some of the producers where they cannot go into a market. If the Act was proclaimed they would be able to operate immediately. So under the present circumstances, they have to get their animals killed by a government-

inspected plant until the Act is proclaimed. Is there any way in which you could alleviate this particular situation, because I know it is a hardship at the moment? Or when will the Act be proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, the proclamation of the Act is under active consideration right at the moment. I think that this problem will be cleared up at that time.

Mr. Innes: You have had some complaints along this particular line?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It has been called to our attention, but I must say quite frankly that we have not had any excessive number of complaints about it; but we do realize that this is a problem.

Mr. Quilty: Under section 9 of this vote, rabies: In discussing this topic with the local medical officer of health last week, he told me we had more cases of rabies in Renfrew county than in any other part of Ontario. My question to the hon. Minister, through you, sir, is this: Has the department considered any detailed studies of the conditions in Renfrew county? If not, I would recommend such a study, because rabies are very bad in Renfrew county at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, there has been no particular consideration given to any definite study in Renfrew county, other than that the whole matter is under the closest supervision in the whole province of Ontario.

Mr. Quilty: Well, Renfrew county is the place that is really infested at the present time with cases of rabies. One man lost five cows.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, when this Meat Inspection Act comes into force, I am just wondering whether the hon. Minister considers they have enough veterinarians in the province to do the work. Have you enough vets to take care of the meat inspection?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is a matter that is being provided—this inspection, I should say—is being provided by the federal Health of Animals Branch; the federal inspection service is supplied by the Ottawa government. And they are now recruiting and training inspectors for the implementation of this Act.

Mr. Belanger: They are not going to be vets, though?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Pardon?

Mr. Belanger: Are they going to be veterinarians?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: One to four I believe is the ratio; four lay inspectors to one qualified veterinarian.

Mr. Newman: Will they be working side by side?

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, there is a considerable amount of meat which comes across from Quebec at Timiskaming and is sold in the unorganized townships there. The inspection of that meat would be carried out in Ontario; it comes across the Ottawa river at Timiskaming and is sold in the—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It could be inspected at the point of slaughter, but the federal regulations take care of any interprovincial movement of meat or meat products. There can be no legal interprovincial movement of these products unless they have had federal inspection. I assume that it is now being inspected or it would not be likely crossing provincial boundaries.

Mr. Troy: Well, if it is inspected, would it bear the stamp?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, if it were inspected, it would, yes.

Mr. Troy: And if it does not bear that stamp?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Then it would not have been inspected.

Mr. Troy: Oh, I know that. Can anything be done then to the vendor who comes across and tries to sell that meat?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, this is an interprovincial matter. It is dealt with under the interprovincial trade relations of the federal inspection authorities for meat inspection.

Mr. Chairman: Carried?

Mr. Innes: No, no, do not hit that so hard, Mr. Chairman. You are likely to break that gavel, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: What number is the member talking on?

Mr. Innes: We are talking on vote 110 and as the hon. Minister possibly knows, last August, approximately last August, the federal Department of Agriculture, and it has been customary for them to TB-test the cattle throughout the province, on a yearly basis, issued the statement that due to the austerity programme of the then government in

Ottawa, that they were going to cease testing on a yearly basis and that it would be on about a five-year period. Now, I have had various requests—and no doubt the hon. Minister and people in his department have—we in the province of Ontario have been proud of the fact that we have a health status for our cattle, I would say superior or equal to any in the world. Because of that health status of the animals we have been able to export cattle to all countries of the world. I believe in all fairness this has had a lot to do with it. We are now informed that if we would like to continue this service, it can be had on a yearly basis but the individual farmers will be responsible for the cost.

Now I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has had requests; if he has I would like to ask if he has asked through The Department of Agriculture in Ottawa what can be done, and if not, if they themselves would like to give some help to this problem. I feel that it is something that we must not just pass over too lightly. Not only will we continue to be one of the provinces that does the greatest export business in the world, but this has been the backbone of the livestock industry in Ontario, namely the exporting of our good cattle, sheep and swine, and we are very proud and want to keep it that way. I would think that the hon. Minister should have something to say on this very important topic.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the matter has been brought to our attention on numerous occasions, by livestock breeders across the province. I have discussed it, I have written to the federal authorities and their reply to me has been that the whole province of Ontario is now declared a TB-free area and as such the pure-bred breeder who was coming under the accredited herds programmes, is now being treated the same as any other farmer in the province of Ontario who has a TB-free herd. It is the same basis right across the province, both for that breeder and for the breeder of grade cattle.

Mr. Innes: Yes, I recognize that fact; that is certainly nothing new to me. On the other hand, requests have been made to continue it on a yearly basis. The hon. Minister is not answering my question, he is evading it. And I want to know if the department has given any consideration to helping and alleviating this situation or compensating the individual farmers for testing the cattle themselves. I want the hon. Minister to understand that this has been a free service to all farmers in the province of Ontario. It has

been done on a yearly basis, and now it is completely cut off and will be done on a five-, six- or seven-year period; they do not intimate how long it could be.

In the intervening time, I might mention to the hon. Minister, the inspectors and the veterinarians themselves have spoken to me on this and they truthfully say that there are very many instances of the odd TB-infected animal from time to time. It is in no way clear across the province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There has been no consideration given by The Ontario Department of Agriculture in initiating such a service as the hon. member suggests.

Mr. Innes: Well, would the hon. Minister take it under advisement? That is a favourite expression.

Mr. Oliver: It would be safe to say that.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 110 agreed to.

On vote 111:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on vote 111, I would like to ask the hon. Minister what co-operation he has in his department with the federal trade department in developing markets for farm goods? We hear a lot of the efforts of the agricultural department itself in taking part in these various trade affairs and exhibits and the efforts of The Department of Economics and Development. I would like to know if there is any liaison between this department and the federal department of trade; and if so, how extensive is it? Would the hon. Minister give us his assessment of it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, there is a very close working relationship with the federal department people along this matter of developing markets for Ontario farm products. We work together very closely. I do not know what the hon. member would want me to say more than that. This is certainly the case; we work closely with them.

Mr. Innes: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the fine work that is being done by the development branch in export sales, but there was an article in the *Toronto Daily Star* on August 20, relative to the export drive and it says:

ANSWER MACAULAY

ONTARIO FARMERS EXPORT DRIVE SUCCESS

Ontario farmers have begun a successful export drive on their own, they claim, in spite of Economics Minister Robert Macaulay's claim that Ontario products aren't being pushed abroad.

I think it was only a year ago that the Minister of Highways got after me on this particular subject. I went into it very thoroughly with the manager of the co-operative at Woodstock and they informed me that they had spent many thousands of dollars getting this market themselves and in no way, shape or form did the department help them.

But Mr. Macaulay, returning from a European trade survey, announced Ontario's export drive. He claimed Australia, USA, New Zealand and other produce was elsewhere, and Canadian products were not to be seen in European markets. In addition to manufacturers, Ontario-grown fruits and vegetables could be sold but were not in the ECM and UK markets.

Dr. John Brown, secretary-manager of the fruit and vegetable growers association, just back from a six-week tour of Europe, said:

Mr. Macaulay is ignorant of development in this province during the past two years. He is a Johnny-come-lately in this field but we are delighted he is interested now. From 1945 until three years ago Britain and Europe imposed quotas on our exports. We made representation for five years to get these lifted and three years ago began to meet with success. Now, except for canned apples, fresh apples, quotas are virtually gone. We have now begun fruit and vegetable products export promotion.

One flaw in the export market picture is the fact that big US companies control many Ontario packers and canners. Many US subsidiaries here use their plants only to supply the Canadian market and are denied by parent companies in the US to export either overseas or to the USA.

Ontario fruit and vegetable growers are considering setting up their own co-operatively owned packing, freezing, canning plant to by-pass US-controlled plants in order to export.

I would like the hon. Minister to comment on the flaw that is in the current market, as Dr. Brown has mentioned, where the US companies control many of the Ontario packers and canners to the extent that we cannot export the amount of fruit and vegetables that we would like to, as mentioned by Dr. Brown.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, there have been certain references made to myself, with respect to this matter, emanating from discussions in the House last year—

Mr. Innes: This has nothing to do with that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I think I have a perfect right to comment on this to some extent and the hon. Minister will probably amplify anything that is said by me.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will be very happy to.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do recall the comments of the hon. member a year ago. He was commenting with respect to the export of apples and made an observation with respect, I think, to the Oxford co-operative and he has misconstrued the remarks that were made to some extent. There were no derogatory remarks made at that time; it was simply said in the House that the efforts of the marketing development branch of the department at that time had been instrumental in developing the sale of apples in the European market and the British market, and that can be substantiated. At no stage of the game did anyone ever say that the efforts of the company he referred to were not influential because they were and of course that is recognized.

I think it might be interesting for the benefit of the hon. member to put some facts and figures on the record at this time. Over the course of the last few years, since the marketing development branch has become interested and has operated rather intensively in this field, there have been some very interesting figures developed. I am going to place them on the record for the information of the hon. member who has just spoken, and as a matter of fact for all hon. members in this House. I am going to put some comparative figures on the record here and now.

I am first looking at the first 11 months of 1961; the first item here is canned pears: the poundage shipped for the first 11 months in 1961, 1.49 million; the first 11 months of 1962—a comparable period—4,197,000, almost four times as much. In terms of canned apples, the first 11 months of 1961 just under 3 million lbs.; and for the first 11 months of the year just completed, just over 9 million lbs. again—over three times as much.

For the first 11 months of 1961 we come to the item of canned peaches, the quantity in the year first mentioned there, 251,572 lbs., and the first 11 months again of 1962, 1,689,000 lbs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, this is Ontario. Pretty impressive figures, aren't they? The first 11 months of 1961, canned fruits other than the ones I have mentioned, 1,103,995 lbs., one year hence the same

period in 1962, 5,938,000 lbs. In terms of canned corn, a very important product of southwestern Ontario particularly—1961 again, the first 11 months—this is a record today that is available—3,304,982 lbs; the first 11 months of 1962, 8,100,000.

An hon. member: Put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: He has not answered the question yet.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, we will answer some of the questions. I am sure the hon. Minister will also answer questions satisfactorily before we are too much older. Now, let us go on with this because it should be on the record.

An hon. member: Yes, put it on.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: 1961 again. In the first 11 months the recorded figures—tomato juice, a very important agricultural commodity, 9,220,000 lbs.; the comparable period in 1962, 10,777,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Any questions?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Vegetables and vegetable juices other than tomato juice, a very interesting figure, here, 1961—3 million lbs.; and in the 1962 comparable period—10,849,000 lbs.

Mr. MacDonald: You look like the cat that ate the canary.

An hon. member: Carry on there, a lot of good material.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Here are some more processed agricultural commodities—pickles and relishes, if you like, quite important to a lot of people: 1961, 11-month period, 1,471,085 lbs.; the comparable period in 1962, 4,285,000 lbs.

Listen to these figures now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Aren't you interested in the agricultural industry?

An hon. member: They do not like this kind of information.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: This was at the start of the year I was talking; that is what this man did and look at the result.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But you see, Mr. Chairman, these people have not really heard anything yet.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: We started a crusade and we really made it into something.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In 1961, and it was regarded as a fairly favourable picture—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Oliver: Make him keep quiet.

Mr. Chairman: You set the example, please.

An hon. member: The example comes from the government.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, just let me give him these figures. They are fascinating; they are fabulous, really. In the first 11 months of 1961—onions, 120,000 50-lb. bags. Now listen to this: in 1962, the first 11 months—1 million 50-lb bags.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But listen to this one. This is the last comparative figure I am going to give but we will have a few other observations to make, so don't applaud too soon.

In 1961 there were 2,000 bushels of carrots exported to the United Kingdom and elsewhere. In 1962—and a great deal of this developed subsequent to the food fair which took place in Olympia last September—now listen; 2,000 bushels in 1961; the first 11 months of the 1962 comparable period, 400,000 bushels.

Now just let me make this observation, if you will. I was privileged in 1960, and I was privileged again in August and September of last year to represent the hon. Minister of Agriculture in the United Kingdom and abroad.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: What, again?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, privileged. But I simply want to say to you people over

there who do not like to hear information like this that it really does not matter very much, does it, whether the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, or any other agency supporting the government of this province, accomplishes these things. Does it really matter who does it? Does it really? This gets back to the point of the hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. Chapple: That is old stuff, is it not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, this is very new stuff.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You had better start to recognize what we are doing. I simply say this to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to these hon. members over there, that even this remarkable performance, in the short space of less than 12 months, is still a drop in the bucket. I am prepared to say that when this hon. Minister of Agriculture and this hon. Minister of Economics and Development, or whoever is associated with him 12 months hence, present these figures to the House, they will be even more imposing than they are tonight. Because you see the thing that you people over there forget is this! This is a government that works together. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development, the hon. Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister means unlike Diefenbaker's government you work together?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well now, that is rather unworthy. This is a team effort, you know; working together in this fashion great things are accomplished. So any attempts by the hon. member for Oxford to try divide one Ministry from another, or break down this government in its total intensive effort to accomplish the sort of thing I have related to you tonight, will fail.

An hon. member: What about cheese?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Stormont is not in his seat tonight because we had a fair-sized dissertation on cheese a year ago and I would rather not get into that. We have corrected the situation that he complained about. Gentlemen, I think this is a reasonably sound presentation of a pretty good accomplishment on the part of teamwork, on the part of a very good

government. You can make whatever comments you like from there on.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to

certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the order paper, and the estimates of The Department of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.15 of the clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

(Thursday, February 21, 1963)

<i>Page</i>	<i>Col.</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Correction</i>
959	1	7	Change to read: Institutions (Mr. Haskett) and I would be glad—



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Friday, March 1, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Friday, March 1, 1963

Report, Ontario Municipal Board	1267
Statement re appointment of Mr. Eric Silk, QC, as police commissioner, Mr. Cass	1267
Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Stewart, concluded	1269
Research Foundation Act, 1944, bill to amend, Mr. Macaulay, second reading	1286
Execution Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	1286
Mechanics' Lien Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cass, second reading	1286
Notaries Act, 1962-1963, bill intituled, Mr. Cass, second reading	1286
George Taylor Richardson Trust, bill respecting, Mr. Belanger, second reading	1288
Association of the Chemical Profession of Ontario, bill to incorporate, Mr. Cowling, second reading	1288
Esther Taylor Wood Trust and the John Taylor Evans Memorial Trust, bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, second reading	1288
Township of Innisfil, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	1288
Guelph General Hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Worton, second reading	1288
Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association of Guelph, bill respecting, Mr. Worton, second reading	1288
City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	1288
Town of Hearst, bill respecting, Mr. Brunelle, second reading, held	1288
Institute of Professional Librarians of Ontario, bill respecting, Mr. Lawrence, second reading	1288
Town of Wallaceburg, bill respecting, second reading, held	1288
Town of Mimico, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	1289
Township of York (1), bill respecting, Mr. MacDonald, second reading	1289
Township of York (2), bill respecting, Mr. MacDonald, second reading	1289
George Taylor Richardson Trust, bill respecting, reported	1289
Sudbury Youth Centre, bill respecting, reported	1289
Town of Fort Erie, bill respecting, reported	1289
Boys' Home, bill respecting, reported	1289
Township of Bruce, bill respecting, reported	1289
City of Waterloo, bill respecting, reported	1289
Beechwood Cemetery Company of the city of Ottawa, bill respecting, reported	1289
Young Men's Christian Association-Young Women's Christian Association of Cobourg, bill respecting, reported	1289
Township of Scarborough, bill respecting, reported	1289
Trent University, bill to incorporate, reported	1290
City of Windsor, bill respecting, reported	1290
Sudbury high school board and the high school board of the town of Coniston, bill respecting, reported	1290
County of Dufferin, bill respecting, reported	1290
High school board of the township of Gloucester and the collegiate institute board of the city of Ottawa, bill respecting, reported	1290
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, reported	1290
City of Niagara Falls, bill respecting, reported	1290
United counties of Northumberland and Durham, bill respecting, reported	1290
County of Carleton, bill respecting, reported	1290
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1291

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 1, 1963

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always glad to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery students from Rolph Road Public School, Leaside.

I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the Ontario municipal board its report on the following case: Bill No. Pr47, An Act respecting the town of Grimsby.

Clerk of the House: The report reads:

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario in Parliament Assembled:

REPORT OF THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD
PURSUANT TO RULE 75 OF THE ASSEMBLY

IN THE MATTER OF PRIVATE BILL
Pr47, 1962-63, BEING AN ACT RESPECTING
THE TOWN OF GRIMSBY

This bill has been referred to this board pursuant to rule 75 of the legislative assembly.

As required by the rule the board has made an inquiry into the matters in question in the bill by:

(a) consideration of an application previously made by the town of Grimsby for approval by this board under section 53 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act of a floating debt comprising the amounts which are the subject of this bill and other amounts; and

(b) consideration of submissions including the auditor's statement now made by counsel on behalf of the town of Grimsby.

By order made May 11, 1962, pursuant to sections 53, (1) (c) and 64 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act the board authorized the corporation of the town of Grimsby to borrow upon debentures repayable over a term of not more than four years a sum not exceeding \$78,420.26 and to defer until the 28th day of February, 1963, payment of the sum of \$132,492.14 subject to further order of this board. The latter amount was one in respect of which this board did not deem it proper to authorize borrowing for the reason that it appeared to consist of debt incurred for the cost of capital works undertaken without approval of this board as required by section 64 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

This board has followed a strict policy of not authorizing under section 53 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act the borrowing of monies to pay the cost of works undertaken by a municipality without the approval of this board. The reason for this policy is that in the board's view such action would be merely to approve the circumventing of the provisions and very important purpose of section 64 which requires the approval of this board before the undertaking of capital expenditures.

This board now reports to the assembly that the amount of \$65,000, the subject of this private bill, is a part of the sum of \$132,492.14 whereof this board has declined approval under section 43 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act for the reason stated above.

In the opinion of this board the indebtedness in question has been incurred by this municipal corporation for purposes within its competence and the only element of regularity lacking is that mentioned, namely, that the approval of this board was not obtained to the incurring of the debt represented by this sum prior to the undertaking. In the opinion of the board the borrowing which this bill would approve will not create an undue burden on the ratepayers of this municipality.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed)

J. A. KENNEDY,
Chairman.

W. GREENWOOD,
Member.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to advise the hon. members of the House that a significant step in the reorganization of the Ontario Provincial Police, to which I referred in this House on Monday last, was taken by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council yesterday.

Mr. Eric Silk, Q.C., was appointed commissioner of the force effective March 1. As previously indicated the commissioner will have the rank and status of a deputy Minister. The appointment of Commissioner Silk is the first major step in the force's reorganization and leads the way to the operational revisions and further appointments and promotions at many levels of command which are inherent in the replanning programme recently described to the House in general terms.

Let me take a moment, not to describe but rather to indicate what I may refer to as the record of accomplishment in the field of organization and administration which Mr. Silk has built up in the service of Ontario since his appointment in 1934.

Entering the service as an assistant law clerk he reorganized the drafting office and

became Ontario's first legislative counsel. Before celebrating his thirtieth birthday, he had set a new pattern by producing the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1937, as a single statute revision commissioner. While in the same post Mr. Silk conceived and prepared The Regulations Act and set up the present system of central filing of regulations. A like Act has been passed by the Parliament of Canada and by almost every province.

Moving to the main office as first chief of the civil side in 1947, Mr. Silk organized the civil litigation branch and guided the development of the new field of litigation law that was to govern the unsatisfied judgment fund for 15 years. He was responsible for the establishment of the first traffic safety office in the government service and for introducing the traffic court clinic and the uniform traffic ticket into Ontario.

The coroner's inquest, as presently applied in the case of major disasters, was developed by Mr. Silk in his handling of ten major inquests which most of you will recall. Indeed, the studies conducted by a committee headed by Mr. Silk resulted in a complete overhauling of the coroner's system in Ontario.

The study of the county and district courts need only be referred to in passing. The report of a recent study by a committee headed by Mr. Silk into the labour arbitration situation is soon to be published. In 1959, Mr. Silk became the first assistant deputy Minister in the province's history.

And so, Mr. Chairman, when one adds to all this Mr. Silk's drafting duties, his appearance in the courts, before Royal commissions and committees of the House, his contributions to the Canadian conference on uniform legislation and the national council on administration of justice, as well as his membership on the rules committee of the Supreme Court, the finance committee of the Supreme Court, the advisory committee to the Public Trustee, the civil service board of appeal, the public service grievance board, and the Attorney-General's committee on the administration of justice as well as his presidencies of the lawyers' club and the medico-legal society, one may feel that his 28 years of service to Ontario have not been without accomplishment.

I am therefore sure that the hon. members of this House and the people of Ontario can, with justification, share my confidence that under Commissioner Silk the Ontario Provincial Police will take its place as one of the foremost police forces on this continent, as I predicted during the consideration of the estimates of the force.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I ask the hon. Attorney-General whether we will be given the opportunity to discuss this particular matter at some time in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, I think I said previously, during the consideration of the estimates, that there would be legislation; and certainly at that time there will be an opportunity to discuss it. I suspect there will be an opportunity for a very full discussion, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said, when a certain report is tabled in this House.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, if the hon. Attorney-General will give us his undertaking that, at the time the bill is submitted, we will have an opportunity to fully discuss this, that is all I ask.

Mr. Speaker, having gone that far, I should say that I do not want to suggest in any way that I would question the qualifications of Mr. Silk; but there may be a legitimate reason to question the advisability of making a man deputy Minister and in charge of police. This raises the old perennial problem.

However, if the hon. Attorney-General will give us the opportunity to debate this thoroughly and effectively later on—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would point out to the members that statements made by Ministers before the orders of the day are not debatable, but a question is allowed. I am afraid if I allow lengthy comment the members will feel a precedent has been created to do it on all occasions. So I am pointing out to the members that such statements are not debatable.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Speaker, in every other parliamentary House the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the various Opposition parties have been permitted to make a short, brief statement on the matter. I am willing to carry on in this fashion but I think that we on this side of the House should have the opportunity to make a comment, in a reasonable fashion.

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House as in former years that this is St. David's day. This is the day set aside by the Welsh people as their national day, to commemorate the birth of their patron saint, St. David. It is also said to be the first day of the year on

which the daffodil appears in Wales. The daffodil, as you know, and the leek, are the national emblems of Wales.

Going back over the years we find that many Welshmen—such as David Thompson—have played a very important part in our history. Today I think it is fitting that I should mention, as the member for St. David riding—named for the Welsh patron saint—the strong ties of friendship and history which exists between our country and Wales.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join the hon. member for St. David in drawing to your attention—

An hon. member: Sing us one of those Welsh songs.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Notice the accent is right too.

Mr. Thomas: —in drawing to your attention that this is March 1, the day when Welsh men and women throughout the world pay tribute to Saint David, the patron saint of Wales. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that intelligent Welsh people are usually connected with some progressive, democratic organization. I suppose that is the result of the great trials and tribulations of the Welsh people during the industrial revolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to your attention a case of discrimination on the part of the Toronto Transit Commission. On their map of the opening of the subway yesterday, they have a station called St. Patrick's, St. Andrew's and St. George. Now I suggest to the commission, Mr. Speaker, that at some time along the way they name one of their stations after St. David.

The other case of discrimination, Mr. Speaker, is against this government. The other day the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) stated that this little brochure had been translated into a number of languages. I am going to suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that he should think about translating it into Welsh, because that is one of the oldest languages in the world. In fact, a Welshman speaking the Gaelic can go into the north of France in Brittany and make himself understood. I am afraid my request, Mr. Speaker, will fall on deaf ears but if the hon. Provincial Secretary should take it under consideration, if he should, I am going to suggest to him that he leave out these pictures on the front and the back because it certainly mars the brochure. If he will do that, Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. K. Brown in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 111:

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, before the House rose last evening the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) made a great exhortation here on the virtues of the export drive and I am very happy to compliment him on it. However, he completely avoided answering the question which I had put to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) and I would like him at this time to comment on what Dr. Brown had said in the column in which he said:

One of the flaws in the export market picture, said Dr. Brown, was the fact that big US companies control many packers and canners. Many US subsidiaries here use their plant only to supply the Canadian market and are denied permission by their parent companies in the United States to export either overseas or to the United States.

Now I would like the hon. Minister to comment on that. I was very happy that the hon. Minister of Highways is not in this morning to throw a disillusioning picture on it, because this was a straightforward question and he got up and there was no relationship to this question whatsoever.

Do I not get an answer from the hon. Minister?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, what is the real answer to the problem? The American companies do own canning factories in Ontario, and in all Canada as far as that is concerned. But I think the evidence is so amply clear that the processing factories and companies in Ontario, and indeed in all Canada, but more particularly Ontario because of the efforts of this government in promoting trade across the ocean and in every export market that we can find an entrance to, have indeed succeeded in developing our export trade in this particular matter of fruit and vegetables. If these American companies do own some of them here, this to me is something that we can do little about. We can hardly deny American companies or any other person coming here and establishing canning companies and

buying raw canning goods in our free enterprise economy. But the fact that really does stand out is that we have processing companies that are in the field and are doing a magnificent job of promoting export trade.

Mr. Innes: In other words, the hon. Minister does not believe the statement that Dr. Brown made? Apparently not.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing trade and marketing of farm products, I want to make one or two general observations that have their base in a particular part of the hon. Minister's remarks of yesterday and the day before. This is the most amazing Minister of Agriculture that we have had in a long line of Ministers. He is amazing in this regard, that he seems to remember when it is convenient and profitable for him to remember and he has a very convenient memory when he forgets to put on record the things that he must or should know.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is the hon. member suggesting he is a master of half truths?

Mr. Oliver: The hon. member can take whatever interpretation he likes out of it. I remember the other day when the hon. Minister was speaking we tried to get from him what was the net income of Ontario farmers and he looked at us in amazement. I remember quite well; he said: "I am not so sure that that figure can be procured." The second part of his remark was that: "I am not so sure just what value that figure would have if it could be procured."

He tosses around the figure of gross income with reckless abandon, he tells us that the gross income of Ontario farmers is up and he asks us to believe that because that is a fact then the net income, which is the real figure, does not really matter.

Now the hon. Minister the other day could not tell us what the net income of the Ontario farmer was. Then after repeated questions from this side of the House, from somewhere in the hinterlands there came the document which purported to show what the hon. Minister a few minutes before had said he was unable to procure. He was able to tell us, according to his figures, that the net income of Ontario farmers was up from the year before.

Now fortunately for us the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has come to our rescue and this morning we are able to tell the hon. Minister of Agriculture precisely what he was unable to tell us the other day, in spite of

the information branch that he has, in spite of the economics branch that he has, he was unable to tell us what the net figure was, did not know how it could be procured. Well, I suggest to you that any Minister of Agriculture who takes that position is hardly worthy to be the Minister of Agriculture of this province. Today on a page of the *Globe and Mail*, you can see these amazing statistics. I would not be surprised if I get some applause from the government side when I read the headline which says that "The farm net income rises 50 per cent to the highest figure since 1953." I want to repeat it because I want it to stand out as I move forward in this analysis: "The farm net income rises 50 per cent." Now, that is an amazing increase: 50 per cent; to the highest figure since 1953.

Against the background of that information, I want to say that the figure for Ontario is somewhat less helpful and somewhat less hopeful. The figure for Ontario is this—in 1961, the net income of Ontario farmers was \$332 million; in 1962, it was \$316 million, or a net decrease in Ontario farmers' income of \$16 million in the one year. Against that background there has been a five per cent increase in operating costs and a \$16 million decrease in the farmers' income in 1962 as against 1961.

Last night in the House, the hon. Minister of Highways in a flamboyant style, told us about the onions that are going overseas, then the carrots and the peaches and the canned apples, and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay), not to be outdone, in this parade of virtue, jumped into the debate and said, "Our trade crusade is paying off, it is paying off. The farmers are becoming more prosperous." The way it is paying off, apparently, is that we have a reduction in our income in one year of \$16 million, while the rest of Canada is basking in an increased net production per farm. I suggest to the hon. Minister that that is the price we pay for having a Tory government in this province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, just to correct the misunderstanding that may be recorded in *Hansard* of the hon. member's statements:

The other day in the House—and this refers to last Wednesday afternoon when this question came up—the figures that I quoted were the figures that were received in our office from Ottawa the very afternoon that I was asked the question. And these figures were brought to me because one of our people here went over to the office and

brought the figures back that had been received that day. They had never been relayed to me at all.

On top of this, the figures that I quoted were for the years 1960 and 1961 and were not for 1962, as the hon. member inferred this morning.

Mr. Oliver: I did not say they were.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was just an inference, just an inference. It was there. I would like to point out that I think it is remarkable when one examines the figures that are revealed this morning in the *Globe and Mail* and to my knowledge have not yet been officially relayed to our office for 1962, that we—I think the hon. member would understand that these figures are released from Ottawa and they are not sent through to my knowledge.

Here are the figures that are quoted here and I believe the great increase that is revealed here—50 per cent of the net farm income—is due to the enormous sales of grain out of western Canada, and certainly I think we in this country should be appreciative of the fact that we had a Tory government in this country that promoted the sales of products that are recorded in the paper this morning.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, some political conclusions have been drawn from this, and the hon. Minister has once again indulged in a tactic which I hope some time he is going to discard. Clearly what he should have done was to come in frankly and indicate the facts, instead of claiming he did not have the figures for 1962 when he knew there was going to be a drop in farm income in 1962.

Mr. Wintermeyer: That is the responsibility of the hon. Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, it is his responsibility. Mr. Chairman, the point I really want to draw attention to here is that this government is responsible for a decline in income here, as the hon. member for Grey South said, Mr. Chairman, and he makes the point with obvious validity. The point I wanted to make with the same degree of validity is that the farm income in the province of Saskatchewan where they have a very good government, has gone up from \$137 million to \$494 million in one year.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I will inform the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) of something: The federal government did what

the New Democratic Party and the CCF have been urging should have been done for ten years—namely, sell wheat to people who need it, instead of worrying about their political colouring.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 111 agreed to.

On vote 112:

Mr. C. E. Janes (Lambton East): May I, as a grass roots farmer, take part in this discussion for a moment? I would like to inform the House that the farmers in my area never had it as good as they have in the last year. And they are quite willing to admit it. They are selling their cattle for more money, their soya beans for more money and everything they have to sell. Their corn is selling higher than it ever has. I talked to one large operator very recently and he said, "If this is austerity, let us have it. I am all for it." And he keeps very definite records. He assured me that his costs are running just the same as they have been running—about ten per cent of his income. They had not increased any. About ten per cent of his expenditure was for the cost of his machinery, and so on. He said he had never had it as good, and my farmers are all feeling the same way.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, on vote 112, this is the one estimate in the government's estimates that always fascinates me. Since I came into this Legislature I have particularly noted this one estimate in The Department of Agriculture.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that about four or five years ago the federal friends of the hon. Minister introduced legislation at the federal level which was supposed to remove the need for a junior farmers' loan board in Ontario and at that time you will recall, sir, that the Minister advised us that the junior farmers' loan board was being discontinued due to the fact that there would be an overlapping. A year or so later, we on this side of the House questioned the estimates of this department, since although the board had stopped functioning in the actual making of loans to farmers, the estimates had not changed very much. We were suspicious that Parkinson's law was in effect in this particular department. And after considerable prodding from this side of the House we noticed that there was a slight reduction in this particular estimate, although it in no way related, in my opinion, sir, to the amount of work that was necessary in this department.

It was simply a token reduction on the part of the department.

What I am particularly intrigued with this morning is the fact that the amount of money which is now being apportioned to this department is pretty well the same as the amount that appears in the last public accounts of which we have record. Now the provincial government has determined that their federal friends really did not do a very good job in this field and it was necessary for the province to re-enter the loan market to the junior farmers. With this I agree, I do not think their federal friends did do a very good job.

But, nevertheless, it is particularly interesting to note that they are going back into the loan business again and yet there is no change in the estimates. The hon. Minister will recall that we were advised some years ago that there was a considerable amount of the work that was done in the field. Apparently we are now going to go back into the field and investigations of this type of work will be necessary and yet the amount of the estimates is relatively unchanged. I think the hon. Minister might very well give us some explanation of the reason.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the reason that the estimates are not changed particularly is due to the fact that the estimates were prepared before the loan was even introduced into the Legislature and has not yet passed the Legislature. If we had advanced the amounts of the estimate we would have been criticized by the hon. members of the Opposition for advancing an estimate for an Act that really had not passed this House.

As far as the statement on the relative number of people who are involved in the junior farmer loans branch, the number on staff since the loan was repealed or abandoned in 1960 has been reduced from 28 to 13. This is considered to be a minimum staff to look after the interests of the servicing and collection of over 3,000 loans and nearly \$20 million of the government's money. It seems to me that we are doing this as efficiently as can possibly be done, having regard to the welfare and the interests of the people of Ontario who have advanced this money.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, that is very interesting. The hon. Minister tells me that the staff has now been reduced to 13 and I see the salary bracket is somewhere in the vicinity of \$83,000. I know a little bit about making collections on loans and I know that a good deal of the matter of collecting

is done by clerical help. I wonder, since there is such a relatively small staff in this department, if the hon. Minister would be able to advise us just what the make-up of the personnel is now that it has been reduced to 13. Do we have all Indians, or do we have all chiefs, or do we have a few of each? What is the general breakdown of the personnel in the department?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not got the exact figures of the breakdown in the department. It consists of a director, Mr. Western; an assistant director; and I believe there are two or three legal people involved. There are some clerks there, stenographic help as well, and two accountants, I believe.

There is service provided in servicing these loans on a part-time basis throughout the province of Ontario. Where there is any difficulty being experienced with the loan and the applicant or the person who has the loan makes advances to the branch, we are always willing to go out and assist them in any way in helping him with his particular problem. This is where the salaries are going in this particular branch.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister advise whether or not there have been any problems with these loans? Is there any delinquency evidenced from the people who have borrowed the money? What has been the situation with respect to that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Fifteen loans in arrears today out of over 3,000 loans.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that—if I heard the hon. Minister right and I think I did—I wrote them down while he was telling me—there were a director, three legal personnel, some clerks and two accountants.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There may be some others, there are 13. I can give the hon. member every individual person if he wants it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that it seems to me somewhat unusual that it would require three legal personnel in a department that has not been making loans for some three or four years simply to make a few collections and he has indicated that there is very little delinquency. It seems to me that this has been up until now simply another case of sloppy bookkeeping in the government side of the House. They have retained a department here which in my opinion the cost of

operating was way and beyond what you would normally expect it to be.

I think the reason they have done it is what I suspect in many of the other departments, there is no real efficiency, there is no real attempt on the part of the government to run it in a businesslike manner. I think the very fact that the hon. Minister stands in his place today and tells that they are still retaining three legal personnel in a department that has not been actively operating for a period of four years is ample evidence that there really is a lack of efficiency in many of the departments.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify this remark. I told the hon. member that I was just simply revealing it to him as it came to my mind. Now I have the actual number of the staff here and maybe he would like to write this down. There is one manager, one assistant manager; there are two lawyers, there are two accountants, there are four stenographers and there are three clerks, making a total of 13.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, does it not seem unusual to you, sir, that there is a manager, an assistant manager, I think he told me there were two lawyers, out of a total staff of some 13, to run a department. If this is the way this government does its business it is no wonder the costs are as high as they are.

I do not know of any organization in financial business that would carry a department with this type of overhead. It is ridiculous and in my opinion, sir, it is absurd. Every time the hon. Minister attempts to clarify the matter he makes it look that much more ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I will not accept that kind of a criticism for the simple reason that this is \$20 million of the people's money, of the province of Ontario. We have a staff of 13 looking after this interest. I believe that public opinion will recognize the fact that we are interested in the welfare of the people of the province of Ontario in protecting them and providing this kind of service.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I submit in reply to the hon. Minister that he shows how little he really knows about the collection of money, when he says that he requires 13 personnel of this type to look after the collection of \$20 million in mortgages. If he knows anything about the business, he knows about two personnel in any ordinary

business establishment would do the same job that he requires.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, if other hon. members in this House wish to make any comment on this matter, I suggest it is their privilege, I suggest that they wait until I am through and then stand up and make their comments. The very fact that the hon. Minister and the government benches opposite are chirping away now is because they do not like to hear this sort of thing. They do not like to be reminded of their own inefficiency. If we could really get to the root of the thing and examine these matters in detail, as we would like to do, I suggest that we would find considerable more of the same type of sloppy record keeping in the government.

Mr. Oliver: May I ask the hon. Minister, is it safe to assume, or is it proper to assume, that inasmuch as there is not an estimate here for the new junior farmer loan board that the loans will not be made in the ensuing year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member, I believe, knows very well that as soon as the Legislature passes this Act—if indeed it does pass this Act—that these loans will be made available.

Mr. Oliver: If that is the case—the hon. Minister has made the statement that as soon as the legislation is passed, loans will be made available. I would think that that would be the situation. If it is, then why in the world has the hon. Minister not an estimate in here that will take care of the situation? What is he going to do? Why should he not have foreseen the expenses in relation to this Act when he brought it into effect?

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): It has never been done in the history of this province.

Mr. Oliver: Oh, go away. Within two months of the Act going effect there is no allowance made for it at all?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: On a point of order, it is perfectly fair to say that the estimates are intended for the legislation now in effect and programmes now authorized. You cannot anticipate in estimates what the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: It has never been done.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: All right, I challenge the hon. leader of the Opposition to find one single instance where it has been done.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Oh, the hon. Minister is missing the whole point. Certainly it is basic parliamentary procedure for ages by, that a government gets authority to spend money as a result of its budget submission. Beyond that it has no authority.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Right.

Mr. Wintermeyer: All right. Now what authority, therefore, do you have to spend money over and above this estimate in respect to junior farmer loans?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: There is no legislation yet to spend any money. When the legislation is passed you can go back to the House if it is sitting, or to the Treasury board if it is not.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is just engaging here in argument that, in my suggestion, is all right in a debating society; but in this House, sir, we know there is no legislation as yet, but we anticipate it. The government has a responsibility to anticipate expenditures. It has no authority, sir, except by way of Treasury warrants, as has been suggested, to spend money with respect to the extension of junior farmer loans in the course of the next fiscal year. And I think, quite contrary to the government criticizing the hon. member opposite, it is our responsibility to point this out.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The hon. leader of the Opposition is quite wrong.

Mr. Wintermeyer: It certainly is.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Find one single instance where that has ever been done, even when the Liberals formed the government in the hungry 30's.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, what the past has been is not relevant to this basic argument we are making. We are now talking budget, sir.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister without Portfolio): What is the hon. leader of the Opposition talking about?

Mr. Wintermeyer: I say, in answer to the hon. Minister without Portfolio, that if he ran his personal operation the way this farm loan is being run he would have been bank-

rupt long ago. He knows, and the hon. Minister opposite him knows very well, that there is not a financial institution in Ontario that has a staff of 13 to man the type of operation that is here. If he is condoning this sort of thing, then he is condoning the inefficiency that obviously exists.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: The hon. Minister of Economics and Development at least takes a debative point of view. I agree that no legislation is in, but what we are talking about here is fiscal responsibility to this Legislature. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has come here as a responsible Minister and asked us to approve of an estimate to which he has not given the foresight to provide for the logical extension into the junior farmers in this next fiscal year. I think that we on this side would be remiss in our duty if we did not bring this to public attention, and to his attention.

He is the Minister responsible. He has a responsibility to somebody other than his cohorts, that is to the people of Ontario as he has said. What we would like to know is how he intends to expand this department, as will presumably be required if he expands his loans—

Mr. MacDonald: They do not need to expand it; they have too many already.

Mr. Wintermeyer: That could well be. But one way or another they have to explain themselves. Either they have had too many in the past, or in the future they are going to have to add something to this staff. This is not specious on our part at all. The hon. Minister comes from the proximity of London. There is not a mortgage company in that area that would staff a division of its department with 13 people to collect payments on an investment of \$20 million.

There are many of us here who have had plenty of experience in this. For years I had the opportunity of doing all the Mutual Life work across Canada and I know something of the efficiency which is required. One lawyer took care of approximately \$500 million worth of collections. To come along with two lawyers and make some facetious argument, sir, is indicative of real inefficiency. Now I suggest to the hon. Minister that he has a responsibility to come forward now and say what he is going to do about the expenditures of money in this department, which presumably are going to have to be made without the authority of this Legislature in the course of the next fiscal year.

Mr. Oliver: I was just going to say to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and other departments, that he said we would not have any authority to spend this money. Well, that is a fallacious argument. Of course, he has not at the moment, but the moment that this Legislature puts on its seal of approval and the moment the Lieutenant-Governor reads this Act as having been passed in this Legislature, then the authority is there, and the vote is there to carry out that authority.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Why, the House might defeat the bill.

Mr. Oliver: Even if that situation should arise, Mr. Chairman, then of course you would not spend the appropriation.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: But the money would have been authorized.

Mr. Oliver: Oh, get out!

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Well, the hon. member should ask the auditor about this.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The legislation which previously permitted the loaning of this money was repealed at the time that the federal government entered the field. Was our original legislation repealed?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, the legislation was not repealed. It was simply amended so there were no more loans made after 1960. In relation to the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition, as far as our responsibility is concerned in this particular matter we have no legislative authority to make a request in the budget estimates for money for which there is no legislative authority. If we had entered this in the budget, you people on that side would have been the first to get up and say, "You have not gotten the legislative authority."

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Let us determine whether the statement that has just been made by the hon. Minister is correct or not. I suggest that he is not correct in the statement that he has just made. I suggest that there is legislative authority right now, the one that has always been operated on. All that the hon. Minister is now making is a Cabinet or governmental decision whether or not he is going to continue. There is no problem here as the hon. Minister outlines it at all.

This is serious. I think the hon. Minister has engaged in a lot of debate here but he has a real responsibility to be honest—I am

sorry, I withdraw that statement—I suggest the hon. Minister has a responsibility to be as fullsome, as complete in his explanation of questions opposite, as humanly possible. And he has not been thus far. He has engaged in a good deal of politicking.

What the hon. Minister is suggesting now is not accurate. It certainly bears on his shoulders the fact that he has here far too much staff to operate the type of collection agency that he has been operating for the last several years. We have every right to inquire now what he intends to do in the future. He has the legislative authority, the same as he has always had, but what we are asking about is his administrative efficiency which relates not to legislation at all. We question it; and we have a right to do so.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it might be the opinion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the opinion of the Opposition generally, that there are too many people involved in this particular branch. This is their opinion. If they feel this is the case, then they are entitled to that kind of an opinion. We feel, as far as we are concerned, that we are doing this as efficiently as can possibly be done.

I would like to suggest with respect to the legislative authority we now have, the new Act which we are proposing is entirely different in its concept from the old Act. Increased loans are made; government guarantees are made for bank loans. It is an entirely different situation. There is a different rate of interest, a different term of repayment. We are increasing our emphasis on the family farm unit, designed to make loans to family farms, to corporate family farms operating under agreements between father and son, brother and brother, blood relationships. Until we get the legislative authority to do this kind of thing, then we have no right in my estimation to put in the budget estimates a request for that kind of an expenditure.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Then what right is the hon. Minister going to have in the next fiscal year to lend one nickel for the very commendable purposes which he has outlined? What right?

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: It will be based on the bill and then a special estimate in the Legislature or from the Treasury board.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Just a moment. You then have the legislative authority. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that they are going to have to operate on Treasury warrants. Treasury warrants are designed and intended

historically surely for extraordinary, unforeseen emergencies. But this certainly is a very foreseen, known, knowledgeable situation. The real difficulty here is that the hon. Minister should have presented his legislation before he asked for the approval of this estimate. That is what orderliness would have required.

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: The Opposition wants police reports, then they want—

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now, just a moment. Just a moment!

I have had enough of this criticism, particularly from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), that we are obstructing. He went out of this House to make his statement. Nothing has ever irritated me more than that particular statement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I was disappointed in the hon. Prime Minister when he made that statement.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): The people were too.

Mr. Wintermeyer: There is not enough legislation on the docket right now to keep us in session for two days, if it were not for these estimates. The government has not brought forth any legislative programme at all. If it has any we have not seen it.

The simple statement is that they use their own lack of legislative proposals in this House to create the impression to the public at large that we are obstructing. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there is no legislative programme to be obstructive about, because there is none before the House.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): The answer is in the hands of the Opposition, let the estimates go on.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Oh, nonsense!

Mr. Chairman, the orderly procedure—and I have a certain element of sympathy for the hon. Minister opposite because I think what he is probably required to do now is to comply with the governmental programme which apparently is to delay the submission of its legislative programme until the tag end of the session, so there is no real time to debate it. Then what will happen we do not know, but we will be ready for anything.

The simple situation is, sir, that in answer to the hon. Minister's question, his legislation should have been introduced before he asked

the Legislature of this province to support the payment of money for a programme that we know nothing about. If the public at large knew what was happening here it would rise up in wrath because this is a most unbusiness-like way to conduct affairs.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, in view of the comments made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I would ask him not to become too irritable on Friday morning. He makes these comments about something I may have said outside the House. I read many reports of speeches he makes at nomination meetings and here and there he criticizes me, he criticizes my government. But I do not take these things too seriously and I suggest that he relax a little bit.

As far as the procedure in this House is concerned I will go back to a statement I have made many times on this eternal effort to put this government in the position where we are not permitting time to debate. Now then, you have said we must have the annual reports before we deal with estimates. Now you are suggesting that we must—what do you want us to do—combine legislation and estimates so that they both go along together?

This is the normal course of events in this House, the legislation is here, it will come down. We meet here at nights, we meet here and listen to long addresses concerning everything under the sun. Some of the comments have very little if anything to do with the estimates that we are discussing. But we do not complain, we sit here and will continue to sit here until midnight, or one o'clock or two o'clock. You have ample time to tell us about your law suits and how you fight them in your private practice.

We go through this fairly frequently for quite some periods of time. But we are patient, we do not complain, you do not hear any complaints from this side of the House. We will give you all the time you need to discuss anything that may come up and what your preoccupation with the length of the session is, I do not really know. The legislative programme will be produced here, it will be debated, on everything you have ever asked me.

About debate, I have given you the assurances you have asked for on practically every occasion. I have given you assurances that there will be plenty of time to debate anything you wish to debate. I have put things on the order paper so that you would have an orderly place to discuss them.

Please let us get this straight once and for all. I think politically you would probably

be very happy if you could indicate to the public that there was some form of closure going on here. I see the end result of this thing. How often in this House am I asked to give my assurance—and this is the term that is used—"give me your assurance that we will have an opportunity to debate this, that and the other thing."

You have always been given it so do not try and say we are not giving you an opportunity to debate the issues before us today. I will stay here until next July if necessary to debate any part of the legislative programme that we produce. It will come forward in due course in an orderly manner. Everything that we have said we will do, we will do. You will have an opportunity to discuss it here.

I just make this point so that we can all understand we are going ahead with the business of this House in the way that it is necessary to do, having in mind what is necessary to produce legislation, to produce good legislation that will stand up and will meet the requirement, the comments and the criticisms of the hon. members opposite. I just make these few comments concerning how this House is to be operated, the opportunity we will have to examine the legislation and to discuss any of these matters which the Opposition might like to discuss.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, while this issue is before the House let me say this: I think the hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, has considerable validity in his argument that this government should be bringing forward its legislation instead of leaving it to the end of the session. Time and time again legislation could be on the order paper so that the members might have an opportunity to discuss it; so that we can have a chance to study it; so that people affected will have an opportunity to study it and will not be faced with 11th hour efforts which they can do nothing about.

I think the hon. leader of the Opposition is on absolutely firm ground in his demand. The only reason why I rise, Mr. Chairman—and I swore I would not do this again this session—is that once again it is the painful old proposition of the pot calling the kettle black.

Last year the hon. leader of the Opposition entered this House in November when the House began and he put on the order paper notice of about a dozen bills—

Hon. Mr. Macaulay: Which he did this year too.

Mr. MacDonald: Just do not steal my lines! At the end of the session, about six of the bills were not even introduced in the House. Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the record for this year, since what we want is an early introduction of legislation so we can look at it?

On November 27, 1962, the hon. leader of the Opposition put on the order paper—listen to this: An Act to establish a medical care commission plan in Ontario. Have we seen it? No. An Act to amend The Minimum Wage Act. Have we seen it? No. An Act to establish an Ontario housing commission. Have we seen it? No. An Act to provide for the disclosure of the cost of credit. Have we seen it? No. An Act to establish a public utility to supply water at cost. Have we seen it? No. An Act to amend The Election Act. Have we seen it? No. An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act. Have we seen it? No.

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, what our situation in this Legislature is—the government does not bring in legislation because it is playing politics; the Liberal Party does not bring in legislation because it is playing politics too. As far as the Liberals are concerned, legislation is not something to meet the needs of the people; legislation is an election gimmick which is held to the last moment, is put on the order paper for two succeeding years and never introduced. Why? Because the Liberals have not made up their minds what they are going to put into it. They pull it out of the hat on the eve of an election and hope that they can dupe the people. This is final and conclusive proof that the Liberal group here is no substitute for the Conservative group even though it is painfully obvious that the latter group should be out.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman—

An hon. member: On a point of order—

Mr. Wintermeyer: It is not a point of order at all.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. MacDonald: I have been waiting two years for this.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now we have the answer—this man has been waiting for two years for this.

Now, just a moment, sir. The simple fact is that anybody who has taken any observance of this House and its procedure over the last while and I—to the best of my knowledge in all the years that I have been here—know

very well that not one private bill has succeeded in passing through this House and into legislation in the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Introduce them and the people will see what you have got.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Sir, I have told the people of Ontario what I have and I have expressed my position. I am going to continue to express it. I have other means of expressing it than to outline it in this fashion, sir.

Mr. MacDonald: You expressed it vaguely,

Mr. Wintermeyer: Now, sir, the hon. member for York South said yesterday that we are here to play politics and we have never heard a better demonstration of it than we heard this morning.

Mr. MacDonald: You are playing politics all the time.

Mr. Wintermeyer: I am not playing politics. The simple fact is that the very legislation that the hon. member is talking about was referred to in the Throne speech, sir, and if we are to debate this legislation then certainly it should come from the government itself.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Just a moment. On a point of order.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): I am on a point of order.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, I am on another point of order.

Mr. Cowling: What debate are we on, what item are we on?

Mr. Wintermeyer: The point of order that I am on is simply this—

Mr. Cowling: The point of order I am on—I would like to know what item we are on.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Well, we are on item No. 112.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order. I would inform the leader of the Opposition that he has had enough to say about this and return to 112.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): There is not a chairman who sits in that chair who has got the guts to call them to order.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: If I might return, sir, to the point I was debating before you allowed the hon. Prime Minister to get political, I would like to get back on this subject because I submit to you it was the hon. Prime Minister who took us off this subject.

Mr. Singer: Certainly it was. There is not a chairman who has sat in that chair who has the courage to call the hon. Prime Minister to order.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: You will recall, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: You will recall, Mr. Chairman, we were debating the amount of the estimates in the junior farmers' loan branch with respect to the adequacy or inadequacy of the amount of these estimates to fill the declared intention of the government to enlarge the loan fund. At that time you may recall that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development tried to throw a smoke screen here by suggesting that it was not possible to bring forward the amount of estimates that would be necessary because the legislation had not yet been approved by this House. Of course, Mr. Chairman, anybody who knows anything about the administration of any business, be it large or small, knows that if you are going to proceed you are going to do it in an orderly manner.

I would remind you, sir, that this House met for three weeks prior to the Christmas recess, and that the House found it desirable to approve most of the legislation which was submitted at that time, and that following the approval by this House it was possible to obtain the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor and the legislation was made into law. It seems to me a reasonable thing if we are going to honestly and intelligently criticize these estimates, that it would have been reasonable for the hon. Minister of Agriculture to have brought forward his legislation dealing with the farmers of Ontario, if he really was concerned about this problem, had it approved at the Christmas recess and brought forward estimates that would have intelligently carried forward a sensible programme.

But I suggest to you what is happening here this morning is that the government is embarrassed because it has taken us four years to finally get into this department and

find out what it really was doing. It has taken us until this morning to even find out the make-up of the personnel. The Ministers prior to this hon. Minister have successfully evaded answering questions in this particular department when we have tried to determine just what the staff was there for and what it was doing since it had gone out for the loan business. For the hon. Minister of Economics and Development to say it could not have anticipated the amount of estimates because the legislation was not brought forward, is in my opinion simply and purely a smoke screen.

The legislation which was on the books prior to the determination on the part of the government to withdraw from the loan field is still on the books. It is the same legislation which was on the books when the government was making loans. So I suggest to you, sir, that the government is indeed embarrassed here. The hon. members opposite get quite annoyed when we take the trouble to examine these estimates to determine whether or not there is in fact efficiency. Theoretically, sir, I suggest to you that this is our responsibility, and if I happen to be back next year, and if the government still happens to be there, as I do not think it will, I am going to continue to examine into this situation because I think it is wasting the taxpayers' money and has been doing so for the past four years.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 112 agreed to.

Vote 113 agreed to.

On vote 114:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, on vote 114, the riding I represent is strictly urban but the people do have red noses and watery eyes occasionally and that is a result of The Weed Control Act. The part of The Weed Control Act that I refer to is the ragweed end of it, and one of my constituents, a Mr. Smith, has been in contact with the department concerning greater control over the ragweed legislation, or possibly better enforcement of it. He has made several suggestions, and I would like to read them into the record so that possibly the hon. Minister would consider them, and if in his opinion, they have merit, see that the legislation is changed accordingly.

Due to the fact that ragweed pollen causes hay fever, it is not sufficient that it be destroyed early enough to prevent ripening of the seed, as is the case of noxious weeds that are important to agriculture. Instead,

ragweed should be destroyed before the flowers have opened to permit a release of pollen. To provide for destroying ragweed at a proper time, it is proposed that amendments be made to two sections of The Weed Control Act, and one set of the regulations, 565, as follows:

Section 3 subsection 1 of the Act now reads:

Every person in possession of land shall destroy all noxious weeds thereon, as often in every year as is necessary to prevent ripening of their seeds.

It is proposed that this be amended by adding to it the following:

In the case of ragweed, the destruction shall be before the ragweed flowers have opened to permit the release of pollen.

Section 10, subsection 1 of the Act, now reads:

Where an inspector finds noxious weeds or weed seeds on land, in the area within his jurisdiction, he may order the person in possession of the land to destroy the noxious weed or weed seeds within such period of time as is necessary to prevent the weed seeds from ripening.

It is proposed that this be amended by adding to it the following:

In the case of ragweed, the destruction shall be before the ragweed flowers have opened to permit release of pollen.

Section 4 subsection 1 of regulation 565 under The Weed Control Act lists five different methods of destroying noxious weeds. It is proposed that section 4 be amended by adding another sub-section as follows:

In the case of ragweed the method of destruction listed in sub-section 1 shall be employed before the ragweed flowers have opened to permit release of pollen.

I do not have to comment as to the economic effect or the effects on an individual's health this may have, but would the hon. Minister kindly comment on the suggested amendments, if they have or have not any merit.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, let me say, Mr. Chairman, we will be glad to give this matter every consideration. It has been brought to our attention, and we are referring it to our crops branch for their consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 114 agreed to.

Vote 115 agreed to.

On vote 116:

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand an article from the *Stoney Creek News* dated Wednesday, September 26, 1962, headed "Report will clarify land use in peninsula's fruit industry." It indicates there was a report compiled, or being compiled, in regards to fruit-growing increase and decline across the province. It is being carried out by a Mr. Fox, director of the extension branch of the Ontario fruit and vegetable experimental station. I would ask the hon. Minister: Is this report in his hands at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not seen the report yet, Mr. Chairman. It has not come to me yet.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, the hon. Minister is aware that the report is being compiled I assume?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is a normal routine matter, and it has not come to my attention yet.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I would ask another question, and I would apologize for jumping the vote. I was unavoidably away yesterday, and I will be very brief. Would the hon. Minister explain the method of allocating grants under the community centres grants?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That was dealt with yesterday. It is recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. Gisborn: It has been dealt with?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 116 agreed to.

Vote 117 agreed to.

On vote 118:

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): May I just have an idea of the enrollment at the western Ontario school at Ridgetown? What is the enrollment there, please?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, the student enrollment at the Ontario Agricultural School at Ridgetown; in the first year 78 entered the course at October, and in the second year course 89 entered last October.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 118 agreed to.

On vote 119:

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out at this time, according to my information, the resi-

dence at the federated colleges, with regard to OAC students in the degree and diploma courses, is very limited. They tell me that only one year can live entirely in residence; there are some parts of other years that are allowed to do so, but the fact remains that the residence for students living in residence is very limited. I was wondering if the hon. Minister has considered a building or new residence for the students who are not able to stay in, who have to go downtown and live off the campus.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the hon. member we have already approved and given top priority, and referred this to The Department of Public Works, for a new 200-bed residence for boys, and a new 200-bed residence for girls, in Macdonald Institute. We have also given top priority to the alumni residence of the Ontario Veterinary College. We have referred this to The Department of Public Works; that will come out in, I am not sure what year, but as I understand it it will be right away; this is the top priority in our department.

Mr. Gaunt: That was my question, Mr. Chairman. I was just going to ask the hon. Minister when the actual residence—or work would be started on this particular project.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the very welcome announcement the hon. Minister has made to us. It has certainly been long overdue. I think the last residence that was built there was back around 1928, in the depression period. Then we came into Tory times; I do not know which was worst but there has been no residence built there since 1928. I thought that this certainly should have been put forth by this government, many years ago, but it is certainly welcomed.

I hope that you will bring it in not in "due course" but very shortly; that you will not put it off until a later date. I think that one of the greatest assets the farm students get from going to Guelph is mingling with different students from all parts of Canada and, in fact, other parts of the world. I think it is a great morale builder, it lets the people know how they live in Africa and the West Indies. I compliment the hon. Minister, and I hope he will push this straight ahead, and not "in the fullness of time."

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister the salary schedule for the professors at the United College.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not got the full salary schedule here. But I will see that the hon. member gets that if he wishes.

Mr. Nixon: The reason I am particularly interested is that the new schedule for the University of Toronto was announced. At the present time this is considered to be a college of the university, and I was wondering what the relationship was. In the competition for competent staff it is obvious the schedules have to be at a competitive level. I would be very interested in receiving information.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are two points I would like to make in connection with this estimate. The first one is—I will not take the time of the House to detail it now, but in a series of articles in the publication at OAC this past fall, there was a review of this whole issue of the advisability of the establishment of a university that would be separate from The Department of Agriculture. In the course of one of those articles they spelled out the promises down through the years of new buildings around OAC, and how nothing has been done about it.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to rub salt in the wounds, so to speak, of the hon. Minister by reading all this record of procrastination and broken promises in terms of buildings around there, because I would hope that with the announcement of this university we have entered upon a new day. However, I think the hon. Minister should have fair warning, he and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), that when the Public Works estimates come before the House we are going to have some pretty conclusive evidence that this is not another step towards two or three years of procrastination with regard to a 200-bed residence for boys and girls and so on there. You cannot build a university by procrastinating in building the buildings. We should have some pretty clear evidence from the hon. Minister of Public Works later that it is the intention of the government to move on this immediately, if not sooner.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other point I wanted to ask the hon. Minister on—

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to tell the hon. member for York South that we opened the \$2 million soils building, here about two years ago. We opened a science building a year ago and we are presently ready to call tenders for a chemistry building, another \$3 million building. There have been a number of others up there too. The physical

education building, the pathogen-free swine building and the artificial insemination building there. I think we have not been doing too badly around Guelph the last few years.

Mr. MacDonald: When we get to the hon. Minister's estimates we will find out what he has for the future in terms of this whole new university structure here and perhaps we—

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am talking about what we have done in the last five years.

Mr. MacDonald: At that point I will go back and review the promises that have been made and match them with the performance.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member will find it is a pretty good record too.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman: the question I wanted to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture is this: I was a bit curious to know how much is being spent in The Department of Agriculture on research? There has been a great deal of discussion about the importance of research in agriculture and I notice in this estimate that it mentions combined expenditure for educational and research institutions. Then again you have the Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario down below, research and services, and I was wondering what would be a rough estimate of the amount of money that is being spent on research itself rather than it being mixed in with a lot of other services. Is it possible for the hon. Minister to give me any indication of that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The services that are mentioned here are services in connection with research. I do not think the two can be separated because they work hand in hand together. The amounts that are outlined here in the budget or budgetary estimates are for education at the federated colleges, it was just under \$3.5 million, \$3,455,515. The estimates for agricultural research under the agricultural research institute of Ontario at the federated colleges is just under \$5 million. These are the figures sorted out as closely as possibly can be determined.

Mr. MacDonald: You see, Mr. Chairman, this really does not meet my need. Perhaps I am asking an impossible question, but if you add the three of them together you have \$9.6, \$3.9 and \$5.9 million; in other words, close to \$20 million.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, that is the total. You add the last two together and it should give you the first. The combined expenditures are

the first one and then the breakdown is in the second and third ones.

Mr. MacDonald: I see. In other words then you would say that it would be not inaccurate to say there is approximately between \$9 million and \$10 million being spent on research and the auxiliary services to it that cannot be separated out.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, that is not the case, sir. If I may make this clear—I will attempt to—the combined expenditures for educational and research institutions—now they are listed here: the Vineland horticultural experimental station, the Kemptville agricultural school, the Western Ontario agricultural school at Ridgetown and the federated colleges.

Now then the research and the educational activities that are carried on there, this is the teaching that is done along with the research, comes to a total figure here in this budget estimate of \$9,967,800. The breakdown, as nearly as can be possibly determined, for educational purposes alone at the Kemptville school, the Ridgetown school and the federated colleges amounts to the figure of \$3,986,670. The research activities and the services, some of them in connection with teaching and experimental work, is the other figure that is listed at the bottom. This is the combined figure.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister about the new research council that was appointed recently—what progress has been made by that committee, how many meetings and what recommendations are they forwarding for the coming year? I notice that the director, Dr. Huntley, was in the House yesterday. No doubt he has made a report of some description and we would like to know what has transpired.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I have to confess I have not got the information here as to the number of meetings but I believe it will be sent in. The director, Dr. Huntley, is here. There have been some recommendations that have come through from the deliberations of the committee already. One of them was dealt with yesterday and this fund that has been set aside for the beef feeding and beef research in the province, this is a direct result of the committee meetings.

They have also recommended that consideration be given to the establishment of an area of land in connection with the OAC which would allow them to do research on

herbicides and the residual effect of herbicides, because I think we must recognize the fact that increasingly more of these are being used. I think we should know more about the number of—or the effects, I should say—of the use of weed control programmes on crops in succeeding years. This is something that is going to be dealt with.

The main purpose, as I see it, of the council today has been to observe and to study the research projects that are taking place throughout the province at various research stations and to co-ordinate these research facilities and this research work. We would have to think that there was duplication of research going on and I think it is the intent of the research council not only to see that there is not duplication in our agricultural institutions, but that if research is being carried on in some other type of institution or some other school of research or learning, not directly related with agriculture, that the findings of that study may be correlated into agricultural research and made available to us. This is the intent.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell me if they have made any study of the effect of strontium-90 along with the weed spray, the effect of the weed spray and strontium on the various agricultural products? I think this is a real concern of a lot of the consumers in the province and I feel it is only fair that we should point out that it is not as harmful as sometimes is led to be known by certain people in responsible positions.

I say primarily the press that should know better. I just want to know what study has been made along that line.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would agree with my hon. friend that study is needed in that I think it has been blown up into a balloon as to the effect of it in many instances to the detriment of the dairy industry, and not entirely always founded on fact. As far as the agricultural research institute meetings are concerned, they hold two-day meetings every three months. This is their policy and I think that is a reasonable number of meetings to hold.

Mr. Janes: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to know that the government is advancing in building up the university college at Guelph, but I hope that the hon. Minister and his department will not forget the Ridgetown and Kemptville schools.

Perhaps the hon. Minister could give me the figures. How many graduates of Guelph

are farming, and are graduate farmers. As far as I can find out very few go back to the farm. They are taken up with industry.

No doubt a great many of them are assisting scientifically in farming, but my feeling is that the Ridgetown and Kemptonville schools are the schools that are doing much more for the farming population than Guelph has done for a number of years. There was a time in the two-year course there, sir, it was helpful. But I hope you will not forget the two schools that are on the grass-root basis and are helping farmers out.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 119 agreed to.

On vote 120:

Mr. L. Quilty (Renfrew South): Before making any comment on this vote on the agricultural rehabilitation and development branch, I would like to say that Renfrew county has been designated as a pilot area in this project. Before I get any questions from the hon. Minister when I ask him a few, I want to state that I am very much in favour of ARDA if it is carried out in line with the name, rehabilitation and development, a planned rural community to help rural Ontario in a positive way.

The first question I want to ask him is what specific projects are in mind in ARDA? In line with this question who is in charge of administration? Is it federal or provincial?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the ARDA programme is the responsibility of the provincial government insofar as the administration of the programme in any individual province is concerned, but it must meet with the approval of the federal government. All projects must be first agreed upon by both governments before implementation. Now, what were your other questions? There were three, were there not?

Mr. Quilty: What projects do you have in mind in ARDA?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As of now, the ARDA directorate here in the province has just met for their first few meetings and they have submitted some recommendations for consideration. Although those recommendations have not as yet been considered by Cabinet council, and this must be done, when they are approved by Cabinet council then they are submitted to Ottawa and approved there before implementation can be carried on.

Mr. Quilty: Mr. Chairman, to carry us a little further, on January 26 it was announced

in Renfrew by the federal member that the pilot survey would start within two weeks. Could the hon. Minister tell me if this pilot survey has started?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I have had no knowledge of what the federal member said in Renfrew in connection with this. However I would go so far as to say this: the federal Minister of Agriculture has been in touch with me in this particular matter and it has been agreed that in the county of Renfrew there should be an initial redevelopment survey taken for that county. I think this would meet with the approval of the hon. members of the provincial Legislature for both north and south Renfrew insofar as determining the course of procedure that might be followed in the implementations of any redevelopment programme. This survey has been agreed upon and will commence.

Mr. Quilty: Thank you, sir, this is the survey of which I spoke and which was promised in two weeks.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): I presume I can ask this question, Mr. Chairman, under the rehabilitation and development branch. Last year on April 13, in the budget debate, I spoke on the plight of the farmers in the Cochrane area, which plight had been brought to the attention of the hon. Minister some three months before. Hay crops generally were a failure and later on the grain crop was a similar failure. They asked for help at that time and I am going to ask now: did those farmers who in an area from Timmins right west to Hearst needed seed grain, needed help from this department, receive it? Unfortunately this government, at that time, I do not think had been a partner to The Crop Assistance Act.

Western farmers received help because of their losses. One of the reasons, of course, was that the western farmers supported the Diefenbaker government in the last election.

Now was there any consideration given to these farmers in the district of Cochrane last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: 1962 or 1961?

Mr. Troy: I brought it to the attention of the hon. Minister on April 13, 1962, it would have been the 1961 growing season.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As far as is consistent. Are you referring to the hay problem they had up there?

Mr. Troy: The hay and the grain! They pointed out, besides the loss of money and

labour, increased expense in feeding costs in the winter, no profit on their operation, no seed for spring planting. An extremely bad economic situation, to say the least. They asked for help and—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): They got help, they got help long before you ever—

Mr. Troy: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Long before you ever—oh, never mind!

Mr. Troy: I would like you to repeat that, because the first time they had no answer, sir, for three months. They wrote to this hon. Minister of Agriculture and had no answer. Now I find—if they got help why did you not say on April 13, 1962, that they got help?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend knows very well that they got help. My hon. friend knows very well that these farmers in northern Ontario got help; all kinds of it. We did everything possible to assist those farmers; we did, and the records speak for themselves. He knows very well that this is the case. The actual figures I cannot give right at the moment, but they run into several thousands of dollars and were provided to those farmers in that particular area for the very things he mentions.

Mr. Troy: You probably would be glad to know that I provided some impetus. This hon. Minister without Portfolio should be the Minister without something else. I am glad to know that any impetus that I gave had some effect.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, could I revert for just one moment to 119? Mention was made by you of storage facilities that were—maybe it is the hon. Minister of Public Works, Mr. Chairman, but the new building which is currently being built for storage at the veterinary college. It has been brought to my attention that there has been a real need for a cold storage for semen in the dairy and beef industry for some time. Individual insemination units throughout the province have holding units of their own. I would hope that this would be enlarged to a degree that would be able to handle all the needs of the various units throughout the province of Ontario.

It has also been mentioned that you were contemplating raising the cost of storage in this particular building. I want to say that I am very much against any rise in cost. I

think it has been stored there recently at 10 cents a vial; other units are somewhat higher. I would ask very strong consideration of the hon. Minister on holding this price at a very minimum cost. I would possibly go so far as to recommend that the government even subsidize it a little. I would like the hon. Minister's comments on that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the building is already going to be completed by mid-summer—the one the hon. member refers to—it is already in the process of construction.

Mr. Innes: I asked the hon. Minister if the cost would remain the same as it is currently. There has been some talk—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I have not the exact cost of what it has been or what it will be, but I would like to say that there is no unit or no service in the province of Ontario that gets more subsidization from the Ontario government than do the artificial insemination units in every respect possible. This semen service, for which we provide storage at the OAC, to my mind is one of the greatest services that has ever been provided for any group in the province of Ontario. We have no reason to delay or to hinder or obstruct that service.

Mr. Oliver: I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he can give us the breakdown on this \$500,000 lump estimate in this last vote?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Which last vote is this? Which one is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. Oliver: Just a minute and I will find out; 120—last line.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is for the initial surveys that would be undertaken, and for the provincial share of any projects that would be undertaken this coming year.

Mr. Oliver: Does the hon. Minister know what these projects will be?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have no specific idea as to what those projects will be.

Mr. Oliver: Not any of them?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: These have not been approved—there have been recommendations made by the ARDA director, but they have not as yet passed the Cabinet council or the Treasury Board. This is in here simply as a fund from which these projects may be developed.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 120 agreed to.

On vote 121:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, in connection with vote 121, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the Farmers Allied Meat Enterprises, which is a co-operative enterprise for the processing of meat, is considered as a co-operative and if it has applied for a loan at any time to the government?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, we have had no reason to check to know whether it is incorporated as a co-operative or not. There has been no application made to us for a loan.

Mr. Nixon: If it is a co-operative, it would be reasonable to suppose that it would be considered under this vote, is that so?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, we have no knowledge as to whether it is incorporated as a co-operative or not. Every application is judged on its own merits when it comes before the Co-operative Loans Board.

Mr. Nixon: This enterprise is presently building a plant, and I was interested to know whether The Department of Agriculture in some of its branches, the livestock branch or the marketing branch, was directly concerned with assisting in this development. Is there any connection in any way between the department and this enterprise?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There has been no request for any assistance.

Mr. Nixon. And none proffered, I presume?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it certainly has not been requested. Does the hon. member expect us to go out and force it on somebody?

Mr. Nixon: No, I would not say force it; but this is a tremendously important development, with which I feel this government should be closely in touch. If they were to allow this to go ahead without at least careful observation to see that pitfalls that might lie in the way of this development were avoided—it would be greatly to their credit if they would assist in this way. The big department has many services; this is a farmers' organization that may or may not need help, and I hope that someone in the department is keeping a close eye on it.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, I certainly think this deserves some comment by the hon. Minister and I think it was a very good statement. The hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for York South and myself were at the sod-turning of this building for FAME

and the hon. Minister of Agriculture and any hon. members of the government were very conspicuous by their absence. I want to say that I think a group like this, which has seen fit to go forth and try to help themselves in a self-help programme, certainly deserves commendation. I would hope that the hon. Minister would make a statement that he is going to try to assist them in any way, shape or form that he can.

He actually has a co-operatives branch here. He has facilities to help them if they so require it, and I think it would be only fair to assume that he would assume a role of help where it is going to be to the betterment of the farmers across the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, as for the hon. member inferring I was not there out of deliberate purpose, I was extended an invitation to go and simply could not be there because I had a previous commitment to which I had already agreed to go. I so informed the director of FAME that that was the case.

Mr. W. G. Noden (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, in connection with vote 121, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House another self-help programme, through a guaranteed loan under The Co-operatives Loans Act to the Cattle-men's Association of the Rainy River district. I might say I used the words "another self-help programme;" this is in relation to one that we had last year, or two years ago, in the building of the cattle sales yard in our area in the most westerly part of this province. I would also like to say that the government of the day is being given credit for recognizing the fine farming area we have in the Rainy River district, and giving special attention to the needs of that area and to the farmers who are trying to do something for themselves.

I might say the cattlemen's association formed a co-operative group, a stockmen's co-operative, whereby they secured a guaranteed loan under this Act. The farmers themselves stepped out and bought the cattle from western Canada, breeding cattle, and had them distributed to the farmers on the basis of ten to a farmer, based on the feed he had on hand, also the barn space that was available. The purpose of this was to encourage the small farmers to improve their beef herds and to enlarge them, and to take advantage of the market that exists in that part of Ontario, which has been recognized through the cattle auction sales which have been taking place in the last three years.

When I say "self-help", I might mention that the local banker has agreed to do all the bookkeeping work, look after the details of it. Farmers themselves have their own committees who have bought the cattle and have distributed the cattle to the different farmers throughout the area. This is a programme where they are not looking to others in this end of the province for this help; they are trying to do something for themselves and trying to improve the economy of that farming area of the Rainy River district.

As I said before, I believe that the farming area of northwestern Ontario lies within the Rainy River district and is noted for the fertility of its soil and for the grass forage that grows like weeds. We feel that our farmers, by entering this kind of a programme, are going to improve their lot in the days to come. When I said that this government has recognized the farming possibilities of northwestern Ontario and the Rainy River district, they are to be commended, and the hon. Minister and the members of his staff in the extension branch as well.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 121 agreed to.

This completes the estimates of The Department of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The ninth Order, second reading Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Research Foundation Act, 1944.

THE RESEARCH FOUNDATION ACT, 1944

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development) moves second reading of Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Research Foundation Act, 1944.

Hon. R. W. Macaulay (Minister of Economics and Development): It is a procedural bill. It changes the length of service of the members of the board of directors to make it

a little more flexible so that there is an introduction of new people on to it more frequently.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE EXECUTION ACT

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General) moves second reading of Bill No. 61, An Act to amend The Execution Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MECHANICS' LIEN ACT

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 62, An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE NOTARIES ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Cass moves second reading of Bill No. 63, The Notaries Act, 1962-1963.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, on the bill, I think we should have something more than the perfunctory passing of the second reading. As I understand it from the hon. Minister's remarks when he introduced the bill, examinations are going to be set up for other than legal notaries public, and I was wondering what criteria would be prescribed for the county court judges who are going to do these examinations. Is it going to depend on the whim of an individual judge, or be by regulation or by some other method? Is the hon. Attorney-General going to prescribe standards?

Hon. F. M. Cass (Attorney-General): Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can explore these matters more fully in committee because these three bills will go to the legal bills committee.

Mr. Singer: Well, I am on the committee.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I would say to the hon. member for York Centre that at the present time all non-lawyer notaries are examined by county judges and a report of certification must be filed with the department concerned before any commission is issued, and this certification is by the county judge based on his examination of the notary public and must certify several things: first of all, that he is

satisfied that he has a fair understanding of his duties and responsibilities; secondly, that there is a need for a notary public in the area where the appointment is being made, and thirdly, that the character and abilities of the person proposing to be appointed are satisfactory in the judge's view. And I must say that I have considerable confidence in the county bench to make a proper determination. But I will be glad, between now and the time the matter is considered in committee, to see if anything further can be added in the way of guidance to county judges.

I would also point out that the bill provides, if the hon. member will read it carefully, for those cases where a county judge would feel that he could not conscientiously approve. We have provision in the bill whereby another independent person could be appointed to examine this person and thereby get around any—if there would be such a thing, and I am sure there wouldn't be—personal or other prejudice.

Mr. Singer: I was not aware that the county court judges presently—

Hon. Mr. Cass: Yes, they do.

Mr. Singer: How long has this been going on? For some time?

Hon. Mr. Cass: For some time. It's a non-lawyer notary. Oh, yes, away back.

Mr. Singer: Well, you are regularizing what has been happening then? Is that the point?

Hon. Mr. Cass: No, we are providing for re-examination on reappointment. Now they are appointed at pleasure after an examination of certification. In future they will be appointed for a three-year period, and when they come up for appointment they need to be re-examined to see if they are keeping up,—among other things, if they are keeping up with the change in laws, and also if the carrying out of their duties over the past has been such that they should be entitled to carry on, and if the need for which they were appointed still exists.

Mr. Singer: I think this is good. I share with the hon. Minister his faith in the county court judges in the various counties. I think they are doing an excellent job. I wonder if it might not be a bit more equitable though, for those persons who might want a non-legal appointment of this type to be able to write to the Attorney-General, or come to some official in his office—

Hon. Mr. Cass: They do anyway, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer:—and be given a sheet of instructions they should know—a, b, c, d: these are the qualifications, these are the things that you will have to satisfy the county court judge about. Because there is much confusion in the mind of lay citizens who think that these appointments will be of benefit to them—and I throw this out in the hope that I am being helpful—perhaps someone in the hon. Attorney-General's department could work out a sheet or two of instructions outlining the general policy and an individual who is concerned about this could get those instructions when he expresses some interest in acquiring an appointment of this type.

Hon. Mr. Cass: I think that is a sound suggestion. As I have said, I will try to have my officials look into it before it comes to committee so that we can discuss it then on a more intelligible basis.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask this question. Am I to understand now that with all appointments of notaries public, as it stands, if the appointees are not solicitors or barristers their term is finished? Am I correct in assuming this, that their term is finished as of when this bill comes into force?

Hon. Mr. Cass: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would peruse the Act carefully he would find that there are three periods when the present notaries come up for renewal of their commission. There are some 900 non-lawyer notaries in the province of Ontario and that would be much too many to expect either my department of government or the county bench to handle, and so they have been divided into three groups of approximately 300 each. The first date, as I recall it, is either the first or the end of April, 1964, so that if the suggestion of the hon. member for York Centre be acted upon between now and then, these people will have the opportunity of knowing what they must know for the re-examination and they will have the opportunity of providing evidence that their commission is still required in the area for which it was issued.

There is no wholesale revocation, Mr. Speaker, and there is no desire to have such, but there is a desire to ensure that those people who have this very important office in the courts and in the commercial world of Ontario, should be people properly acting

and people with proper knowledge and education to do the job properly.

Mr. Belanger: Will the application be made to your department as it was made before?

Hon. Mr. Cass: The applications will still be made to my department. The commissions will still be issued as before by the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

RICHARDSON TRUST

Mr. Belanger in the absence of **Mr. J. Gould (Bracondale)** moves second reading of Bill No. Pr3, An Act respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CHEMICAL PROFESSION OF ONTARIO

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr10, An Act to incorporate the Association of the Chemical Profession of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

MEMORIAL TRUST

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr11, An Act respecting the Esther Taylor Wood Trust and the John Taylor Evans Memorial Trust.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF INNISFIL

Mr. Cowling, in the absence of **Mr. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre)**, moves second reading of Bill No. Pr13, An Act respecting the township in Innisfil.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

GUELPH GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr14, An Act respecting the Guelph General Hospital.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

YMCA & YWCA, GUELPH

Mr. Worton moves second reading of Bill No. Pr22, An Act respecting the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Association of Guelph.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. Cowling moves second reading of Bill No. Pr26, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF HEARST

Mr. R. Brunelle (Cochrane North) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr38, An Act respecting the town of Hearst.

Mr. Singer: **Mr. Chairman**, Bill No. Pr38 is a bill concerning fixed assessments. This matter came before the private bills committee.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): **Mr. Speaker**, I notice that bill is not reprinted. If there is any discussion on it, I would prefer to withdraw it, so it could be considered when we have the reprinted copy in front of us.

Mr. Singer: I propose, **Mr. Speaker**, to discuss it at some length.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, then, I will just withdraw this order.

LIBRARIANS OF ONTARIO

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr40, An Act respecting the Institute of Professional Librarians of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF WALLACEBURG

Mr. Singer: **Mr. Speaker**, that bill was in the same category.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: All right, we will withdraw that.

TOWN OF MIMICO

Mr. Cowling moves second reading of Bill No. Pr52, An Act respecting the town of Mimico.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF YORK

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr55, An Act respecting the township of York.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF YORK

Mr. MacDonald moves second reading of Bill No. Pr57, An Act respecting the township of York.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: Sixth order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. C. E. Janes in the chair.

RICHARDSON TRUST

House in committee on Bill No. Pr3, An Act respecting the George Taylor Richardson Trust.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr3 reported.

SUDBURY YOUTH CENTRE

House in committee on Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the Sudbury Youth Centre.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr5 reported.

TOWN OF ERIE

House in committee on Bill No. Pr2, An Act respecting the town of Fort Erie.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr2 reported.

THE BOYS' HOME

House in committee on Bill No. Pr12, An Act respecting the Boys' Home.

Sections 1 to 12, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr12 reported.

TOWNSHIP OF BRUCE

House in committee on Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the township of Bruce.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 5, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 6 and 7 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Schedule A agreed to.

Schedule B agreed to.

Bill No. Pr18 reported.

CITY OF WATERLOO

House in committee on Bill No. Pr19, An Act respecting the city of Waterloo.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill No. Pr19 reported.

BEECHWOOD CEMETERY

House in committee on Bill No. Pr20, An Act respecting the Beechwood Cemetery Company of the city of Ottawa.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr20 reported.

YMCA-YWCA OF COBOURG

House in committee on Bill No. Pr21, An Act respecting the Young Men's Christian Association-Young Women's Christian Association of Cobourg.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr21 reported.

TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

House in committee on Bill No. Pr23, An Act respecting the township of Scarborough.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr23 reported.

TRENT UNIVERSITY

House in committee on Bill No. Pr24, An Act to incorporate Trent University.

Sections 1 to 34, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr24 reported.

CITY OF WINDSOR

House in committee on Bill No. Pr29, An Act respecting the city of Windsor.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr29 reported.

SCHOOL BOARDS OF SUDBURY
AND CONISTON

House in committee on Bill No. Pr30, An Act respecting the Sudbury High School Board and the High School Board of the town of Coniston.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill No. Pr30 reported.

COUNTY OF DUFFERIN

House in committee on Bill No. Pr31, An Act respecting the county of Dufferin.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill No. Pr31 reported.

BOARDS OF GLOUCESTER & OTTAWA

House in committee on Bill No. Pr33, An Act respecting the High School Board of the township of Gloucester and the Collegiate Institute Board of the city of Ottawa.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill No. Pr33 agreed to.

CITY OF HAMILTON

House in committee on Bill No. Pr41, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr41 reported.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

House in committee on Bill No. Pr43, An Act respecting the city of Niagara Falls.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr43 reported.

THE UNITED COUNTIES OF
NORTHUMBERLAND AND DURHAM

House in committee on Bill No. Pr45, An Act respecting the united counties of Northumberland and Durham.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr45 reported.

COUNTY OF CARLETON

House in committee on Bill No. Pr46, An Act respecting the county of Carleton.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr46 agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain bills without amendment, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment of the House, we have the estimates of The Department of Health in front of us. We will sit at 2 o'clock on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday of next week, and 3 o'clock on Tuesday. There will be a night session Tuesday night and a night session Thursday night. Following the estimates of The Department of Health the next department will be the Civil Service Commission. I will tell you on Monday the timetable after that.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House is it not possible for the hon. Prime Minister to give us any indication of what

estimates might be called? As I pointed out before, some of us come over and stay, and some of our documents are at home; it is not possible to bring them all over.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, as closely as I can call it, we will continue with Health; after that will be the Civil Service, and after that The Department of Energy Resources. You will understand, of course, I cannot tell you when we will reach them.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Is that all we will have for the week?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If I see that we are proceeding quickly enough that I can move in

another set of estimates next week, I will endeavour to give you a couple of days notice.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that when this House do adjourn it stand adjourned until 2 of the clock on Monday, and that the House do sit at 2 of the clock on Wednesday and Thursday of next week.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Monday, March 4, 1963

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Monday, March 4, 1963

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued	1296
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1336

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1963

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the chief commissioner of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario (Mr. Grossman). Would the hon. Minister please comment on changes in the government's policy concerning the licensing of veterans' clubs in view of a statement made in the executive meeting of the Canadian Legion that new regulations for legion branches in dry areas would permit them to have beer licences and in wet areas would permit them to have dining lounge licences?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, since the matters referred to in this question do not come within the jurisdiction of the Liquor Control Board, I would suggest the hon. member put his question on the order paper as a question of the Ministry generally.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when questions are tendered to your office before 12 noon, I believe it is—a practice which I have always resented having to do, smacking as it does of a certain degree of juvenility—and a question is deemed to be one not appropriate to reply your office usually informs us that it may not be asked. This question was tendered with plenty of notice to the chief commissioner and he might have had the courtesy to inform us that the question was misdirected. I was always under the impression that these licences were handled by the Liquor Control Board, which is the superior body in the distribution of liquor in this province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, about getting this notice in sufficient time to be able to inform the hon. member who had

been misdirected, I did not get notice of this until about one o'clock in the afternoon. I am here at two o'clock—I was here about 10 minutes to two—and it takes some time. I had people in my office, I had conferences. By the time this actually got on my desk it was about half past one. Certainly I could not have done much more than come down here and inform the hon. member as I have—certainly he should know that the Liquor Control Board has nothing to do with licensed premises.

Mr. Sopha: Well, if the hon. Minister did not know the answer he might have asked the judge what the answer was, so he could tell us. The hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Singer) attempted to raise the question of liquor under the Provincial Secretary's estimates and he was told that he was out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: The chairman of the Liquor Licence Board does not speak to any Minister apparently—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Does the member realize when order is called—

Mr. Sopha: Well, I just feel like making a speech—

Mr. Speaker: The member will have all kinds of opportunity, no doubt, to make a speech, but not at this time.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts).

1. Does the government intend to table the report of Dr. R. W. B. Jackson of the Ontario College of Education on university space requirements?

2. Does the government intend to table the report of Dr. John Deutch of Queen's University which was submitted by the universities of Ontario to the government's advisory committee on university affairs?

3. Does the government intend to table the submissions of the universities to the government advisory committee, and if so, when

may the House expect these reports? And if not, why not?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as I said the other day when I was speaking about other educational matters, I propose to make a complete statement to the House on universities and I would hope to do so within the next few days. Within that statement the questions the hon. leader of the Opposition raises here and the documents to which he refers will be dealt with. If I may have his indulgence for a few days I think I can give him a complete answer to the questions he raises.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

House in committee of supply; Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West) in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 701:

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned I believe I was talking on this subject of the estimates of The Department of Health. I will not be much longer, but there are just two items I wanted to mention.

One has to do with the mental health unit in the city of Toronto, here. The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), when he was giving his general remarks before the estimates, said there were no waiting lists here in Toronto; in fact I got the general impression there were not any waiting lists anywhere. Perhaps I am misinterpreting the hon. Minister and making his remarks too general, but when I was speaking after the hon. Minister spoke I pointed out a number of places where there were not proper facilities, here in Toronto and in other places in Ontario.

One of the worst instances that I know of is in the mental health clinic here in the city where, after a would-be patient has seen a social worker, a patient must wait from four to six months before he gets any treatment from a psychiatrist. If the hon. Minister does not think that is a long time to wait, I think he should change his views. When you have a person who needs psychiatric help, an awful lot can take place within four to six months. My information is that because the waiting time is so long many people who would accept attention in a case of mental health just give up because of the waiting list. If a person needs psychiatric help in the mental health clinic here in Toronto, and if his is

a really urgent case, he is waited on within a month or two. That is, an urgent case is taken care of within a month or two.

I believe, also, as far as the waiting list for people who need psychiatric help at the Hospital for Sick Children is concerned, that there is a waiting list there of 1,700, and of course this is a list that is almost impossible to cope with. You can see that an awful lot has to be done.

One of the other weaknesses we have in the servicing of mental health patients here in the city of Toronto is that attention to children at the Sick Children's Hospital is cut off at the age of 14; at the Thistletown hospital they cut off service at the age of 12, and even now at Thistletown there is a six months' waiting list. A child's parents can apply when he is about age 11 and, by the time he receives any service or treatment, he has practically reached the age of 12. You can see that the facilities in this field are very meagre and it is most unfortunate that the hon. Minister should come to this House to show how he has cut back his budget by millions of dollars. So much is needed and so little is done.

A lot of this is because we have a shortage of staff, and yet about 20 per cent of the trained psychiatrists here in Ontario leave to go to the States. It costs this province about \$40,000 to educate a doctor and after we spend all this money, as a result of grants or donations from private sources, at \$40,000 per person, 20 per cent of our psychiatric staff leave for the States. Of our medical doctors about 20 to 40 per cent leave. We are going to have to do far more in attracting not only our own people who are leaving the province, but in attracting trained minds to this province. I do not think that the hon. Minister's department is showing any aggressive leadership in this field whatsoever. I think the results show that he is not doing very much.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal briefly with one subject, a most important subject, that the hon. Minister ignored completely. That is the matter of a medical care insurance plan. We have been told that such a plan is going to be presented to this House. Perhaps we will have an opportunity at a later date to discuss this in detail. We on this side of the House have brought this subject up from time to time and we are hoping that we are going to debate the government bill, but this is not in our control. The only thing we can do is to discuss this subject whenever we have an opportunity and to keep pressing the problem and the need for a medical care insurance plan.

Mr. Chairman, I, on different occasions, have gone into various figures obtained from the Canadian sickness survey in 1951. I do not need to repeat those, but I can say that over 80 per cent of our population every year needs medical treatment. I think it is up to us to emphasize that our people are our greatest resource, and unless we see to it that there is good health for all we are letting our people and this province down.

At the last Liberal policy meeting we in the Liberal party came out strongly in favour of a medical health plan across Canada. Failing that we were going to introduce one here in the province of Ontario. Because of the flux of the national politics I think it is safe for us to assume for the moment that we should proceed here in the province of Ontario. At any rate, our plan for the province of Ontario is basically this: That we guarantee to make available medical insurance to everyone in the province regardless of their age, the state of their health and what money they may have or not have.

There are two people who do not need to worry about doctor bills; the first is the man who has all kinds of money, and the second is the person who has nothing, or is the type who spends every dollar they have. So many people say, "Well, why should my tax money be used to support a bum?" In any event we today are supporting or paying for the medical bills of the man who will not look after himself, whom, if he makes \$80 a week and spends it all either wisely or foolishly and is broke, we still look after. The people who should be covered are the vast majority of people; that is, the person who wants to pay his own way and, by setting up an insurance plan, we are making it available; we are making it possible for an individual to protect himself and to protect his family.

We, in the Liberal party, feel that this has dragged on long enough. We have in our scheme two stages in which we will bring this about. The first stage is where we would insure immediately all those over 65, those on welfare and disability allowances, and the unemployed, with the premium costs to be paid by the government. You might say: "How long is immediately, and why do you do it in stages?" The main reason is this: We believe, from what information we have been able to gather from expert sources, that such a plan, which would cover the old age and those on disability allowances, could be put into effect within three months of our gaining power.

I think that it is very hard for the government to say to us that we have not come out with a proper plan. I have read in the paper

on occasion what the government spokesmen have said. I think that a three months' time limit for these people, I say among the most neglected people in our population, shows that the Liberal party means business and that we are going to do something not far in the future, but right away.

The importance of this part of the scheme is that the people who are aged 65 are those who need medical care the most. A lot of us can go through most of our lives without needing a doctor; but today, as people live longer, as they suffer from diseases of old age, they are the ones who seem to have the expensive drug bills, need the hospital care and need the medical attention. We in the Liberal party are determined that within three months, on assuming power, we will be able to reach out and help these people, especially in that age group of 65 and over.

Simultaneously, as we begin the programme of helping the 65-and-over group within three months, we will set up a scheme whereby insurance will be available to anybody in the province of Ontario. We feel that within possibly—and here it is difficult, when we are not in power, to be exact—but possibly within 18 months we should have a scheme working here in the province of Ontario which will be a credit and be every bit as worthwhile as the hospital scheme we now have in the province of Ontario.

I think the success of the hospital scheme in the province of Ontario is an indication and a good example that a medical scheme can also work in the province.

As we Liberals have emphasized, time and time again, we are most anxious to co-operate with the medical profession. We believe in the freedom of a patient to choose his or her doctor and for the doctor to choose his or her patient. And if we can—and I am sure that we will be—able to co-operate with the doctors, then the service plan will be worked out in co-operation with PSI and other doctor-sponsored schemes. The reason why we emphasize the PSI and doctor-sponsored schemes is this: they are non-profit schemes, and because they are non-profit they can be worked far more cheaply. It is perhaps a bit too dangerous to set up private insurance companies as quasi-public companies but by dealing with doctors we can certainly work out a proper and good scheme for the province of Ontario.

Failing this we, as a party and as a government, would set up our own carrier of insurance, but we hope that this would not be necessary because a plan that has already worked can be put into effect much more

quickly and much more cheaply than if we had to start from scratch.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the government should have come forward and given us some idea on what it intends to do in relation to health insurance. They are in a far better position to tell us what can be done than even the Opposition, because an Opposition, when approaching a problem, can deal in principle, certainly; but it is more difficult to go into great detail when one does not have all the figures, or is not in a position to put a plan into practice forthwith. But you, the government on the other side of the House, have the facilities, the civil servants, the experience of the hospital insurance plan, and yet you sit there and do nothing. I think it is time we had some action on this problem.

We know from the Gallup polls that the people want it, and surely a province of the wealth of the province of Ontario can afford it. I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that the government not only has not given the leadership in this programme but has failed to utter a single word about it.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, in making a few introductory comments on the health estimates on behalf of the New Democratic Party, I would like first of all to congratulate the hon. Minister of Health on his customary lucid and forthright presentation of the work of his department and of his justification for coming before this House asking for money to be spent for the continuance of that work.

The only criticism I would make of his introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman, is that they sounded a little stale. He also favoured us with a speech during the budget debate, back before Christmas. As I listened to him introducing his estimates, I got the very distinct impression that he was reading the same speech to us that he had given in the budget debate. It was a good speech, I agree, but not so good that it needed to be repeated; and not so good that it should be repeated to the exclusion of what I would consider to be more vital issues not dealt with in the Throne speech debate, and unfortunately not dealt with again when he presented his estimates to the House.

I would submit to this House, Mr. Chairman, that by all odds the most important issue in the field of health today is the issue of medical health insurance, or what is more popularly referred to nowadays as Medicare. The hon. Minister has spoken twice in this session to the House, once to the House in

formal session and once in committee, on problems affecting his department. On neither occasion has he had a single word to say about Medicare which surely is a very important issue—I think we can all agree on that. I submit it is, by all odds, the most important issue.

All that we have had from the government to date, apart from some very vague generalities on the subject, has been a barrage of scare propaganda as to the alleged stupendous cost of a complete programme of health insurance or of Medicare. Even the member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Frost) has lent his prestige to this scare campaign in a speech made a few months ago, I think in one of the Simcoe ridings. I do not happen to have the speech in front of me, but I think he mentioned \$240 million or \$250 million a year as the cost of full health insurance, or some equally ridiculous figure.

This is the approach and has been the approach of the government to this vital issue. As we evaluate its scare propaganda, Mr. Chairman, I would like to recall to the minds of the hon. members of this committee a similar type of scare propaganda in which the government engaged last year and the year before. I very distinctly recall a meeting of the health committee of the Legislature, held in one of the committee rooms, before which the provincial economist came, or provincial economist as he was then, to present the results of alleged statistical studies, indicating that our hospital insurance programme in this province was going to cost us astronomical amounts of money in the very near future to the point where one—if one had not taken the whole presentation with a grain of salt—one would have concluded that we might have to abandon the hospital insurance programme in the near future. No doubt the basic purpose of the presentation was to attempt to scare the hon. members of the Legislature and the people of the province generally from proceeding to the next great development in this field, namely, full Medicare. We now discover that the statistics presented to us by the provincial economist were so much hogwash.

The hon. Minister himself engaged in a certain amount of quite natural self-congratulation in introducing his estimates this year by stating that he, alone I think among all departments, was asking for less money this year than he has asked for and received in previous years. That is true, and I certainly think any hon. Minister is to be commended if he finds he can carry on his operations for less money than he previously thought he would require. But let us bear in mind, Mr.

Chairman, that the whole of the decrease in his estimates for this year as compared to last year is accounted for by the decrease in what he is asking for the Hospital Services Commission. In fact more than all the decrease is accounted for by that. He has what one might call normal increases in the other phases of his operations, but there has been a decrease of almost \$20 million in the amount that he is asking for the Hospital Services Commission.

I have taken this year's estimates book and jotted down some of the comparable figures from last year's estimates which were voted to the hon. Minister for the Hospital Services Commission and I find that in vote 714, item No. 1, the hon. Minister this year is asking for \$40.8 million. Last year, influenced no doubt by the scare statistics of the provincial economist, he asked for \$57.5 million for that particular item. The total amount for the Hospital Services Commission last year was \$73,376,000 as compared with \$55,907,000 this year. So the forecasts of almost uncontrollable expenditure for the hospital plan, that were given to us last year and the year before, are proving to be totally wrong.

The hon. Minister was kind enough to present us with an interim statement—I suppose that would be the proper description of it—of the expenditure and income of the Hospital Services Commission for the year ended December 31, 1962. One finds that the commission's total expenditures amounted to \$250 million approximately for that year, of which \$114 million came from the government of Canada.

When this hospital plan was first presented to the Legislature of Ontario, Mr. Chairman, the then Prime Minister, now the hon. member for Victoria, stated that financing would be based on a three-way split of costs. One-third would be raised by premiums, one-third would be contributed in the way of a subsidy by the federal government, and one-third would be contributed out of the consolidated revenues of the province of Ontario. In actual experience, the charge on the province of Ontario has been quite modest. Out of the total of \$250 million spent last year, the province of Ontario actually contributed \$47,785,000, or less than one-fifth, when it had originally anticipated it would have to cover one-third of the cost of the plan. I may say that the \$47 million that the province has contributed includes items that it would have had to pay whether or not there had been a hospital plan in effect. So its actual net contribution is even less than one-fifth.

The clear conclusion, Mr. Chairman, is

that notwithstanding the sort of propaganda—and I think that is the only fair word for it—that was presented to us last year and the year before, the hospital plan is in a very sound financial condition. It does not represent an undue burden on the people of the province so far as financial levies are concerned, or on the public Treasury of the province. For that reason there is every reason in the world to propose that this province should now move forward to full coverage for medical bills as well as hospital bills. I would suggest to hon. members of this House, and to the people of the province, that they should not pay any attention whatever to the exaggerated estimates of cost emanating from government sources to try to persuade them that they cannot really afford this service which is essential to their welfare.

The government has stated, I think in the Throne speech, but if not there certainly very soon after the presentation of the Throne speech, that it plans to bring in a bill on the question of Medicare or medical insurance at this session. As the hon. member for Parkdale has pointed out, we have now progressed a long way in this session and we have not yet seen the bill. In fact, I checked the order paper again today and we have not even seen a notice of intention to introduce a bill. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Health that perhaps he could forego himself the pleasure of reviewing once again all aspects of the work of the various branches of his department and get down to business on this bill.

This assembly has been in session now for ten weeks approximately. I doubt if it will be in session for much more than another six weeks and I think it is a disgraceful thing that the government, if it intends to bring in legislation, should delay so long in placing it before the Legislature. I think it will be regrettable if they come forward with a bill, in what are really the dying days of the session, and expect the Legislature, in the midst of all the other work that it then has to deal with, to give proper consideration to it.

I have a suspicion, Mr. Chairman—and only the facts will indicate whether I am right or wrong—that the government is delaying with its bill because it is going to be such a poor apology for a true Medicare plan that they are really ashamed to bring it forward. They want to bring it forward under circumstances where there will be a minimum opportunity for debate and for criticism. If I am wrong in that I will be very glad to retract the statement when the time comes.

I suspect that what they have in mind is a phoney Medicare plan which will really just be a form of subsidization of doctors and insurance companies involving some sort of payment from the public Treasury for the indigent whom we are told by the doctors are already cared for; some sort of a subsidy to insurance companies in the form of a government subsidization of premiums paid by individuals; and perhaps an undesirable extension of the means test which will permit people of limited means to buy the over-priced policies now offered by insurance companies provided they are willing to submit to a means test and permit the government to subsidize these excessive premiums.

That, I suspect, is the kind of bill the government has in mind; if it has, I think it is a regrettable retreat from reality, a regrettable failure to face up to the real challenge of Medicare in this province.

This province surely has the resources and the means to go ahead in the immediate future with a full programme of medical care insurance covering all residents of the province and protecting them against all medical bills, both those of general practitioners and of specialists.

The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) has already placed before this Legislature a sound and sensible plan whereby that can be accomplished. He has indicated how much the plan will cost and he has put forward proposals as to how the cost of the plan can be covered. I notice that nobody anywhere in this House has at any time criticized the programme he has put forward, nobody has been able to find any flaws in it.

Therefore I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the reason why we have had such complete silence from the government benches about the proposals of the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party is that those on the government benches are well aware that his proposals are sound and well founded. They know they cannot attack them successfully so they prefer to ignore them and in doing so to evade the whole issue.

Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested to read some time ago, approximately a year ago, an article written by the hon. Minister of Health in a small publication called "Letter to the Laos". For the information of other hon. members of the House, I might say that this is a publication that circulates only to people who belong—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): That is God's chosen people.

Mr. Bryden: It circulates, as the hon. Minister says, only to God's chosen people, that is to people who belong to the same church as he and I do.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Must be a big church!

Mr. Bryden: As you can see, it is not lacking in pride anyway.

At any rate, there is one paragraph that I would like to quote from the hon. Minister, because I thought it was a very interesting statement from the hon. Minister of Health of this province. He said:

Should we have "socialized medicine" here in Canada? I do not believe this would improve the health care given our people one iota.

Now if I may interject here, Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone who has proposed what he calls socialized medicine—what I would call medical insurance or Medicare—has done so with the idea that its prime virtue will be to improve the health care given. The proposal for medical insurance is put forward as a means of financing health care.

The quality of health care I think, is essentially in the hands of the medical profession. I do not think most people envisage that a medical insurance programme is going to make a great deal of difference in the quality of health care given, except perhaps—I will differ from the hon. Minister to this extent—that it will improve it by making it more available. As for standards of practice, I am sure that the medical profession will continue to ensure that standards are high and that they continue to improve. I make this interjection with regard to that one sentence in the hon. Minister's statement to indicate that although I would agree essentially with what he said, I do not think that the statement is really germane to the question he asked, which was: "Should we have 'socialized medicine' here in Canada?" He went on to say, however, and I am now quoting:

Yet I do say that no one in Canada should ever be denied complete and adequate medical care just because he cannot afford it. Nor should any Canadian be stripped of his human dignity begging for such essential care because he cannot pay for it. The provision of such care therefore becomes the responsibility of society, and since governments usually act in behalf of the society governed, I would look to government to make such care available.

I would hope, but I must say I am a little pessimistic, that that philosophy might carry over to the kind of proposals the government may see fit to make on Medicare. I am afraid that it is not going to, for reasons I have already indicated. I am afraid that the government plan is going to envisage that many Canadians will be stripped of their human dignity by having to submit to a degrading means test if they are to get insurance at prices they can afford.

I have found, with regard to the hon. Minister of Health, that if he permits his own natural humanity and common sense to speak and to penetrate the hard crust of Toryism with which he is surrounded he usually comes up with very sensible propositions. I would think if he would just pierce the hard crust of Toryism once again, as he did in the flash of insight reported in this little magazine, he would accept essentially the proposal that the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) has already put before this House.

I know that he has an awful lot of other hard crusts of Toryism to penetrate over on the government side of the House, but the hon. Minister of Health is a very energetic and eloquent man. If he would just put his mind to it, I think he could perhaps penetrate some of those hard crusts. Then we would get a genuine medical care insurance programme presented to this House in place of the phoney sort of proposal—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. member talks as if he is going to have to make the decision.

Mr. Bryden:—which I think is going to be presented.

The hon. member for Parkdale criticized the hon. Minister, in my opinion quite rightly since I have also done the same, for its failure to bring forward any sort of a bill at this time, notwithstanding long standing government announcements that it intends to bring such a bill forward.

I would, however, like to call the attention of the House to the order paper—to the order paper of any day, it does not matter which one. You will find under the heading “Intention to Introduce Bills”, under date of November 27, 1962, which is some substantial time ago, a series of bills standing in the name of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wintermeyer), the first of which is An Act to Establish a Medical Care Insurance Plan in Ontario.

This, I would remind the committee Mr. Chairman, is not a record that a bill has been

moved. It is merely a notice of intention to introduce a bill, a notice of intention given on November 27, 1962, which is about three months ago. It seems a little strange that the official Opposition should be criticizing the government for failure to bring in a bill when its record is certainly no better, if as good.

In fact, if one goes back to the order papers of the last session I think one will find, Mr. Chairman, that the same notice was given at the beginning of the last session of the Legislature. On the last day of that session, when the House prorogued, there was still no bill presented to this House. It is not merely a matter that we have been waiting since November 27, 1962. We have been waiting from November, 1961. The Liberals have come to this Legislature trying to create the impression that they have an intention to bring in a bill, when all we ever see is the intention; we never see the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Since 1919, not since 1962.

Mr. Bryden: I suppose one of the difficulties, Mr. Chairman, is that to my certain knowledge the Liberal party had at least three Medicare programmes in the last six months. I say to my certain knowledge; they may have had some others that I do not know about, but those three I know about.

Last fall, I think the people of the province and certainly this group, were most pleased to notice that the Liberal party appeared to have been converted to the principle of full medical care insurance for the people of Ontario. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in a speech given to a Liberal policy conference at that time, or a convention, I am not sure which it was, outlined a programme. Admittedly he was very vague on details, but he outlined a programme that sounded very much like our programme. We are always quite happy to welcome converts to the ranks; the only trouble was that it was only a matter of two or three months until he had lowered the boom on his own programme. Last January he went before the Liberal policy conference with a substantially different set of proposals, which indicated nothing but a retreat from the whole principle of medical care insurance; a retreat to halfway measures; a proposal to hand over this vital public service to private agencies at excessive cost, and without proper public control. In other words, the old Liberal weasel policy was in operation again. Once again there was a complete failure to be frank with

the people, to indicate how the plan was to be financed. On this occasion as on previous occasions there was merely a vague reference to the fact that, and I am now quoting: "the plan will be financed from a combination of personal premiums and medical care insurance taxation."

I think it is time that the Liberal party defined that term "medical care insurance taxation."

Mr. Sopha: You worry about your own.

Mr. Bryden: My hon. leader suggested to this House that the hon. leader of the Opposition had told a meeting of doctors in Scarborough that he intended to finance his plan by premiums of about \$75 per family, plus a one per cent increase in the sales tax. There are some very reputable men who claim that that is what he said but he denies that he said it and so as far as this House is concerned, we have no option but to accept his denial. But I would think that he should be prepared to state frankly just what he does envisage if it is not sales tax. I suppose the people will have his tax landed on them some time later, if this gentleman has his way, when it is no longer possible for them to do anything about it. That may be his plan.

The people will get a half-baked programme with inadequate coverage at excessive cost, provided through private insurance companies, with an increase in the sales tax. If that is not what he plans to do, I think he has a duty to say what it is he plans to do.

Mr. Sopha: You will never have the responsibility of doing anything.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order! Address the chair, please.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Sudbury is concerned about accuracy because he is getting an unaccustomed dose of it right now. Mr. Chairman, much as I regret the government's continued determination to play footsie with this problem, I would like to suggest to the committee that the greatest obstacle to obtaining medical care insurance in this province and in this country has been the persistence of the Liberal party, federally and provincially, for a period of 40 years in playing politics with the issues. At least we can say for the Tories that through most of the last 40 years, they have been against the whole concept. I think they were wrong, but at least they were against it and we knew it. Now they are finding the world is catching up with them and it is not too expedient to

be simply against it, so they are trying to trim their sails a little bit.

But the Liberals have been for and against it, day in and day out, one week one way, one week another way, for as long as anybody can remember. I would like to read to this House some proposals that the Liberal party put forward in August 1945, almost 18 years ago, to the federal-provincial conference on reconstruction. These were put forward by a government that was then in office, and stayed in office for another twelve years.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): This is a federal matter he is talking about.

Mr. Bryden: The federal Liberal government of that day stated—and I may say I am reading from this book with approval, I think what was stated here was very sound then, and very sound now. For example this Green Book, as it became to be called, stated on page 28:

It is becoming evident that the basic condition for good health in the community is the wise use of sufficient money, and that this requires a degree of organization and long term planning in the twin fields of preventive and curative medicine greater than anything yet attempted in this country.

Under our present system, for the man who can afford to pay, the cost of ill health falls at the very moment when his earning capacity is cut off. The cost of treatment and cure for the individual who cannot afford to pay is borne to considerable degree, through the benefactions of well-to-do members of the community and the generosity of doctors who give so freely of their time and skill, and more and more by the provincial governments and municipalities. In spite of these efforts, desirable treatment is still not obtained in many cases. While much of the cost of illness is thus hidden, it can only come out of the total productive capacity of the country. The advantages of a broader provision of health services on a more equitable basis are obvious.

Then on page 29 the documents states:

Nearly all countries—

this was back in 1945:

—have adopted health insurance in one form or another. The chief exceptions to date have been Canada, Australia and the United States which are all federal countries where jurisdiction over health is a matter of local concern, etc.

That was back in 1945. We were lagging behind then and we are still lagging behind.

We have not made any real progress at all. Then a little later on page 29 it is stated:

Health insurance has been widely adopted because it is regarded as the best means of meeting and of distributing fairly the costs of illness and, in conjunction with preventive services, of improving the general health of the nation.

Then on page 30, referring to speeches from the Throne in the House of Commons:

In the speeches from the Throne which began the session in January, 1944, and which closed the session in January, 1945, the federal government declared again its desire to bring in a nation-wide system of health insurance as soon as suitable arrangements could be made with the provinces. It was stated that this would be one of the subjects to be brought up at the Dominion-provincial conference to be held as soon as possible following the general election.

Then the document goes on to set forth detailed proposals as to how, by co-operative action between the federal government and the provinces, health insurance could be established across the country with each province bringing it in at the rate considered appropriate for its particular province.

Mr. Sopha: Is that the NDP national programme?

Mr. Bryden: The hon. gentleman from Sudbury asks me if this is the New Democratic programme for this election. Mr. Chairman, in answer to his question I would say that essentially it is. Essentially this is our proposal.

We have put forward a concrete programme for Ontario, but essentially we believe in health insurance or Medicare coming forward as a joint federal-provincial plan. With some modifications, in the light of new circumstances, we believe in the sort of co-operative arrangement that was set forth in the Green Book proposals of 1945. Our proposals presented in this House are proposals that we consider appropriate for Ontario and which we think Ontario could proceed with whether or not there is any initiative at the federal government level.

In answer to the hon. member's question I would say once again that essentially that is the kind of programme our party has at the federal level. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that it does not appear to be the kind of programme that the Liberal party has at the federal level. This is most regrettable and this again illustrates my point as to the

reason why we have been so long delayed in getting health insurance in this country. It is primarily because of the way the Liberal party has played politics with the issue.

One day they are for it, one day they are against it. At election time they are usually for it and if they are in Opposition they are usually for it, but if they are in office they are against it and they do nothing about it.

The regrettable thing, Mr. Chairman, is that it would now appear that the Liberals are not even for it at election time as they used to be. In fact, the federal leader, hon. Lester Pearson, stated about a week ago that Medicare had to be dropped down—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I regret to see that these hon. gentlemen welcome the statement from their federal leader to the effect that Medicare had to be dropped down low in the list of priorities of any federal government that might bear a Liberal stripe. I do not think we will get one, but that is his announcement.

Mr. Sopha: We are all members of the same family.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. gentleman says that they are all members of the same family. One can only conclude from that that they, like Pearson, have repudiated Medicare almost entirely, because that is what he has done. He has pulled out the old chestnut that we cannot do anything about it now because we have to do something about the economic problems of the country first. This is always an excuse for inaction. It is a reversion to the old policy of defeatism of the '30s that we can do nothing because we have to deal first of all with immediate problems. This is the negative, defeatist, deflationary approach of the Liberal leader.

I will say for our party that our policy is a dynamic policy. We believe that we can go forward on all fronts. We believe that one can move forward with economic development and with social development simultaneously, and that top priority should be given to Medicare. In fact, we would say that anyone who is interested in the economic development of the country should also be interested in the health of the nation. One of the finest contributions one can make to economic development is to introduce a proper programme of health insurance, that will make adequate health care available to all people and will thereby improve the health of the nation.

We refuse to take the defeatist attitude. We refuse to accept the hon. Mr. Pearson's reversion to the '30s. We want to deal with the problems of the '60s and deal with them in a dynamic, constructive and progressive manner.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): He will be the next Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): God forbid!

Mr. Whicher: April 9!

Mr. Thomas: God forbid! The country will be in a mess.

Mr. Sopha: David Lewis will retain his seat, the other two are licked.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that right? Well that is good news from the oracle of the hour.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Sudbury always likes to make a parade of his ignorance, so I suppose there is no use trying to persuade him, in his own interests, to talk only about things about which he knows something.

Mr. Sopha: Your hon. leader said we are too busy to help our federal colleagues.

Mr. MacDonald: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. Sopha: You are quoted as saying that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if these hon. gentlemen would contain themselves for a moment I could bring my remarks to a conclusion quite quickly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I know their digestive capacity is overfilled already. You have really hurt them this afternoon.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, in concluding my presentation, and in once again appealing to the hon. Minister to let his natural humanity and sound common sense prevail over his Toryism, I would like to read what I consider to be a very interesting article in the *Toronto Telegram* of February 7. It is a report of a speech by Dr. John Hastings, who is associate professor of public health and preventive medicine at the University of Toronto.

Mr. Sopha: I know him; a splendid fellow.

Mr. Bryden: Dr. Hastings was speaking, I might say, to the York-Scarborough Progressive-Conservative Association, so I am sure the hon. Minister will agree that he was in good company. The newspaper report does not indicate how Dr. Hastings' remarks were received by the assembly to which he was speaking, but I am sure that the remarks provided a great deal of food for thought. The first paragraph of the story reads:

One in five Ontario residents receives "hopelessly inadequate" public health protection that "borders on negligence," a health expert said last night.

Then if I may skip over a few paragraphs that deal with other matters I would like to read the last few paragraphs of the report:

On Medicare, Dr. Hastings said human welfare should not take a back seat to economic or professional interests.

He emphasized that any national health service should equally protect professional and lay interests. He urged that the terms "socialized" and "free enterprise" medicine be dropped because they do nothing to clarify the Medicare issue.

The source of money for health services would have "little or no positive impact" on the standard of medical care provided, he added.

I would commend those words to the hon. Minister and to the government. I think they are sensible words. They are the words of a man who has obviously considered the needs of a highly organized and complicated community, such as we have in Canada today. They indicate the clear need for clear thinking and for brushing away arguments over words and attempts to brand proposals with labels.

Let us consider this proposition on its merits, let us consider the needs of people for health care. If we do that, then I do not think there is any doubt that we will conclude, as most people in this country have concluded if one can judge by Gallup polls, that a full medical care insurance programme of the type already outlined by my hon. leader is essential in this country.

We have seen a great many attempts to confuse the issue with statistics. There is an old saying that we all know that one can prove anything by statistics and I think this is true with regard to medical insurance, perhaps more than in other fields. A statistic that is frequently quoted to us is to the effect that 60 or 70 per cent—it varies with the speaker—of the people of Ontario are already covered by medical care insurance.

This, Mr. Chairman, is an outstanding example of proving anything with statistics because that statistic by itself does not mean anything. Most of those people referred to do not have anything approaching full medical care insurance. What the statistic means is that 60 to 70 per cent of the people of the province now have some protection against medical bills. Practically none of them have complete protection, and the majority of them have inadequate protection. It should be on that basis that we should consider the whole question of medical care insurance—on the basis of the fact that about one-third of the people have no protection at all and at least another third, and probably more than a third, have totally inadequate protection. When we consider it on that basis, then I think the hon. Minister will be prevailed upon to agree that any sort of plan, such as we have heard by the grapevine the government is now considering, is quite inadequate to deal with the situation with which we are faced at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 701:

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions, on vote 701, I should like to ask the hon. Minister with respect to the matter of air pollution and smoke control. I presume that this is the vote under which I would discuss that problem; is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Vote 710—environmental sanitation; industrial hygiene—710.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, last year I brought up the problem of ambulance services, and to date we still have no reply concerning the setting up of rules and regulations re operators of ambulance services. The Chamber of Commerce themselves are quite concerned about the situation and in their meeting held in Niagara Falls last June, I think it was, they passed a resolution concerning the study of ambulance services. The chamber is convinced of the need for a comprehensive study of ambulance services throughout the province, to ensure that victims of highway accidents receive prompt attention and transportation to hospitals. Provisions for ambulance services in remote sections would substantially reduce the number of deaths caused by delay in providing ambulance service for injured persons.

They recommend that the government undertake a comprehensive study of ambulance services throughout the province. Is such a study at present being undertaken by the department?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, formerly, no; but we have begun discussing the matter on an informal basis with a small group very interested and already well equipped in this direction, who have taken it upon themselves to spearhead the matter insofar as their own group is concerned. We have already begun informal discussions with them which we intend to push towards more formal conversations.

Mr. Newman: Then we can conclude that, possibly within the year or so, rules and regulations would be set up re the operators of ambulance services within the province?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we would hope to work to that end but I would not specifically state that this is the thing that you will get. Just what is involved in this I do not know because this has never been a responsibility of The Department of Health or the hospitals. Nevertheless, we are working toward the end where at least we will take a good deal of concern about the type of equipment carried, the type of vehicle used, and the quality of the vehicle used, and the skill and training of the people who are operating it. These are the areas in which we are basically interested because this is the interest of the ambulance people themselves.

Mr. Newman: I can see the hon. Minister has the problem in hand and, knowing his capabilities, I am fairly certain that he will come through with a solution.

The next is concerning civil defence. Is there any stockpiling of drugs by this department for civil defence purposes?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this whole matter comes under EMO, and we only co-operate insofar as we are asked. The federal government is responsible for the overall stockpiling of drugs. Insulin is already stockpiled, as doubtless you read in the newspapers only a few days ago. This is our first concern and I presume that we would follow this up with biologicals for which we ourselves are responsible, although they are very definitely on a dated basis. Whether or not they can be stockpiled for any length of time I am not in a position professionally to state.

Mr. Newman: Another problem, Mr. Chairman. Back in the community in which I live there happens to be a plant which will be manufacturing electricity by means of atomic energy. There is always talk of the danger of something happening to the plant itself and

then, as a result, possibly the danger of fallout. Is the department undertaking tests at the present time to sample the air, checking the content—I think it is strontium content or whatever it is—of the air, so that they can compare it later on, once the plant gets into operation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right, Mr. Chairman. We have already taken samples of the air in the vicinity of this and other similar plants, to the end that we have what we should look upon as the normal—to be compared with the situation existing after the plant opens.

We are also involved in an interdepartmental committee at the present time, studying this entire matter of dangerous substances and the effect of their escape on the people and vegetation and life in general in the vicinity of the places where these substances are stored. Out of this we hope will come a clear and complete understanding of what The Department of Health's role will be in controlling these things.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister. The last problem or question that I have is: I notice in item 32, vote 701, that there is \$10,000 being voted for victims of thalidomide. Is there any thought on the part of the government to extend assistance beyond thalidomide cases, to parents who have children who have very serious physical defects?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this points up exactly the fear we had when the government of Canada, with ourselves and with all of the provinces, drew attention to deformities in cases where mothers had taken thalidomide in the early days of their pregnancy. These children, who are seriously and severely handicapped, are being and can be looked after now. Having in mind the tragedy of this situation, we have feared all along separating them from others on the basis of cause. It has been our feeling, and we made this feeling very clear when we met the hon. Minister at Ottawa, that they should be treated as handicapped children, whether we knew the cause or not.

If we knew the cause so much the better; we could at least eliminate that cause in the future. But the children, the sufferers, should be treated exactly the same. Through the crippled children's society these things are all being done. Indeed, I believe we had a case drawn to our attention from the hon. member's own riding, or at least from his own city, a very tragic case which has all the stigmata of a thalidomide baby and yet no

record of thalidomide having been used. That child will receive exactly the same care as the thalidomide baby through the crippled children's centre, grants to which are paid by this government.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the case that I had in my own riding was the reason that I brought up this thalidomide item. I know the hon. Minister will do the best he can with it.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this thalidomide, I have been trying for about one year now to find out the extent of the government assistance. I see in the estimates that there is \$10,000 set aside for this. It seems to me that I recall reading in the press, at the time this problem was more active in the press than it is now, to the extent that assistance would be given. I thought it was without it having to be on the basis of having to, more or less, come and ask for it. I understood the government was assuming the responsibility. Am I correct in that? Would the hon. Minister tell us the extent of the assistance? This is what I have been having difficulty determining.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the extent of the assistance is this: We will provide all assistance that the parents want. The hon. member is quite right in both ways; the parents must ask for it, but we can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that no parent will be refused. It is simply a matter of asking for it. We have already had six cases where the parents absolutely refused government interference or government assistance at all.

They have accepted this as their parental responsibility, and they have elected to handle it in this manner. I would feel very impertinent if I were to impose government into a situation of that kind. If I were a parent in that situation, I would take a very dim view of the government, or any servant of government, interfering in what I consider my own private difficulty.

However, the help is there and they only have to let their doctor know. That is all. They do not have to send any formal application or anything of that kind through us. They let the doctor know, and, if he lets us know, then we will provide the care. The care involved is all the medical care that the infant needs.

The item in the budget may appear small, \$10,000. There are two reasons for that. First of all, we do not know exactly yet—we cannot know until we have some experience—how much will actually be needed. Secondly, there

will not be much needed in the first year or two of the infant's life. It is only when we think of the time where the infant is prepared for and ready for prostheses, artificial limbs and that sort of thing, that the budget, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, will then in all probability be excessively high, since we have already been informed that some of the newer prostheses which will be used in these cases might well cost us many thousands of dollars for each limb. This will have to be met as it comes along.

At the present time, we will provide all the medical care. We will provide transportation as is required. Through The Department of Public Welfare, certain other assistance will be given; such as help in the home, if this is necessary.

This is just a case of our deciding at head office what we are going to give. Each case will be treated on its own merits, mostly through the crippled children's society, which has field workers in the area close to these cases, and is quite familiar with them and who are in a far better position than anyone else to tell us what is needed. In areas where there is not a representative of the crippled children's society we hope to make use of the public health nursing service and the medical officers of health who are usually much closer to the public in matters of this kind.

But I assure you, sir, that no child will be denied, and no parent will be denied, whatever assistance it lies within our power to give. This is the expressed desire of the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare also.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister made mention that The Department of Public Welfare—I was trying to determine whether or not an individual had to be, if you will, to the point where they were eligible for assistance under the Department of Public Welfare before they got assistance from this particular department with respect to thalidomide babies.

I understand there is somewhere in the vicinity, and the hon. Minister will no doubt correct me if I am wrong, about 23 of these children born in Ontario. I am particularly concerned with two cases that came to my attention. It seemed to me that these people were not the type who would require any welfare assistance. Yet on the other hand the additional expenses that are imposed upon them as a result of thalidomide are going to be quite a serious obligation and strain on their budget. What I am trying to determine is whether or not this assistance is available

regardless of their means. If they do ask the government for assistance, must they prove they are unable to carry the load themselves? If not, why does The Department of Public Welfare enter into it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Insofar as the medical services are concerned we do not ask what they have, even if the parent of the infant is a millionaire. I do not think it is my business to ask them whether they can afford it. It was my clear understanding with the department at Ottawa that they were to share in any case that applied for assistance.

As far as the welfare part is concerned, I think this was something that our government added to assist a little further. I am not in a position to discuss that, but I believe there is an item in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Cecil's) estimates. I believe I remember seeing it as I looked over the estimates. He himself will be better able to discuss that. As far as my department is concerned, there is no question whatsoever of a means test.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would just go back for a moment, on the subject one of my hon. colleagues brought up on the question of ambulance service in the province of Ontario. I am sure that the hon. Minister is familiar with the problems the owners of ambulances have. May I point out, Mr. Chairman, most respectfully, that in the rural areas many of these ambulance drivers simply do not get paid for hospital calls that they have?

I have been told of serious accidents in my own area where the police called an ambulance driver, not once but several times. Perhaps the accident might be so severe that the victim had to be brought all the way to Toronto. Now this costs a great deal of money for the man to take his time and his ambulance to bring the patient down to a hospital here in Toronto. He has to turn around and go back again and on several occasions that have been brought to my attention, the ambulance driver has not been paid.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that necessarily they should be paid by The Department of Health, but I feel that The Department of Health should take leadership in seeing that some department of government ensures that these people are paid.

It is not fair that the owner of an ambulance, because of his own situation in life, is called upon by the police. He cannot ask the patient: "Do you have the money to pay this call?"

He automatically goes out as a good citizen and I feel as good citizens we have an obligation to that patient. On the other hand, it is not fair to the owners of ambulances in the province of Ontario that they should accept the full financial responsibility and have to pay out of their own pocket for cases for which at the present time they do not get paid.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to stress strongly that I feel The Department of Health not only should listen to the story that the ambulance drivers have put before this department, but I think that they should take leadership in seeing that one section of our population, namely, the ambulance owners of this province, do not in many instances have to finance the whole ambulance costs of various patients, who through unfortunate circumstances have been hit on the road, particularly accident victims on the highways.

I would like the hon. Minister to say something more about this, please.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this whole matter will be discussed again, and probably from some other angle. As I have just stated, these have begun on a very informal basis.

I would point out to you, sir, and through you to the hon. members, that this does not only involve ambulance operators. As a physician who practised for quite a long time in an area where we were very prone to be called on to attend accidents, my record is that I never collected even 10 per cent of the total care provided—

Mr. Whicher: We are bringing in medical care on this side of the House and then the hon. Minister would be paid.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well then, of course, the farsighted policy, which is so traditional of the old Liberal party of taking 40 years to talk about a proposal, will give us ambulance service in maybe 40 or 80 years. I am quite certain that the Conservative party will have dealt with this matter long before with much greater success.

This is a very difficult situation though, seriously, and while I recognize that the ambulance driver should be supported, I have to say very frankly so too should the doctors, so too should the hospitals have been, prior to the inception of hospital care insurance. They are now, but only because this great government on this side of the House brought in hospital care insurance. We settled that part of the problem. But remember the hospitals, and thereby the municipalities in

which the hospitals were situated, for many years subsidized those accident cases.

This opens up a tremendously broad area and again I can only say to the hon. member that I would hope that when further studies of this whole ambulance question are completed—and this is not a new matter by any means—we do hope that we will be able to come up with some solution. One or two solutions, which to me sound as though they might well work or at least might well be worthy of trial, have already been submitted for consideration. We would hope that out of them one workable one will come.

Mr. Whicher: I appreciate what the hon. Minister has said. I would like to point out, however, that when he says he, as a doctor, probably collected only 10 per cent of his calls, I would imagine that in the majority of doctors' calls they are simply selling their services or collecting for the services that they may give the patient. But I would suggest that the ambulance driver's stature, financially, in the province of Ontario, does not anywhere nearly equal that of the medical profession.

Besides selling their time, they are selling that vehicle which is going many miles; therefore, I appreciate what the hon. Minister has said. This matter will be investigated thoroughly and I would hope that some plan would be forthcoming so they do not have to accept the brunt of the financial cost.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the hon. Minister about another subject. I hope this is where it would come in. I have been informed by the chiropractors' association in my particular area that this government does not recognize the chiropractic association in Ontario; and if they do recognize it, they do not allow chiropractors to discipline their own members. Before I go any further, is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the assumption is incorrect on both counts. The government does recognize chiropractors in that we have a Chiropractors Act under The Drugless Practitioners Act. They have their own board of regents, and they do have the right to discipline their own members. The regulations giving them the right to discipline their own members I thought were already cleared, but there are certain points at issue yet between my department, the department of the registrar of regulations, and the chiropractors. There is not any doubt in the world they are getting the right to discipline—

Mr. Whicher: They have not got it yet?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is just a matter of working out the details. The hon. member will probably remember, a year ago, that the legislation was amended to give them that. I corrected an erroneous impression which got abroad that this department had forced upon them regulations to discipline themselves. The hon. member will perhaps recall I corrected that, I think, on a question which he himself posed to me, and stated that the chiropractors at that time asked for this change in legislation because they were concerned that they did not have strong enough authority to discipline their own members.

This is being given to them, the legislation is passed, we are simply clearing the regulations between the two bodies concerned; but there has been no hint that this government does not recognize them. Indeed, we are one of the few provinces where people who are beneficiaries under the Workmen's Compensation Board can enlist the services of chiropractors directly without going through a doctor. I am simply stating this as a matter of fact. This does obtain in this province.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear this because it certainly is not what I was told by chiropractors only three or four months ago. The legislation may very well be passed, but I suggest to the hon. Minister that, according to what the members of the chiropractic association where I was were saying, these regulations have not come into effect and the chiropractors' association has not got the power to discipline its own members.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister this: Has the chiropractic association of Ontario, or whatever its formal name is, the same powers to discipline its members as the Ontario Medical Association has in dealing with its own members?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, no. Neither of the associations, neither the medical association nor the chiropractic association, has any right or authority to discipline its members. But the College of Physicians and Surgeons, in the case of doctors, and the Board of Regents of the chiropractic profession, have the authority to discipline their members. The associations have no right to discipline at all, neither medical, dental, nor chiropractic. My deputy tells me that the hold-up lies with their own solicitor. As soon as their solicitor gets the regulations in such form that they are acceptable to us and acceptable to the registrar of regulations, they will be brought before the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and, I am quite certain,

will be passed. I told them that we are quite prepared to accept the regulations in principle.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this as well because I must say that I was given the same impression as the hon. member for Bruce. It is my understanding that this chiropractic association has three different groups of people in it. I am not familiar with it as a layman, but I understand there is a type of person who must attend some 4,300 hours of scholastic achievement before he is entitled to become a chiropractor. Then I understand there are other groups of people who do not have the same high standards, who are grouped together under the same bill and controlled under the same statute in Ontario. My understanding is that this is part of the problem, that it is difficult for the three groups to be compatible.

I may be incorrect in this and if I am, perhaps the hon. Minister will correct me. But I was certainly under the same impression as the hon. member for Bruce. I might state that I have had representatives of this association to see me; and these gentlemen who did come to see me were certainly not people who were not qualified in their profession. They had spent years in college perfecting it, and yet they tell me they are being hampered very seriously by the statutes and the regulations in Ontario. And I think further they have said that our legislation in this respect is inferior to that of many of the States below us, and some of the other provinces of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Again I have to say that the information is not exactly in keeping with the facts. First of all, we do not deal with the chiropractic association. The chiropractic association is the professional socio-economic arm, or socio-economic arm of the profession, just as the medical association is the socio-economic arm of the medical profession.

I do not deal with the OMA, sir, I deal with the College of Physicians and Surgeons when I want to deal with matters pertaining to the education, recruitment, licensing, and disciplining of doctors. When I am dealing with those matters relative to chiropractors, I deal with the board of directors of chiropractors. They operate now under a piece of umbrella legislation known as The Drugless Practitioners Act, but each—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the hon. Minister? Is this not the very Act they are complaining about?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is quite true. And if the hon. member will just give me a few moments I think I can make my point clear. Under this umbrella legislation come five different bodies, chiropractors, osteopaths, drugless therapists, masseurs and physiotherapists. But the overriding body, charged with responsibility for The Drugless Practitioners Act, does not interfere with any one of these individual bodies. Each one comes under its own board. For instance, chiropractors come directly under the board of directors of chiropractors. Osteopaths under their board; drugless therapists under their board; masseurs under theirs; and physiotherapists under theirs.

Mr. Chairman, we have felt in the department for a long time—and this is an opinion shared by many people, an opinion not only held in Great Britain for a long time but now put into effect there—that all of the bodies involved in the practice of the healing arts—we should make it as broad as we possibly can with that term—should come under some type of umbrella legislation with each individual group answerable to a ruling body of its own members. This is what we are doing in The Drugless Practitioners Act.

Of course the Acts are different in some of the States. I say to you, very frankly, Mr. Chairman, that I would not want to see my own profession, nor any of the professional bodies, ruled by Acts such as they have in some of the States. I do not like their legislation, I do not think it is good.

While our legislation is not perfect, we believe it is good. We believe they can do anything within the scope of their training and capabilities under their Act. We have never yet rejected any reasonable amendment to that Act and I have had no word from the board of directors of chiropractors that there was any disagreement with that Act.

It is they who come to see me. I do meet the representatives of the association once or twice a year. The board of directors suggest recommended amendments to me and I cannot recall ever having turned one down or that they were not in agreement that it should be turned down. We discuss the recommended changes. We discuss them very vigorously. Indeed they have proposed one or two amendments to me which I rejected after discussion with them on the grounds that I felt they were exercising too much control and too much discipline over their own members. If my profession heard that they would probably crucify me, but the fact remains that my job is to see to it that chiropractors are treated exactly like others.

If people want chiropractic treatment, then my responsibility is to see that they are provided with the best possible chiropractic treatment available.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned five different groups of people. Certainly these five different groups do not require the same educational standards. They are, I understand, considerably different. I understand this is one of the problems.

Would the hon. Minister of Health advise me on masseurs and drugless practitioners? What scholastic standards are required by those two groups?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Each board sets its own standards of training. The drugless therapists would have nothing to do with setting the standards of training for the chiropractors. That would be set by the board of directors of the chiropractors, Mr. Chairman, and the other groups would have nothing whatsoever to do with it. Now I say this very advisedly, and I believe the chiropractors are in agreement with me, unfortunately a few people are calling themselves chiropractors, and I believe it is, naturopaths—whatever in the world that is, and, frankly, I do not know, but they call themselves naturopaths—and, when they get into difficulty, neither board wants to assume responsibility for disciplining them.

Now, what the standards for training for entry into naturopathy may be, what the standards for training to become a naturopath may be, what they do, what they aim to do, what they think they can do, I have not the slightest idea. They come under an Act provided for them by this Legislature and they are given the right to control their own destiny. But they would have nothing to do with standards of training or standards of entry required of chiropractors.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it this is the source of the problem. There was an article which appeared in *Maclean's* magazine, I understand, about a year and a half ago, which was very unfavourable to this group of people. Now the people who came to me, who tell me that they required over 4,300 hours college training to become eligible as chiropractors, tell me that while all groups were grouped together in this *Maclean's* item, none of the actual chiropractors were involved in the problem. Yet they were all damned because they were all included under the one Act in the Legislature.

These people feel—and maybe the hon. Minister has good reason for thinking otherwise—that the absence of legislation in this province is directly responsible for them being unable to attain the standards in their profession that other people such as lawyers and doctors and other groups who have their own particular standards to govern their activities enjoy.

I am told that in I think all but two of the States, and my information again may be incorrect, that the chiropractors that do have the basic standard of study have their own Act. They are not grouped together in an umbrella Act with a lot of other groups who do not insist on the same standards of attainment. Perhaps we are evading the problem in not giving them the same type of legislation which is apparently available in other jurisdictions.

This seems to me to be the sore point. If, for instance, the hon. Minister cannot tell me what qualifications are required for naturopaths, it may well be that one can become a naturopath with 1,000 hours or less. If this is the case it is no wonder that these people are having problems. It is no wonder they are having difficulty in having their profession accepted by the public. I think if that is the case it is the responsibility of this Legislature to give them some further protection.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand the claim of chiropractors that this Act would hamper them in any way. There is no possibility in the world of their being lumped together in the minds of the public with naturopaths or any other group.

They are ruled by their own body, their own board of directors, who are chiropractors without exception. They propose the names of the directors to the department for me to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. They set their own standards of training, they maintain their own college, they say who shall graduate, they say who shall not. They issue the licence to that person, his right to practice, and they have the right to withdraw that licence. They have the right to discipline their members.

Indeed there are those who object. This is a very common argument I have with certain schools of chiropractic to the south of us—who cannot be accepted for practice in the province of Ontario because the standards here in Ontario, set by the board of directors of chiropractic, are apparently higher than their training fits them to meet. I cannot understand the argument, because this Act is a very simple Act. The Drugless Practitioners

Act states in section 3 that boards of directors for one or more classifications of drugless practitioners may be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, to be composed of not fewer than three and not more than five members and to be known as the board of directors of the particular group concerned, in this case chiropractors. Then they rule themselves by by-laws or regulations.

None of these other disciplines or professions, or what ever they may be, have any right to say what shall go into those regulations. No member of these other groups, although they are all covered by this very simple umbrella legislation, The Drugless Practitioners Act, has any say in what the other group shall do.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this: why, if the government is so favourable and keeps the chiropractors on the same basis as the medical profession—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not say that, Mr. Chairman. I did not say anything about the government keeping chiropractors on the same basis as the medical profession or any other profession. I said that the chiropractors have the right to control their own destiny by legislation.

Mr. Whicher: I would like to ask this question: why is it that in your estimates here you only have bursaries for medical and dental undergraduate students? There are no bursaries for chiropractic students. Why is that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is really one to answer!

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that nowhere in the world to my knowledge, and I say this in all kindness, but I am simply stating it as a statement of fact and it is more difficult for me to say it because by profession I am a physician, but no jurisdiction in the world that I know of has recognized chiropractic as an orthodox branch of the healing arts.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: You just said we did here.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did nothing of the kind. I said, Mr. Chairman, if enough people in the province of Ontario believed in chiropractic and wanted the services of chiropractors, it is my responsibility as Minister of Health to see to it that the best possible chiropractic service is provided for them. This is the limit of my responsibility and this

is what I have tried to do. We have not hampered them in any way.

Mr. Whicher: Have you helped them?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have helped them insofar as they themselves have asked help by way of legislation. I know of no jurisdiction whereby the state provides bursary, fellowship or scholarship assistance for chiropractors, nor for a great host of other disciplines: the optometrists, podiatrists, hypnotists, and a whole host of other people who are practising on the fringes, or at least are impinging upon, the practice of medicine. No state that I know of has as yet provided assistance by way of scholarships or bursaries for these people.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, in connection with these bursaries for medical students you are not going to put chiropractors on the same basis as the medical profession. May I ask you this about your bursaries to medical students: how many more doctors have you got in the province of Ontario now than you had 15 years ago?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot give you the number, I did not expect to be asked that question. I can say that the ratio of doctors to population has not altered very greatly in the last 15 years. In the last 15 years there has been quite an influx of doctors trained in other jurisdictions who have met the standards of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario and have qualified to practise here. We are not educating enough doctors in the province of Ontario to meet the demand and, had it not been for those who have come in from other jurisdictions, we would have been in a very sorry state.

Mr. Whicher: May I ask the hon. Minister what facilities have you added for the training of our own doctors in the last 15 years? I mean have we any other medical colleges? Are there more seats, more students than we had before?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think it is about 15 or 17 years ago since the last medical school in Ontario opened. I think all four of them—there are four medical schools in existence in Ontario—have expanded their facilities. I believe all, with the exception of two, have expanded to the limit of their capabilities now, and we are actively involved in discussions with the interested parties to the end that a new medical school will be established.

Mr. Whicher: I would suggest that no matter what has been done, enough has not

been done. There is a feeling around the province, and I would hope that I would be wrong in this, but there is a feeling among laymen that the medical profession and the government of Ontario have not done enough towards the encouragement of medical students, of our own students in the province of Ontario. Many of us know of young men and young women who graduated from Grade 13 this past year and have no place to go. They want to be doctors but unfortunately this government, or the medical profession tied in with it, have not provided the facilities so that these young men and women can get training. Is that true?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, that is not true, unequivocally and absolutely.

Mr. Whicher: Then where have you provided more facilities in the last ten years?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, may I have an opportunity to answer the question?

I know of no young man who wanted to go into medical school and was turned down, if he had the standing, if he had the qualifications.

Mr. Whicher: What standing is that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not know—

Mr. Whicher: Was it changed this year from last?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No. Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. Whicher: Well, I can assure you that it was changed.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, then the university did that and I do not control the universities. The universities—

Mr. Whicher: But you control the medical profession and you should do something about it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do not control the medical profession. The medical profession is controlled by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, an autonomous body administering legislation provided by this House, and that has been so since before Ontario was a province. But I can say to you, Mr. Chairman, that last year this House approved a sum of money to be administered by my department to provide 20 bursaries for medical students and ten for dental students. The only stipulation we attached to it was that they would,

on graduation, practise in selected parts of the province where their services are needed. Only eight medical students and six dental students have applied and been accepted for those bursaries, and we did not turn down anyone who had the qualifications.

I would also point out to the hon. member that the doctor-population ratio in Ontario is the best in Canada, and better than the great majority of the states to the south of us. It is one doctor to some 859 population, I believe, and oftentimes you will be shown figures that compare with 1900 when the ratio was 1 to 600-something. We have got to realize that we are living in a far different age.

I go around a far greater number of patients today than my colleague of 1900 could when he was depending on a horse and buggy and mud roads. Again this fine government on this side of the House has provided roads that have helped me cover my practice in far less time than my colleague of even 20 years ago, in the 1930s, was able to do. The fact remains that here, in Ontario, we actually have a very satisfactory doctor-population ratio.

The unfortunate thing is that, until we reach the stage where we are going to regiment people and tell doctors where they are going to practise, we will always be plagued with maldistribution; and I, for one, sir, would have no part of any thesis of that kind. This is a free society; I believe in a free society; I believe in doctors, dentists, lawyers, farmers, and what have you, practising their professions, or trades, wherever they choose to do so.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is talking about the fine government. I am informed that this fine government had 200 applications from students who wished to study medicine at the University of Ottawa and this fine government only provided room for 70. What would you say about that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can say this very definitely, that this fine government did not have one application from a student who wanted to practice medicine. The only way we have applications from students interested in medicine would be in the cases of those who applied for these bursaries, and graduates who apply for post-graduate bursaries which the department advocates. I can say to the hon. member that the year I went into medicine the university which I attended had something like 8,000 applicants for 60 spots in schools, but the great number of them did not have the necessary training to go into medicine. The university is naturally going to

pick those, in the interest of the student himself, who in their experience have the best chance of success.

I do not know how many were turned down because of lack of accommodation. I would have to ask the deans of the various universities. You have to realize that this department has nothing to do with the education of doctors. These discussions we are having now are completely off the record. It was simply in trying to provide a little of the leadership we are so often accused of not giving that I stepped out of line and went into an area which is not my concern at all, believing that the people of the province would look to The Department of Health to be sure that there is an adequate supply of doctors in the days ahead.

Mr. Whicher: Do you consider that there is an adequate supply of doctors?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe that we are heading in the direction of being sure that there is an adequate supply. There is an adequate supply just now, only it is badly distributed. I say this very frankly.

Indeed I would recall to your attention the time, a little less than a year ago, when there was just a little bit of fuss out in one of our western provinces and the newspapers stated that 200 doctors were about to leave Toronto. I asked the newspapers to remind them of their responsibility to their own province. A doctor then said to me: "Mr. Minister, 200 doctors could leave this city of Toronto tonight and they would not be missed in the morning." Now, if doctors are going to practise in big centres, there really is not much that a government can do about it in a free society.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, could I ask a supplementary question about this proportion of doctors—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have had fifteen supplementary questions and I have been up fourteen times.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): You are getting good exercise for the forthcoming campaign.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, I grant you it is good, that exercise. I am in the campaign, in case you think not.

Mr. Chairman, I had three or four items I wanted to raise but a couple of points have come up along the line on which I would like to comment. I want to suggest to the hon. Minister that he cannot wash his hands

of responsibility with regard to the number of doctors who are being trained in this province. As a matter of fact, one of the things in which I have been most interested in the public discussion of the whole question of Medicare at the present time, is the standard arguments of the medical profession that there is a shortage of doctors in Great Britain at the present time. This is attributed to the fact that they have got that horrible monstrosity called "the national health service" over there.

The fact of the matter is, and this is an historical fact, that the extent to which they have a shortage of doctors at the moment is because of a decision that was taken within the profession a few years ago to cut down on the number of people who were going to be trained. Now they acknowledge that they had miscalculated their needs, because there has always been, not only down through the generations, but down through the centuries, an exodus of people in this profession from Great Britain to other places in the world.

It is true that there has been a raising of standards at a time when, I submit to you, we need more doctors. If we treat our universities, not exclusively as provincial institutions, but as national institutions, which I submit they should be, and if we are training them not just for the people of the province of Ontario but to meet the needs of Canada, then we should be training more doctors. The hon. Minister cannot wash his hands of it and say that this is the responsibility of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, because, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is a fair amount of evidence that this profession has tended to regard it as a closed profession to keep the numbers from getting too great. That is point one that I wanted to make.

The second one is that the hon. Minister mounted a political platform and made a little speech about how he is not going to indulge in regimentation. What, in effect, he is saying is that he refuses to face this problem of people who have not got adequate medical services, because he figures it is better not to have what he describes as regimentation, if facing up to this is going to get the medical services to these people in the outlying areas. I think he has a wrong set of priorities. I am not suggesting that we should have regimentation, but I would like to see this government do something more—as indeed other provinces have done more when they had to get people out into the hinterland of the province to assure adequate medical services—by way of incentives rather than regimentation.

We hear a lot about these incentives; where

are they? The problem with this government is that it is not regimenting but it is also doing precious little on incentives to have a better distribution of doctors. I think I am correct in saying the only thing the hon. Minister is doing, by way of these scholarships, is a minor alleviation of the problem. It may obligate a doctor, once he graduates, to spend a little time in an under-doctored area, but he usually flees it as quickly as that obligation has been met. It is, at best, picking at the problem instead of really coming to grips with it. Instead of making speeches about regimentation, I wish this hon. Minister would apply his capacities, of which he has more than the average on that side of the House, to coming up with some solution that will get doctors out into the under-doctored areas.

I want to go back to this chiropractic issue. The hon. Minister gave us a display of verbal footwork this afternoon which was really something to behold. Let us face the issue. The issue here is of a group that has not yet been accorded professional status, at least a professional status on a par with dentists and doctors. It is idle for the hon. Minister to say that he does not know how the public mind can confuse chiropractors with any of the other groups which come under The Drugless Practitioners Act. I suggest it is idle, because they are under the same Act; that is why they are going to be confused. If the hon. Minister is going to be logical and say there is no need for confusion because of the fact that they each have their own disciplinary body that lays down rules and regulations, then he should put the doctors and dentists under the same Act and he would say that there is no need for confusion.

I suggest we quit the political footwork and face up to the fact that here is a group that, beyond any shadow of doubt, has greater professional standards than some of the others under The Drugless Practitioners Act, and which is struggling against the vested interests of the medical profession to get some greater professional status. When the hon. member for Wentworth or the hon. member for Bruce misinterpreted the hon. Minister's comment as saying they had already been given professional status—they tried to put those words in his mouth—as a member of the medical profession he spat those words out in a hurry because he would have a little difficulty in going back among the medical profession—who up until now have taken this adamant stand that they are not going to let these imposters—and this is almost the phraseology they would use—get in as equal members of the healing arts team.

If we have moved at the level of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and if we have moved in other areas—I was very interested, for example, to learn that during the past year the medical co-ops across the province of Ontario, and there are some 30 or 35 of them, in the absence of an adequate plan on the part of this government, providing medical services for a good proportion of our people in the rural parts of the province—I think it is very interesting, and very much of a pioneering achievement, that the medical co-ops through their provincial federation have been able to sit down with the chiropractors and work out a proposal for using their services on a prepaid basis. I do not think it has actually been implemented but certainly they are moving in that direction.

Some time, sooner or later, the government has got to face up to this issue. I recognize the difficulties of the hon. Minister, particularly being a member of the medical profession, in being as forthright as perhaps he would want to be. I think he has been dealing with the facts and not getting his personal views in because he has to live with his fellow doctors. That was the second point that I wanted to deal with, Mr. Chairman.

The third one that I want to ask the hon. Minister a question on is with regard to item 15 in 701, registered nurses' association of Ontario to further nursing education as directed by the hon. Minister, \$5,000. I am interested in the whole field of nurses' education and training, and under the appropriate estimate we can deal with that; but I am a little curious to get some further elaboration as to exactly what this particular item in this estimate means.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's questions. In Great Britain, as I recall it, the doctors were the first to recognize the fact that they had underestimated the needs and were very apologetic about it. I think they went into a varied programme of recruitment to try to make up for the error they made. I am very happy to note that the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the deans of the medical schools in Ontario have been among the foremost and the most vigorous in pushing for the establishment of a new medical school in Ontario. Indeed, I believe the deans are pushing even for a second medical school and looking farther into the future.

I have not by any means sought to wash my hands, neither in fact nor by implication. Indeed, without any knowledge or without any legal authority, I got into this area and I

am still not sure on what ground I stand because I can find nothing in the historic references of our province to say that the Minister of Health has any right to take an active part in the establishment of a new medical school. I did speak three years ago, a short time after I became Minister of this department, to the then Prime Minister about the matter and I spoke to the present hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) about it. In both cases they gave me the green light to go ahead and carry on the preliminary discussions to the point where we would be ready to appear before the university affairs committee and discuss the mechanics of the establishment of a new medical and new dental college.

I am a little disappointed in my hon. friend from York South because I thought that we had provided some incentive. I do not look upon this bursary system as picking at the matter; it is an on-going thing. The budget this year is double what it was last year. Albeit we did not use it all last year; we hope to use the additional sum this year so that we can catch up.

It is quite true that I do not expect the graduate to stay more than his given time in the under-doctored areas. Indeed we would be very happy if each one carries out his stated return of service in that area. But when he steps out of it we hope to have another one ready to place in his stead and keep this an on-going programme. I believe that we will reach the place where we will be producing, by this bursary system, enough doctors.

There is, without a doubt, a time lag. We should have started this probably a little earlier, but this maldistribution has actually jumped on us in far less time than we had anticipated. Perhaps this again may be my fault, but I underestimated, like my colleagues in Britain, the need that does exist. We have to establish other incentives because there is not any doubt in my mind that there will be some areas so sparsely populated that they will not of themselves support a doctor.

We are already looking into that to see what further incentives are required. We are not prepared with a programme in this regard now. First of all we have not thought the whole matter through; secondly, we do not have the doctors to provide for those areas. I do sincerely hope that we will bring the problem through to a conclusion so that, when doctors are available, we will be able to answer that question, too.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I can serve any useful purpose by discussing chiropractors any longer. My own feeling is, Mr.

Chairman, that the average man on the street does not know whether I practise under an Act of Parliament or not. All he knows is that I am his doctor, or so-and-so is his doctor, just the same as this is his chiropractor. I do not think that the average patient cares or worries one iota.

I believe this sensitivity is in the minds of the chiropractors themselves. I have told them this on occasion and I shall continue to tell them, just as I am quite ready to tell my own colleagues, that many things that seem to loom large in their estimation, about which they seem to be hypersensitive, are really problems in their own minds and nobody else is bothering about them.

Mr. MacDonald: What sort of reaction does the hon. Minister get when he tells them that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are pretty reasonable fellows, just the same as chiropractors are. I would repeat, Mr. Chairman, since I have been Minister of Health we have not turned down one reasonable recommendation from the chiropractors, and I certainly have not been unreasonable because I do not pretend to know what chiropractic is or what it does.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, about item 15, this is an item which has been granted to the registered nurses' association for some years to assist them in their recruitment of students for nursing. Now, since the establishment of the college of nurses, and since recruitment will become the responsibility of the college of nurses, I would anticipate that this will likely be the last time this item will appear on the budget. The college will now take over the responsibility for recruitment and the registered nurses' association will no longer directly have that responsibility.

Mr. MacDonald: Once again, I do not want to pursue the chiropractic very much further but I have just this comment to make. For one fleeting moment the hon. Minister ceased to be an hon. Minister and became a doctor. He said: "I do not pretend to know what the chiropractic business is at all." Now as long as this is a fact—and I will take his own words—it is idle for him to go around and say to the chiropractors: "You should not have an inferiority complex, all you have to do is grow up and forget it."

They are being constantly reminded, day in and day out, that they are really not a full-fledged member of the team. The hon.

Minister himself, being a rather well read person who knows what is going on in the world, knows what the chiropractic business is. He just revealed that he shares the medical profession's attitude towards it. And therefore—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think, Mr. Chairman, I have to protest. The hon. member is doing what he is so well skilled in doing and so frequently does, putting words in my mouth.

Mr. MacDonald: I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, just before I leave this, if I was putting words in his mouth they were his words.

Just before I leave this—there is a factual point I would like to get clarified. The hon. Minister earlier said that the problem insofar as there is a remaining problem really lies with the solicitor for the chiropractors' association because he has not yet been able to work out the regulations. When he does the hon. Minister will be willing to proclaim them.

What is the reason for this delay? Is it simply a case of differences of opinion between the department and the organization?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, my solicitor assures me that it is not. For some reason, the profession's solicitor has not gotten them to us yet.

One set of regulations did come and I think there was a question raised by the registrar of regulations and we sent them back, I think it must be three months ago. I would not want to be held to that time, but it is some time ago that we discussed it with their solicitor. He came to the office, indeed, to discuss it with me. We have heard nothing from them since that time, but when they are brought forward and are satisfactory to the registrar of regulations, I have no reason to withhold them.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately we are dealing with a number of topics here, in succession and repeatedly, but I want to return to this business of bursaries again. The hon. Minister at one point talked about bursaries and said this is meeting the problem. In his next breath he said that they were going to consider other kinds of incentives, thereby conceding that the bursary programme is not meeting the whole need. I think quite frankly this is a fact, but I do not want to get into an argument with the hon. Minister. What I would like some elucidation on is how many people—am I correct that it is 10 bursaries a year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Twenty medical and 10 dental.

Mr. MacDonald: Twenty medical and 10 dental! What is the number of years that they are obligated to practise in the hinterland before they can move into Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: A year for a year! I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that this need not be the hinterland. Indeed, there was a town in my own riding, 50 miles from Toronto in the heart of Ontario, which for several years did not have a doctor and really needed one badly.

Mr. MacDonald: I will concede that, but that is really part of the hinterland. Anything outside of Toronto, by definition, is the hinterland.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the same kind of definition as the one which designates everybody a barbarian who is not a Greek.

An hon. member: Is the hon. member a barbarian or is he a Greek?

Mr. MacDonald: I am a barbarian because I am not a Greek.

Mr. Chairman, has any study been made of the effectiveness of these bursaries in terms of getting doctors to stay—if I may use the term again without being too provocative—in the hinterland or out in the under-doctored areas? For example, the hon. Minister made the comment that he fully expects them to come back as soon as their time lapse is gone, and it is year for year. So presumably that is what: five, six, seven years?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Four years!

Mr. MacDonald: Four years! Has there been any instance at all, for example, of a doctor having become enamoured sufficiently of the area in which he did the practising that he stayed there, instead of moving back into the over-doctored areas?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes. There have been some of the States doing this for some time and they are the less populated States, as would be expected. I think it would be fair to say that some have become enamoured and stayed. But families grow up and I suppose they want to get nearer the built-up areas to get the advantages of higher education for their children, Mr. Chairman, as so many of us do.

I can recall myself going out in the country with the intention of staying for a few years. But 20 years later I am still there and have

no intention of moving because it is a very pleasant life and a very satisfying life. Strangely enough I have two colleagues, both young men, who have done exactly the same thing. One has been with us ten years and the other eight now. So some of us do stay when we go out in the so-called hinterland. But we call it the heart of Ontario, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. Minister can some time work out the details of further incentives, because he himself has implied that it is necessary if we are going to meet the needs of the under-doctored areas. I think that there is a growing urgency for it if we are going to provide adequate medical services for all our people.

Mr. Chairman, the final question I would like to ask the hon. Minister is this—and this may be a difficult one for him to reply to and I concede that to him in advance: how much money is being made available, or being spent from public funds, on medical research?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is a fairly sizeable sum of money being spent on this. There is never enough money for research for some reason or another. I think most of us saw the article by Dean Hamilton in last week's *Toronto Globe and Mail's Weekend Magazine*—a very sound, well based article. From the province this year we will spend, between our own money and federal grants, \$4,151,000. Does the hon. member want to know what it is spent for or shall I put it on the record?

Mr. MacDonald: No, for my purpose at the moment I am particularly interested in the overall amount.

Now, if there was one thing in the hon. Minister's presentation of his estimates that I found disappointing—even more difficult to take upon further reflection—was his little political speech on the eve of an election that for the first time, in an unprecedented fashion, he had been able to present estimates that represented a drop. I think this was almost, if the hon. Minister will forgive me, an unforgivable approach.

There are so many areas throughout these estimates where clearly the need for more effort is desperately urgent. For the hon. Minister to come in and contend that his estimates were being dropped and almost to boast about it, I repeat, was a bit unforgivable. I think this is one thing.

Now the hon. Minister has said that the total money being spent on research is something like \$4.5 million. In earlier years when we have been discussing the estimates in the

House, for example on mental health, we have acknowledged that half of the people in our hospitals are there because of mental illness, and yet there was a tragically small amount of money being spent on mental health research.

Let me take the hon. Minister's own overall figure. I want to draw his attention to the fact that just a day or so ago we completed discussion of the estimates of The Department of Agriculture and in The Department of Agriculture, for plants and animals in the province of Ontario—I elicited this figure from the department so I would have it correct—we are spending approximately \$6 million in research.

The simple fact of the matter is that this government is spending \$6 million on research for plants and animals—and I have no objection to this being done—but for the human resources of the province, including the desperate loss arising from mental illness through half the patients in our hospitals, the hon. Minister comes and tells us that our total research is something like \$4.5 million.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is shameful. Indeed, people who are much more familiar with this field than I can pretend to be say that Canada's record, generally speaking, on medical research, or at least on the devoting of public funds for medical research, is not a very creditable one. Usually it is compared with the United States and we make the excuse we are a small country. This is not fair. Take other small countries, Mr. Chairman, much smaller countries than Canada, like Denmark and other Scandinavian countries and you will find that their efforts and the amount of public funds that they put into medical research have been much greater than ours on any proportional yardstick that you want to choose.

I want to say to the hon. Minister that I am deeply disappointed in him, as a vigorous, cocky little fighter with the Treasury Board, that he, like Tories, sooner or later succumbed to the blandishments of the Treasury Board and has not come in here and said, "I have failed to get what is necessary in so many areas, particularly this one in medical research." I know the hon. Minister cannot defend the proposition that we are spending \$4.5 million on medical research to meet the needs of human beings in this province, when we are spending \$6 million on research for plants and animals.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Chairman, I noticed in the estimates of this

year that there are no grants for the Ontario Heart Foundation. In the public accounts statement of 1962 you had \$111,999 but this year these seems to be no amount at all for the Ontario Heart Foundation. Is there a purpose?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we passed this in the supplementary estimates of the week before last—\$150,000.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I was caught up in this controversy of the chiropractors and then I lost the floor. I did not pursue it quite as far as I wanted to; I wanted to go back to the bursaries. Who determines what bursaries will be paid? Is it the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Health, or is it something that fits into the overall budget? In other words, who determines the amount of bursaries that will be given each year? Is it the responsibility of your department?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: You mean these bursaries mentioned in my estimates? We estimate the number we can award, the number of applications we hope to get, and then we ask the House for the money. This is what we did when we instituted this proceeding last year. I think the events have proven that we were within a reasonable figure. We will have a better idea this year, this being the second year of operation of the plan. But this is for medical and dental students only and is certainly with that selfish a motive that realizing there are areas in the province where they are needed we are using this as an incentive to get doctors for those areas.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to belabour it, because it has been well said before me, but I did receive several inquiries from people living in my area who were attending other colleges. I think the one we debated so well this afternoon, the Chiropractic College, is where this government determines they shall not have anything for bursaries. They rule it out completely. It seems to me somewhat unusual. I think it is indicative, as the hon. member for York South said, of the feeling of the hon. Minister.

These people do go to these colleges; they spend several years there attaining a standard; yet there is no assistance at all from the government. I think it is wrong. I think the government should either recognize them, or say they will not recognize them; but to make fish of one and flesh of the other simply because they choose a different profession is, in my opinion, wrong.

I think that the hon. Minister has said that the Workmen's Compensation Board now recognizes this as a responsible group of people. I am told that the insurance industry recognizes chiropractic services. Yet the government—and the hon. Minister, in particular, shows his feelings are as a doctor rather than as a man responsible for the citizens of this province. I am told that some two million people in Ontario have at one time or another made these services available to themselves. Surely, if this is the case, it is time we got rid of the bias, and maybe put a little bit of money aside to help students entering this profession. In a day and age where we are trying to encourage education at all levels, when we are trying to encourage our youth to advance themselves and prepare themselves for the years to come, I think it is no time for us to show bias, as particularly has been done in this department. I want that to be on the record, sir.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot let this go past. I do not know why the hon. member takes this tack. It certainly does not become him. He knows, by checking the historic records of our province, that none of these groups other than medicine or dentistry have ever been supported by the state in any way at all. Whether the day is coming or not, I do not know. I think it ill becomes the hon. member, sir, to attribute this to my personal bias. I have no bias for the chiropractors, against the chiropractors, or anyone else. I have my own personal opinions, but I strongly oppose any charge that I have allowed my personal feelings to sway my control or my direction of this department. I must repeat, sir, and place it on the record that it ill-becomes the hon. member to adopt this attitude.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I also have a great respect for the hon. Minister, and I say that publicly. But I would say this to him: Earlier in this debate, he even lumped together the hypnotists with this group. He made mention of this group, and if he tells me he has no bias I will accept the hon. Minister's word. But I say that it looks extremely suspicious to me when I am told that these people spend a total of 4,300 hours attaining the standards required of them. I think that he might take another look at the situation. Perhaps in the future, if he is still around, he will give consideration to making some assistance available for this particular group of people.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a

question with regard to dentistry. Quite a bit has been said about medical doctors, but we find that many towns and villages are certainly in need of dentists. They have been trying for quite a number of years, but have had no results in getting dentists to establish or set up business in these towns or villages. Would the hon. Minister enlighten me on how many dentists graduated in 1962, and how many dentists graduated in 1950 and 1955?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would not have that figure, and I could not get that figure, without asking the dental college for it—over which I have no control at all.

Mr. Spence: The hon. Minister could not give me any information. There is a real shortage of dentists.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is, and this is why we have introduced the ten dental bursaries a year—to try to do something by way of incentive to get dentists to practise in the areas where their services are badly needed.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to follow up with what I think the hon. Minister said about the way that doctors and dentists are proportioned around the province.

The hon. Minister said, and quite rightly, that he is not going to force people to go and live in one area or another. He said his inducement is through these bursaries. But it seems to me that we could take a lead from the approach of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) in connection with inducements. I am thinking of inducement to underdeveloped areas, or whatever he wants to call them, in connection with getting industry.

I stress that the doctors themselves on the whole are not as concerned about their business area as they are about medical practice. But I would feel that in the hon. Minister's mind, I am sure, is a dream or an ideal of the proportion of medical services throughout the province for the benefit of all the people. I would think that he probably has in his mind the idea of, perhaps, clinics in outlying areas; that is an efficient and able way for doctors to get some free time, but principally to make the most use of their own services to the people.

He has an idea of clinics, and then an idea perhaps of central hospitals, of research facilities, to bolster these up, to have the proportion carefully arranged. I would feel that there are methods as well as tax inducements

—and I say this really without deep thought because it would be a problem that would have to be worked out very closely—but there must be ways of encouraging doctors and dentists to go into underdeveloped areas similar to that of encouraging businesses.

I would also think that in some cases a young doctor or dentist may not want to go out into these areas because there are not the facilities available for research, up-to-date hospitals, and so on. I would hope that you would have, sir, some kind of overall plan in connection with the location of hospitals, of medical schools, in order that this will encourage a distribution of not only doctors but dentists.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has brought up a point that is part of our planning, the establishment, not as a government-sponsored matter, but in co-operation with communities, of clinics. Many communities have already done this, built a house and clinic for the doctor as an inducement and either rented it to him or given it to him on a lease-purchase basis. This has worked out very well in many parts of the province. The areas where we believe doctors will be needed are being marked out in the province with the intention of discussing these possibilities with either the municipal authorities or service clubs or interested groups in the area, to the end that we might get them involved and help them provide medical attention for themselves.

I would ask my hon. friend to separate research from those things. The doctor who goes out to practise is not going into research. If the doctor is going into research he is going to stay in a teaching centre, so that it is quite a different thing; and, while we certainly need research workers, I have not got to the point yet where I feel that I can step far enough to think of getting adequate research personnel.

The matter of the hospitals, of course, is one that is very important, and the community hospital is an important facility in such areas as we are thinking of. As long as good, well-equipped, community hospitals are situated within reasonable distance of the doctor's office, then he can expect to practise a very high quality of medicine. This is all part of our planning and thinking and the hospital services commission has directed its efforts to that end over the past four years, so that no one will be too far separated from adequate modern hospital facilities.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate very much the answers from the hon. Minister. Certainly I

am not in any position, as a layman, to talk about research. I was thinking, sir, of Princess Margaret hospital and the fact that there is research done there, I understand, on patients coming in, in the study of cancer causes right in the field, right in the hospital. There is a relationship between this research and that at the university. A similar association should be developed in the field of, say, mental retardation and mental illness to that with hospital and university in the study of cancer. What the hon. Minister is meaning is that he is not going to have a research institute up in Barry's Bay or somewhere. I say that with no reflection on Barry's Bay, for my hon. friend is here from Barry's Bay. But it might be allocated where there is more need.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question under vote 701, item 24, alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation, \$1,500,000. We read a great deal, Mr. Chairman, about the treating of drug addicts these days in the papers by giving them free drugs and we are told this has been very successful in England. But on reading, we understand that the drug addiction in England is a little bit different than in Canada in that they are mostly addicted to morphine rather than to heroin, as here in Canada.

I happened to pick an editorial out of the *Toronto Globe and Mail* today entitled, "A new approach to addiction". It refers to a meeting, sponsored by this foundation in Niagara Falls recently, whereby Mr. R. E. Curran, the legal adviser to The Department of National Health and Welfare, interpreted The Narcotics Control Act of 1961 as permitting doctors to prescribe narcotics for addicts under treatment within the limits of good medical practice in an effort to achieve gradual withdrawal. This is sort of a little different view to the legislation we have had in this country up until now and perhaps tends to be a little more in line with the British philosophy of drug addiction rather than to the United States view.

Now that the addiction foundation is working in this area I would like to ask the hon. Minister a few questions.

1. If it is working satisfactorily in this area, would the hon. Minister tell us if this method has proved successful, and if so will the foundation employ it here? And perhaps coupled with that double question, has the foundation other methods or does it plan any study or research to develop other methods?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of very great interest at the present

time because just within the last week or two it has been very much before the public eye. Indeed, we had one of the world's noted authorities visit us here, indeed visit this building and meet us here just last week, in the person of Lady Frankau. She has perhaps done more progressive work in this area than any of her colleagues.

Lady Frankau opened our eyes in many ways. As the hon. member has pointed out, she made clear to us that there is not any British system, that this is a fallacious idea that is abroad in Canada and other parts of the world, that her method is not to be construed as the British system as such. She has approached this in what she believes, and what many of us agree with her, is, a very common sense manner, within the framework of the law and within the framework of medical practice.

I think the British people have been looking upon drug addiction as an illness more than we have until recently. As they have looked on it for some years as an illness we have been prone to look upon it as a crime. I must admit that when I came to the city—you know when we young boys get off the farm and get into difficulty—I found that as a practitioner I had treated drug addicts very much in the way, although not with the ability, that Lady Frankau had. I felt that as a physician I had the right to prescribe narcotics for a patient who was an addict, and have done that in practice. I can say I have done it because apparently I was within the law; but when I came to Toronto I found all of a sudden that I had been practising outside of the law albeit the narcotics division at Ottawa knew what I was doing.

However, we know now, on the authority of one of the legal advisers of the narcotics division, that this is permissible in Canada and in Ontario. The addiction foundation here, while it was given the right a year ago to go into this area, has spent the last year in collating research material it had and in acquiring the staff for this field because this calls for a person with particular training. There are not very many of them here but they have got the staff now and this was one of the reasons they invited Lady Frankau here, so that they could get the benefit of her experience, and get her opinions on what we were doing and how we were approaching this, prior to the foundation's getting into the area.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the foundation intends to try this out and that it also intends to continue its research to see if new, different, and other methods can be

found. From the increase in the budget it will be found that this is sizeable; nearly \$.5 million increase this year. The greater part of this will be devoted to the expansion of treatment centres, not the least of which will be in this area of treating drug addicts.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister: How will people be referred to this clinic?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: By the doctors, by the hospitals, or by any other agency. Any agency which has been in the habit of referring any of these people to different places will still do so—the foundation is prepared to accept patients referred from any one.

Mr. Chairman: Vote carried?

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford): Mr. Chairman, on this same vote, item 24, last year, I noticed that the estimate was \$790,000 and the department spent \$785,000. This year the amount is \$1.5 million for the alcoholics foundation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the budget last year was \$1,065,000.

Mr. Gordon: But in the public accounts—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That was the year before, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gordon: Well, there is \$1.5 million this year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Perhaps the hon. member will recall, Mr. Chairman, that there was a very sizeable increase for education last year and that was the first phase of a three-year programme. The addition for education this year is something on the order of \$85,000. According to a recommendation of a plan which was approved last year there will be a further increase for education next year.

Mr. Gordon: This is for alcoholics! I want to speak for just a moment on a serious situation in connection with alcoholics and a group of people for whom I do not think much has been done. I have in my hand here a news item of January 2, following New Year's day, and the headline is:

UNINVITED, UNWANTED TIPPLERS MAR
NEW YEAR'S DAY RECEPTIONS

In almost every instance the crowd that showed up at the open house—

I am talking about the military clubs, the messes, the veterans clubs and so on, they

have open house every New Year's day; and it says:

—in almost every instance the crowd that showed up at the open house was liberally laced with the social derelict known as the "wino" or the "rubby" and as the New Year celebrants made the traditional rounds the winos followed where the punch was flowing free—

An hon. member: They followed a natural instinct.

Mr. Gordon: I continue to quote the article:

Despite the infringements of the unshaven and unsteady drunkard the veterans carried on the observance of the New Year's ritual, undaunted as they were in the wartime campaigns which they recalled or forgot.

Now these are called alxies, they are winos, they are rubbies and nobody wants them. You have them in every city, in every town. They are derelicts, they are on the scrap heap. In other words, they are the finished products of the booze business.

They were at one time very fine citizens. I know one in Brantford who, if he was not in this situation, would be earning \$2.50 as a steamfitter, a plumber, but today he is just a waster. They sleep under the stars in the summer time and any vacant building, wherever they can get, and no one seems to want any part of them. You see them on the streets during the day, here and there. Nobody wants them, as I say. They get into jail once in a while and are taken care of there.

But coming back to this alcoholics foundation, what can be done for these people? I know that the alcoholic who has money, or his people have money, can come under this vote. But these people have nothing. As I say, they are bums, shall we say, and they are called alxies and winos and rubby-dubs and they are fluffed off like that, you see.

Something should be done for these people. Take them off the streets and take them somewhere so they can be dried out or fitted for some position where they would come back in society which is their rightful place, I would say.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has tackled a problem that has plagued humanity for a long time; I suppose ever since mankind tasted the juice of the grape it has plagued us and puzzled us.

They may be derelicts, as my hon. friend has stated, but they are not altogether neglected. The first misconception I should

clear up is that this foundation is set up to treat those people. This foundation is not set up to treat the alcoholic who has money. We hope by our educational campaign to get at the man who is still able to carry on his job, and by education and by treatment at that stage prevent him from reaching the point where he is a wino, rubby-dub, and alkie, and all the rest of it.

But this man is welcomed at the clinic, is welcomed for treatment just the same as anybody else; but of course he must seek out the treatment. I have to point out to you, sir, that we do not go out looking for them, that is quite true. The physician does not go out looking for his patients—maybe we should, I do not know—but they are not neglected. There are organizations which have specialized in this: for instance, the Salvation Army have the Harbour Light whose operations come under The Department of Public Welfare; there is the Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic whose operations come under The Department of Reform Institutions.

Rehabilitation of these people has been tried, sir. In some cases, in some very few cases, it is successful; but the successes are not notable. If we can get them in time, as is the case in so many diseases, we can usually do something about it.

We hope that we are beginning to make a show in our attempt to end the problem and that there will be fewer of these and that the backlog that now exists will not carry on but that steadily, as we progress with our work through this clinic and similar clinics, we will prevent others from getting into the category of which you have spoken so eloquently.

I cannot really say anything more forthright about them than that, except to emphasize again that they are not turned away from our clinic.

Mr. Gordon: Mr. Chairman, these men that I speak of, I know them by seeing them around so often and if I miss one or two, probably when he comes around to see if we can give him something he will say that he has been on vacation for 30 days! Of course you know what that means.

I was at the funeral not too long ago of one of these chaps, a very fine fellow but he was just, as I say, a derelict. He had not worked for years, just because he had this disease of alcoholism. They are a peculiar kind, these people. They seem to just want a certain kind of drink—it is poison, what they get, that is what I am told, they will drink anything.

No one seems to bother with them. They are in our streets every day; you see them. When they go to welfare, as soon as the welfare administrator gets one whiff, why they are out, they cannot get any welfare, they have to just go and beg what they can get. I think a good look should be taken at this situation, to get these people off the streets and into some institution where they can be rehabilitated.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, may I just say one word on this subject. I was very closely connected with Alcoholics Anonymous for some time, also the projects that were being instituted in this province, and I think we have a very creditable record. We have some very famous men who are looking after this institution, one, I might say, who is with us this afternoon in the person of Mr. Archibald, who will be up in the Lakehead shortly to open a new centre in that area.

The hon. member for Brantford I think is talking about what I call the periodic drunk. He is not the big problem that the alcoholic is. Remember, the alcoholic is not confined to men who are uneducated. It is a problem among the highly educated skilled men and women and it is a tremendous problem.

I have heard—I do not know how true it is—that there are some 35,000 alcoholics in the city of Toronto. Now that is a statement I have heard, whether it is true or not I do not know.

I have been quite close to this problem for some years during my term as Minister of Reform Institutions, and I would like to tell the hon. members that there have been great strides made in the treatment of this disease, because it is a disease. Any man who is an alcoholic tries his best to control it, but that control is often beyond himself.

Great strides, as I say, have been made, Mr. Chairman, and I want to compliment the hon. Minister's department and The Department of Reform Institutions for the work they are doing. The hon. Minister mentioned the Alex G. Brown Clinic, Mimico, and other clinics here that this government helps, and I think that they are making an indentation in this terrific problem which concerns us all. But it is not only the periodic drunk who is the problem; it is very often top men in business who have lost control through alcohol and the only source of successful treatment seems to me, from my observations, to be Alcoholics Anonymous, where they ask a higher power than themselves to assist them in controlling or giving up this vicious habit.

But the hon. Minister is making strides, and I would like to make that as a public statement because I have seen an awful lot of it in my years with The Department of Reform Institutions. The Department of Health and the hon. Minister have been of great help and as I mentioned, Mr. Archibald's department too—which comes under The Department of Health—is making a great contribution in this worthwhile work, which we all hope will save so many lives who are the breadwinners of families in this province. It is deplorable to see alcoholism taking the toll it does.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on this vote I listened to the hon. Minister's introductory remarks and there was very little reference in them to the problem of alcoholism and the treatment of alcoholics.

I think it was two years ago in this House that we had a rather full and thorough debate—I do not propose to speak at any great length on this point now, but there were complaints from this side of the House, I think from myself, about the capacity in the Brown Clinic, the number of beds that were there. I think the hon. Minister who has just spoken perhaps made a slip of the tongue when he said the Brown Clinic and Mimico—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: And the Bell.

Mr. Singer: Yes, the Brown Clinic is at Mimico, the Bell Clinic is a privately run foundation. I would have hoped the hon. Minister would have told us about increased bed capacity, the number of treatments, the number of cures, the progress that has been made.

The other thing that was talked about at some length when this matter was debated a few years ago, was the revision of procedures in the criminal courts. I think it is an opinion generally shared on all sides of the House that magistrates have a tendency to send the people, that the hon. member for Brantford was talking about, off for ten days as they appear regularly. This really does not do anything except clog up our jails and send the man out in ten days' time to continue on with the same disease that he had. Efforts were made by amendments to one of the Acts to give the magistrates further power. I think this was a good idea in its concept, but I have not noticed any statistics that indicated that magistrates have taken advantage of this.

I would have hoped that the hon. Minister, through his introductory remarks or perhaps now, can tell us whether this has been successful. I suspect it has not been and that

the magistrates are continuing to say, "\$10 or ten days," and the majority of these derelicts are going off, after they have been out on a binge, to spend their ten days; and out they come after ten days, just the same as they were when they went in, ready as soon as they get a few more pennies together to go off on their next binge. I would like to see, with the additional monies being expended, some progress reported. I would like to hope that we are making some progress in this and I hope the hon. Minister can give us some more information on it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I was looking up *Hansard* and I did deal with this before in the Throne debate. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Woodbine accused me of repeating the same speech. I thought I had kept the subjects very separate. Indeed, before Christmas I dealt with the cancer foundation and the alcoholism foundation almost exclusively and only touched on a very few general matters pertaining to my department. But I did give a fairly complete account of it there.

However, I did not say anything about this matter that the last hon. member spoke about because this does not come within my purview at all. This is a matter between the hon. Attorney-General, the courts and The Department of Reform Institutions. The foundation does not pretend to operate in this field at all. When the man is discharged from the Alex G. Brown, or any of the other clinics of The Department of Reform Institutions, if he is referred to the foundation, by all means we will continue supervision over him, and we will continue to help him on an out-patient basis where most of our work is done.

The hon. member spoke about beds and this is an error into which I think most of us fall. I myself had fallen into the error until I knew a little bit more about the business. A bed is not really an essential thing for the alcoholic for a very great part of his time. Once he is dried out, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member for Brantford put it, he does not need a bed. He can very well be carried along on an out-patient basis, and this is something that Lady Frankau has found very applicable. She was in the area of treating alcoholics as well as drug addicts, and what she has found in her very great and rich experience is that the idea is to get the patient working as quickly as possible, and indeed working before the problem is all solved. One of the greatest needs the patient has is to have redeveloped in him or her a sense of responsibility.

While we do not—I repeat—while the foundation does not deal primarily in those cases that come through the courts, they will take them after they have been released from the jurisdiction of the courts or reform institutions or penitentiaries and carry on with the work if that is necessary. But the great area that the foundation is concerned about is that much larger segment of the population, the man or woman still quite able to carry on normal living but who has reached the point where he or she is getting very much concerned about the grip that alcohol has taken on him or her. There is where the foundation does its biggest work.

That is really the reason for the being of the foundation, because this is the field that troubles us the most. The hon. member for Brantford spoke about the man who today might well be in a position of paying him \$2 and something an hour, I believe he said. These are the men and women we are trying to save, if I may use the word in a different connotation. We are trying to treat them to the end that they will not slip beyond the place where they now have reached. Much of our educational activity is directed to that end. Indeed, we have close liaison with many of the larger industries and many of the larger commercial organizations, where they have adopted the plans and programmes instituted by the alcohol addiction foundation and have found very great success. I am sorry that I cannot give the hon. member figures about the results. I am quite sure I could get those figures for him and would be very pleased to make them available to him.

Mr. Singer: I would like to see them.

I want to return again to this question of split jurisdiction. So often in affairs of government we get something that does not fit foursquare within the walls of one hon. Minister's jurisdiction but falls over into the department of another or another one or two. Without going into this matter at great length—we went into it, I think, if my memory serves me correctly, a few years ago when the Attorney-General of the day brought forward a bill and it concerned Reform Institutions as well. But surely there should be some sort of co-ordination for these people who get the \$10 or ten days regularly? Surely some of the money we spend out of the revenues—I do not know whether it should come from this hon. Minister's monies or not, but from some department. There should be a working together, a melding of cures and treatments, and some better effort should be made to redeem some of these people who

get into this treadmill of magistrates courts, and the \$10-or-ten-day business.

Again, this was touched on when the hon. Attorney-General's estimates were up; there was a general condemnation of the character of our magistrates court and some of the things that happen in them; the lack of facilities, the lack of time for the magistrates to really consider some of the people that come before them. But so far as alcoholics are concerned, and these people who are perhaps down at the bottom of the field, these people who come regularly before magistrates court, I would hope that the hon. Minister of Health would be able to work out something with his colleagues to get some of this money he is asking for used for the treatment of these people.

It is a shame that these men get into this treadmill, and there is no way for them to get off until they die. Nobody has any interest in them. The police pick them up and throw them in the cooler, and in the morning they come before the magistrate—"\$10 or ten days." They have not got a penny in their pocket by this time, so back they go. They come out in ten days' time and, when they have a few dollars together again, another bottle of wine and back they go again when the policeman sees them next time.

I think the hon. Minister of Health should be able to work with his colleagues to do something for this very bad group of derelicts that we have in the community.

Mr. Thompson: My question is in connection with the alcoholics foundation. I was interested in the remarks of the hon. Minister of Mines about 30,000 to 40,000 alcoholics in Toronto. I realize that the bed space is not the most important aspect in the treatment, but I wonder, in the foundation programme of the clinic in Toronto whether you can tell us what the bed space is, whether you can give us some indication of the number of cases that are carried? I am thinking of comparing your alcoholic clinic in Toronto with, say, the Bell clinic in proportion to staff, whether you have more staff per patient or less staff. Is the director on a full time basis? I presume he is a psychiatrist. Does he do private practice outside of his regular duties? If he does private practice, how can he be doing sufficient community interpretation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The present number of beds in the hospital that the foundation has under its care is only 15. But with the new building proposed, for which the land has been assembled and which we hope will be

started this year, the proposed bed space will be 60 for alcoholics and I believe ten for drug addicts.

I am just getting the information about the case load, and about the staff.

The one psychiatrist is on full time and certain staff are on a sessional basis. The ancillary staff and the other disciplines are mostly on a full time basis, but we also employ them on a sessional basis as well, as the need demands it.

In the outlying clinics, of course, one of the areas in which the foundation has been very active has been in the training of professional staff so that they will—outside, privately practising professional staff that is—so that they will be familiar with the methods of dealing with these people. This has been a very active phase of their operation and fairly sizeable numbers of professional people have gone for special courses. The medical profession, through the college of general practice, has co-operated with the foundation in setting up seminars for general practitioners, who in many cases are the first professional people to see the alcoholic. Indeed, often times the family physician sees this problem steadily growing and steadily creeping up on the patient and heretofore has been in the position of not being very well equipped, from his own knowledge or experience, to deal with this. Now these courses have been set up by the foundation, through the co-operation of the college of general practice, we hope to be able to train more family physicians in recognizing the signs and taking the first steps to deal with them.

The case load, I am advised by the director, is 1,000 per year more or less, not an exact 1,000. The total staff on the treatment side: five medical doctors, two psychiatrists, three general physicians part time, five social workers, eight nurses and two psychologists.

Mr. Thompson: I asked this question because I have had occasion myself to refer someone to this clinic. I have been informed by this person's private doctor "You will not get into that place because there will be a long waiting list." I would think this is perfectly understandable in view of the fact there are about 30,000 alcoholics.

I would think the alcoholic needs bed service initially, until you start the further therapeutic treatment. If you only have 14 beds, it would seem to me that the real need is to expand—I think there is a luxury basis in the treatment of alcohol, that if you have money you can go to the private clinics. It gets back again to the points of the hon.

member for Brantford and the hon. member for York Centre: if you do not have money then you join the queue to get into your provincial foundation.

I congratulate you on starting this, but I would hope it would grow.

There are the figures of other countries. I know for example in Norway they have something like 40,000 which are run by the government, I understand with less alcoholics than we have in this country.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister without Portfolio): That is not true!

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, is it not true? What is the figure? I am taking this figure from memory and I might be inaccurate to some extent. We can check on it. Do you have the figures?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The known number of alcoholics?

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry. I had stated Norway. I have read about it but taken it from the top of my head. The hon. Minister from St. Andrews tells me I am not accurate. I was saying that they have something like 4,000?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Four hundred.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry. I do feel you are going to extend your bed space and I think there is a need for this. I am sure you realize it and I congratulate you in anticipation of extending the bed space.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is quite right about the waiting list, although it is not quite as long as is quite often said. It is three to four months, but we should point out very clearly that this is not the only clinic dealing with this problem.

Our admissions at the Ontario hospitals in 1960, the last figure available here, is 557 alcoholics for treatment. Of course the alcoholic, when is acutely ill, is really a seriously sick patient who does need the services of an alcoholism clinic as much as he needs the services of a general hospital and a family physician.

He is a seriously sick man organically. The great problem then is to get him over his acute phase, or the phase of acute illness, which is very very serious. Then when that is over—in four days, a week, or 10 days, something like that—he is prepared to go to the clinic. But he may not then any longer

need the bed. He may be quite adequately handled and sustained, and in his own personal interests perhaps better sustained, through the out-patient department if the staff are able to develop in him a great enough sense of responsibility that he is able to go back to work. If we can get him working so that he does not have time to devote to drinking, then perhaps we have taken him over the hump, so to speak, to use a rather poor word, while carrying on his treatment on an out-patient basis.

Some of the Scandinavian countries have done a great deal in this work. We had on our staff, I believe he is on loan to someone now, Dr. Jellinek, a world famous authority. I have to say with a good deal of pride, the greater number of our staff are people of world repute in this area. Indeed I think in this House last year I quoted from the World Health Organization a statement which certainly indicated that WHO holds the Ontario foundation in very high repute indeed.

Dr. Jellinek was not impressed in great measure with what is being done in the Scandinavian countries. That may be an inaccurate assessment of his feeling, but this is how I interpreted what he wrote and what he said to me or more than one occasion. I am not boasting, or at least I am not making a point of boasting about what we are doing here. We are doing the best we know how at the present time, always aiming to do a little better, recognizing the while that the problem is an acute one and needs all the attention we can give it.

The director of the foundation tells me that this long waiting list has been causing them a very great deal of trouble and has been the object of a research project now for intense study over the past two years. They are prepared now to make recommendations which we feel will be of some use to them.

You will also recall that in my remarks at the outset I stated that they had opened a branch at the Lakehead and planned to open three satellite clinics, if you will, if I may use that word, during this ensuing year. They have a five-year plan of development now, with the greater part of their efforts now directed toward treatment.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I am pursuing this, but I know this is something of great importance across this province. The hon. Minister has been doing a great number of forward-looking things, in my opinion, and I want to congratulate him again.

You read in the paper in connection with alcoholics a suggestion that perhaps there is a physical aspect to this alcoholism which could be looked into. Of course I am in no way a medical person but is such research being done? You find that there are drugs being used for the alcoholic such as Antabuse or Temposil which are not basically to get the man to stop drinking himself but at least act as a deterrent. I am wondering if the foundation is doing physical studies in connection with alcohol, and if such studies are co-ordinated with others across the world?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I will have to wait for an answer to that question, but I would say in the meantime that the foundation, of course, was very prominent in the development of one of the drugs which has been acclaimed as among the most useful that have been used in the control of the treatment of the alcoholic. I am not positive of my facts until I get this, but it seems to run in my mind that it was this LSI that was banned a little while ago, much to our chagrin because, as I said in this House just before the Christmas recess, I think we need to take a very long sober second look at this business of banning drugs just because we run into difficulty. They should not be completely banned but should be left in the hands of those who are skilled and trained in their use.

The foundation again has done a good deal of original research work in this. I am not in a position, either by training, knowledge or experience, to outline these projects. I can get the projects for the hon. members if that be desired, but they have been in the forefront of producing some of the most original research work undertaken in this area of alcoholism.

I am advised that the physical basis of alcoholism is now being studied in the university laboratories as a project under the foundation. LSD is the name of the drug—I thought it had something to do with pounds, shillings and pence—which is being studied. And Temposil was invented, if I may use that word—it is not a good word, it was developed by the foundation. Temposil is one of the drugs that followed, if you will, Antabuse. It was developed by the staff of the foundation here in Ontario, and is being widely used in the treatment and control of alcoholism.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on item 15, concerning the nurses, I would like to refer the hon. Minister to an article that appeared in the February, 1963, issue of the *Canadian*

Hospital Journal, when it was reported in that journal that Dr. Dymond had decided to put his signature to only ten of the 38 regulations prepared under The College of Nurses Act. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the nurses have been attempting to get more control of their own profession, much in the way that the doctors and lawyers have, and I was wondering if the hon. Minister would comment if that article is true, that he has only given his assent to ten of the 38 regulations that were proposed for that Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the article is perfectly true; but there was nothing sinister in the Minister's refusing to sign the remainder of the regulations. First of all, may I advise my hon. friend that the nurses have not been under the control of the doctors. I do not know whether they have been under the control of the lawyers but I would say to the lawyers here that, if the nurses have been under their control, they were very stupid girls and I do not think, from my knowledge of nurses, that they can be dubbed as such.

Mr. Trotter: No, no. I think I am misunderstood. I said they wanted to control their own profession much in the same way that doctors control theirs, and lawyers control their through the Law Society.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman. I misunderstood my hon. friend. It is quite true and I think it should be borne in mind that I, as the present Minister of Health, introduced that authority into this House and had the legislation passed. Indeed I proposed it to them, and it was opposed by them to begin with; although they came around, as the sensible girls that they are, and saw that it was a good proposition. We did reject some regulations, not because we intend to continue to reject them but because we did not feel that the provisional board should take it upon itself to write the regulations which would control the profession for all time.

We felt that if the first elected board, elected by their own members, proposed the regulations to us, they would be on far sounder ground. With this in mind we asked them to hold out regulations that did not have to be passed immediately. But the nurses, as of January 1 this year, are really controlling their own profession. The regulations that we did not consent to a few weeks ago, were those dealing with education, discipline and registration, and they will be dealt with as soon as they are passed by the duly

elected board set up by the nurses themselves to govern their own profession.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the 38 regulations were, I have not got them in front of me; but I know that as a result of the rejection of them, the hon. Minister not signing all 38, the impression is around, at least in part of the nursing profession, that the hon. Minister is changing some of his views and is giving way to the Ontario Hospital Association to such an extent that the nurses are still going to be considered cheap labour.

I think the nurses have wanted to put teeth into the regulations so that they would eventually get higher pay and, in the regulations, not be regarded as sort of cheap labour. The result of his refusing to sign—this I do not know to what extent this is in the nursing profession, it is considerable in any event—but the fact still remains that the hospitals tend to use a nurse as cheap labour. I certainly think this should be borne in mind because such a large number of our nurses head south.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend is quite misinformed. I would like to point out to him now that I am quite certain from my dealings with the nurses that they have far more confidence in me than my hon. friend apparently has.

First of all, the college of nurses has nothing to do with setting rates of pay for nurses. This is one of the reasons why I insisted that the regulation of the profession should be in the hands of a college of nurses rather than in the hands of the association. Among other things, if it so chooses, it will be the association's business to set rates of pay and therefore the college will have nothing to do with that whatsoever. The college, again I repeat, sir, and the provisional board know why we withdrew these regulations and did not give our consent, and I can assure this House, through you, that the regulations will be dealt with when they are proposed to us by the board set up by the nurses themselves.

Indeed, it is quite possible that they will be approved before that if I am assured that this has the backing of the whole of the nursing profession. I have not changed my mind. There are certain areas of difference between the hospital authorities, the people who are charged with the responsibility of providing the schools of nursing and the college of nurses. The college of nurses is not very strong without the co-operation of the hospitals and their training schools.

There are points at issue which I think are of great enough importance to be talked over, and probably some compromise reached, but this is a matter that is in hand now between the nurses' solicitors, the representatives of the hospital schools of nursing, and my legal staff in the department. But there is nothing sinister or underhanded or anything of which we need be ashamed in our refusal to recognize or recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council all of the regulations.

Mr. Trotter: I am awfully glad to hear that, because I think a lot of the nurses admire the hon. Minister. One nurse said that he was a dear, sweet boy but he was being misled by the hospital association, so I hope it is not true that you are being misled.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am neither a dear, sweet boy nor misled by the hospital association —

Mr. Trotter: I hope you are a—

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): We never thought you were dear and sweet, but we were concerned about you being misled.

Mr. Trotter: In any event we hope that the other 28 regulations under The Nurses Act are forthcoming in the near future.

Under the first vote, there is one other item, that having to do with occupational therapy. I believe the vote is for \$5,000, but I am not sure of the number—sorry, it is item 19. I cannot understand, Mr. Chairman, why this government treats occupational therapy in such a niggardly fashion. We read articles in the newspapers of how well patients can be treated if they have the proper care. Still I believe there are about two to four occupational therapists in one hospital here in Toronto where there are 1,600 patients. I know of one doctor, who is not in the employ of the government now, who once told me he could get rid of half of his ward and put them out working as relatively cured people if he had enough occupational therapists. I was wondering if the hon. Minister could give us any reason why this area of his department seems to be neglected year after year, because \$5,000 does not go very far today.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is not an area of my department. This is a grant given to a body, given to an association to help them. Because of the fact that we use a good many occupational therapists in our Ontario hospitals, we give them this grant, a small grant of \$5,000 a year, to help them in their efforts

to enhance the profession. It helps them with recruitment efforts very much in the same way as we give the \$5,000 grant to the RNAO.

Mr. Trotter: I know it is a grant, but do you not think if the grant was larger it would assist this association in getting more recruits? This, to me, is a matter of saving the taxpayer the money. If you have enough trained help to cure these people that are ill, put them back on the street earning money and paying taxes, in the long run you are saving the taxpayer money by helping and giving larger grants, because with \$5,000 the association of occupational therapists are not going to get very many recruits.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend is confusing occupational therapy with physio-therapy. In any general hospital, a physio-therapist is the important one in my mind. The occupational therapist is very useful in a chronic setting, such as our Ontario hospitals. We have nothing to signify that a larger grant would help them to increase their numbers in any way.

This is a university course and I would presume, as university students, they would be eligible for the usual scholarships, bursaries and student aid loans that are available to any graduates of the university course. This has nothing to do with the profession itself; this is given to the association—again, the socio-economic arm of the profession—to help it enhance the quality of its profession. But it has nothing to do with training at all.

We, ourselves, run a course of training for occupational therapy assistants, who are used on our own staff, in our own hospitals. Again, I repeat, it is because of the fact that we have 38 registered occupational therapists on the staff of the Ontario hospitals that we feel this very small grant is helpful to us to encourage others to come and join our staff. It has nothing to do with education.

Mr. Trotter: I do not care if the government does the training or someone else does the training for you, you are still awfully short of occupational therapists. I have not got them confused with anybody else, as I understand what some of the experts in this field tell me. It is true when you talk to experts they vary how important various fields are, but whether occupational therapy is the most important part or just a segment of it, at least it is very important.

I have been told that if there were more of these people available the stay in hospital

of patients would be much shorter, especially if these new patients were reached as soon as possible. I feel the government is certainly falling behind in this field. I still think the grant is far too small.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a few questions on item 37, grant to the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation.

Back last summer the hon. Minister, speaking to a Canadian Cancer Society fund drive in the city of Niagara Falls, mentioned the apparent connection between smoking and lung cancer. From some of these statements—granted the hon. Minister does not mention that there is actually a connection between the two—but an apparent connection exists.

I have run surveys myself among students of all five grades in a secondary school and I have found that the number of smokers is approximately one out of two in Grade 9, whereas in Grade 13 it is down to one out of three. To me the education might be of major importance right at the public school level, before the student enters the secondary school. Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to publicize this fact that there is an apparent connection between smoking and lung cancer as a warning to elementary school students of the province?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, my department is, at present, in conversation with The Department of Education to the end that we may propose a rewriting of the health education that is given to our students in Ontario emphasizing this very fact.

I do not think it would do one bit of good for my department just to start an advertising campaign *per se*. This has been widely advertised. The regrettable thing is that so often when doctors talk about this, they talk about it dangling a cigarette from the corner of their mouth. This is not very consistent and, in spite of all that has been written, heard and spoken about the apparent relationship between cigarette smoking and carcinoma of the lung, those who should know better still smoke very widely. We are, however, concerned about children and directing our efforts to the end that we may do everything possible to educate them that there is a danger and that they should be aware of it.

Mr. Newman: Will the hon. Minister direct the information now to the elementary school level, or to the secondary school level?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am really not in any position to tell you that until the whole matter has been discussed between the experts

in Education and the experts in my department.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the hon. Minister that he not neglect the elementary school because it is probably there where they first should be made aware of any danger, if there is danger. It is apparently a little too late when they do get into the secondary school because they have already started the practice and it is most difficult, the same as in alcoholism, to convince the youngster that he should be getting rid of the so-called cancer stick.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I shall pay attention to that.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I could not emphasize that point which my hon. colleague has just mentioned more strongly, because I do happen to know that in the elementary school there has been a definite increase among the pupils to start smoking. In fact you find them now even in Grades 3 and 4. Therefore, I would say that if The Department of Education is going to do something, I would say to start right there at the elementary level.

Along the same line of this grant to the Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, I would say that I have read the reports in regard to cancer of the hon. Minister's third annual report for the year 1962. I do not find anywhere in the report whether there has been progress made in cancer research; in other words, whether—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The report of the Cancer Research and Treatment Foundation is a separate report and will be tabled in the House. It comes directly from the foundation.

Mr. Belanger: Whether it is on the increase or whether it is on the decrease?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There will be a report on the cancer research foundation alone.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you, very much.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, in that report on the cancer treatment foundation would that cover the amount of postgraduate doctors' scholarships that are given by the government of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It will cover those, I presume. Now, I cannot be sure about this, but I rather think it does give statistics concerning the scholarships provided by the foundation which derives all of its monies from the government.

Mr. Thompson: My point is simply that I am interested in knowing, particularly in regard to the Connaught Laboratory.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The Connaught Laboratory has nothing to do with this, unless the foundation approved a project submitted by the Connaught Laboratory. The Connaught Laboratory is a part of the University of Toronto and is neither a branch of government nor of the cancer foundation.

I could conceive of the Connaught Laboratory proposing a project to the foundation and having that project accepted for grant purposes. If that were so then that would appear. But I do know that in the report, in one of the reports at least, you will find a list of all of the projects that have been supported by the foundation, the amounts of grants given and usually the director of the project is named, too.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister—I asked this in 1961—what does the government do, what does your department do, sir, in connection with postgraduate doctors' scholarships? I say this because, as I mentioned before, there are names like Dr. Angus Graham and Dr. Smithies who have left. They are apparently famous names in international science, who have been studying biology and advancing much worthwhile research. There has been a suggestion that because we are not getting young Canadian postgraduate doctors in biology encouraged by scholarships from our own government, prominent scientists may be looking towards the United States or somewhere else to do their research work.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My department is very active in the matter of postgraduate education, but not particularly in biology. For instance, we have 45 in psychiatry, seven in public health, 51 in nursing education, 34 in nursing administration, four in mental health nursing, three public health nurses in advanced mental health, 74 public health nurses, 12 medical record librarians, two in hospital administration, one in bacteriology, 45 lab. technicians, three mental health teachers, six psychiatric social workers, seven occupational therapists, 21 psychologists, five engineers, 25 sanitary inspectors, one dental hygienist, two physio-therapists, and two in speech pathology—for a total of 351 bursaries.

I do not know which groups this new plan of The Department of Education is going to cover. We will wait for the hon. Minister of Education to state that. But if I recall correctly, the Throne speech mentioned an item whereby the government is going into this

new field. There are many fellowships available to postgraduate doctors, and they are all well aware of many of them.

Some are sponsored by the United States, because some of them, by choice, go to the United States for postgraduate courses. Some Canadian fellowships are awarded to those who go to foreign universities, and I think in the great majority of cases there is no geographic boundary—or no geographic condition made—although oftentimes a condition of the fellowship is that they will return and do a certain amount of work in their home jurisdiction.

Mr. Thompson: I say this without specific facts, but it has been suggested to me that, particularly, postgraduate doctors' fellowships in biology is an area that has not been given much emphasis. You have, naturally, a great area to cover, but I suggest that you could look at this particular area, because Ontario has a very high name in biological research. We think of Banting and Best and so on. It is something I think we can do for the world.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: For the hon. member's information, I rather believe that in the cancer foundation report we will likely find that they support several fellowships in biology, at the Princess Margaret or other institutions of learning. Again, I must be excused if I am wrong in this information, but it runs in my mind that I have seen that in their report.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, before we go to 702, I just have one question on 701. Item no. 5, I see, was \$77,000 for information and publicity. It is broken down to \$27,000, \$5,000, and then we have \$45,000 for maintenance. What would that be?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The \$45,000 covers advertising and publicity. It also pays for the cost of the Canadian National Exhibition and other exhibitions. We usually go to the medical-dental conferences, the tuberculosis conferences, the cancer conferences, and so on, where we put up a health exhibit. At the public health conferences we exhibit material pertinent to public health in Ontario.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Just one other question: Is it the opinion of The Department of Health that our facilities for training doctors and dentists are inadequate in Ontario? Would the hon. Minister make any comment on that?

I understand that the dental faculty from Hamilton has proposed that a new dental college be erected in the Hamilton area, if and when it could be done, at the same time

that the medical facilities are made available. What is the situation with respect to the adequacy or inadequacy of these colleges at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I did already discuss this this afternoon. I mentioned in my remarks that we had been carrying on discussions with the medical and dental professions to the end that preparation be made for the establishment of new dental and medical faculties. I am not in a position to say where these will be because I think this is information that is not ready to be released yet. We have not studied all of the possibilities. I think we are about to appear before the university affairs committee to make specific recommendations now, which will be mentioned to this House. We believe at the present time they are adequate, but they are certainly not adequate for the future. There is a need now to make preparations; but it takes, we believe, about ten years actually, from the time a medical faculty is started until it graduates its first class, and the same, by and large, would apply to a dental faculty; by that time we are certainly going to need new schools.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I believe there have been studies made by independent organizations. Would the hon. Minister be in a position to advise us how many additional facilities will be required? How many different colleges? Will it be restricted to one or will several be required?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: One each—medical and dental—for the time being.

Mr. Thompson: I wonder if the hon. Minister could qualify for me in item 25, St. Elizabeth Visiting Nurses Association? Could you distinguish between their role and the VON? Are they similar?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This very small grant is given on the same per capita basis as the grant given to the VON under the department of my hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile). For some reason or another one is under Public Welfare, and this was left under The Department of Health. I do not know why. They are given this grant on the same per capita basis as the VON.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if I could point out to the hon. Minister, I asked the question about the Victorian Order of Nurses and their role in 1961, and the hon. Minister pointed out to me at that time that the VON do the bedside care, while the public health

nurse does a preventive job. He suggested at that time, if I could quote on it, it is page 2351 of *Hansard* of 1961, he said then that:

It would be my opinion that the VON might be worthy of consideration for even further grants.

I wonder then, sir, with this amount that he is giving, why it is so small?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think, Mr. Chairman, they now get additional grants through the home care programme under The Department of Public Welfare and the municipalities' home nursing programmes, but they do not come under my department at all. I think these grants are available to any nursing group apart from the public health nurses. This grant that is given under my department is to assist the organization in meeting deficits which may occur; this is a grant that has stood on this same basis for many years. They are eligible for the same grants paid to other nursing groups, as I have already stated, through the department of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate it goes through the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, but I would point out that the hon. Minister of Health feels a responsibility about the role of the VON. If I could again refer to his remarks in 1961, where he suggested:

The VON is of extreme importance because in doing bedside care they are going to ease the overflow into hospitals.

At that time he strongly suggested the VON should get more of a grant, and I would hope because of this and the fact it relates to his department by preventing the hospitals from being overcrowded, he would see that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare would ensure a larger grant this year.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 701 agreed to.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman: I am still on 701. Before we leave 701, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he intends to make any statement in respect to the prepaid medical programme in this House under these estimates?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would presume, Mr. Chairman, that statement will be made when the bill is introduced.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, surely we in this House have some right to know what amount of money is to be expended in conjunction with the hon. Minister's department and a Medicare programme before we vote any part of this estimate.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister made it clear there would be no money voted this year, that the plan would not be put into operation immediately. For that reason no item is included in my budget for it.

Mr. Wintermeyer: So we can presume that no financial commitment whatsoever will be made by this government in the next ensuing fiscal year in conjunction with a prepaid medical programme? Is that correct?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I do not think any such assumption could be made. There is none planned at this moment and therefore there is nothing in the hon. Minister's estimates. But there are, of course, such things as supplementary estimates. If it is not in the hon. Minister's estimates I think the hon. leader of the Opposition can assume that it is not planned at the moment.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with supplementary estimates. But I think the hon. Prime Minister would be the first to acknowledge that in the orderly disposition of any institution, particularly a governmental institution, supplementary estimates are reserved for those unforeseen expenditures that nobody could possibly foresee. If Medicare and the prepaid medical programme is in that category, that is one thing. But I would remind the hon. Prime Minister that the prepaid medical programme certainly gained a good deal of publicity as a result of several statements that he himself made, and particularly as a result of what was said in the Throne Speech. I would think that we on this side of the House have a duty, let alone the opportunity, but a duty, to pursue this question at this time.

All I want to know is whether or not in the normal course of events it is within reason now, in the judgment of the hon. Prime Minister, that any money will be spent in the course of the next ensuing fiscal year in conjunction with a prepaid medical programme?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I do not think it is, Mr. Chairman. I have the Throne speech here, I can refer to what I said, but I can also repeat what I said several times and that is we are preparing legislation which we propose to bring into the House and which will be a concrete proposal. Then we propose to refer this to a committee of citizens, not a select committee of this House, but a committee made up of citizens, so that it may be examined and representations made to that committee by interested groups of the public.

I am not saying anything today that I have not said before in public, on a public platform. I do not envisage, apart from whatever expenses may be involved in operating the committee—which is not what the hon. leader of the Opposition is speaking about—I do not anticipate that this involves any expenditure of public funds.

On the other hand, the question the hon. leader has asked was—I forget the wording—but it amounted to an assurance. He put me in a position where we could not go to supplementary estimates if it proved necessary. All I am saying to the hon. leader of the Opposition is that presently we have no plans to expend any money.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Prime Minister has given us basically what we want and I do think he has added something substantially new over and above what has been said heretofore. First, in the statements thus far, to the best of my knowledge, he has said that any cost of the programme would be absorbed out of general revenue.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, no!

Mr. Wintermeyer: Heretofore that statement has been made, not today, but generally he has said that. Unless I have misinterpreted his remarks in the press, I have taken the remarks to mean that whatever cost of the programme there would be, that cost would be paid out of general revenue.

Now, what he is saying this afternoon is that no such cost will be required to be taken out of general revenue for the next ensuing fiscal year. He has said that understandably the cost of the committee, which I would quite agree is something different than I am inquiring about, would be taken out of general revenue. But I think heretofore the impression has been left in a lot of minds that public monies would be used, but that there would be sufficient public money in the general Treasury to pay for the cost of whatever portion of the programme the government is going to bear out of general revenue. Now, today I think the hon. Prime Minister has materially negated that particular suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not think I have.

Mr. Wintermeyer: The hon. Prime Minister has not?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I really did not intend at this stage to get drawn into a debate on this, so any impression I may have left with the hon. leader please negate. I will go right

back to where I was when he asked about the amount of money that might be in these estimates.

Mr. Wintermeyer: The hon. Prime Minister would certainly do me the favour of saying that we have a right, on this side, not only to ask, but to expect, whether any part of the public funds of the province will be used for a medical care programme in the course of the next ensuing year, within reason or within expectation? Now, surely I think I am only being prudent in saying that they will not.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There is no objection to the hon. leader's statement, I just simply say there are none voted here.

Because of the many problems involved in bringing this plan into operation and the many groups that will be affected by it, a committee composed of representatives of medical, hospital, labour and others will be appointed to examine the legislation and to receive representations from all interested parties before the provisions of the bill are brought into effect. Now the assumption is that it will take some time for this committee to carry out its hearings. I believe I have said that I did not anticipate this could possibly be introduced before the first of January of 1965.

Mr. Wintermeyer: The second aspect of the question, sir, and I do not know whether I should address this to the hon. Prime Minister or the hon. Minister of Health, is this: I did not realize until just now that the hon. Prime Minister had been quite as specific as presumably he has been about the appointment of the committee other than a committee of this House. Frankly, I thought it was to be a committee of this House.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It has been in the Throne speech since last fall. I was reading from the Throne speech.

Mr. Wintermeyer: That may be, sir, and to that extent I would—

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: The people over there do not know enough—

Mr. Wintermeyer: I am not quite sure—

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: The statements they have been making—

Mr. MacDonald: He is trying to acquire information.

Mr. Wintermeyer: Exactly! And that is a good thing, and a better thing for some people who think they know everything.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to ask now directly is: Will the hon. members of this House have an opportunity to sit in committee on this proposed legislation?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Yes, because there will be legislation brought in here, it will not be given third reading and then it will be sent to this committee. This is exactly the procedure that was followed in the introduction of the hospital services legislation.

Mr. Wintermeyer: We cannot be so naive. When an election is on our doorstep you know better than anybody—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Do not confuse naivety and honesty. This is what I propose to do. This is what I said in the Throne speech I propose to do and this is what I will do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: May I say to the members, would they not agree this is a little out of order?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask you to rule. This is a question of prime importance to the people of Ontario. It is something that I had understood up until now we would have the opportunity to debate in the House.

Now, when would one be expected to make remarks respecting the matter of Medicare insurance?

We have been restricted on this issue up until now to the prime speaker from each of the parties. This has been a rule in this House, apparently there is nothing in the estimates. When might we be accorded the opportunity perhaps to question the hon. Minister with respect to plans for this particular scheme?

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member that ample opportunity will be available to all members when the bill is presented, whenever that is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 701 agreed to.

On vote 702:

Mr. Thomas: Well, Mr. Chairman, are we now on vote 702?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Trying to be.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, I think my question would come under this vote. Before

I put the question, I would like to compliment the hon. Minister and his staff for this very lucid and comprehensive annual report. I find that, to the average layman, it would be quite readable and I want to say I appreciated receiving it very much.

There are some things, Mr. Chairman, that one can commend, and some things that one naturally would be disappointed in, and along the different estimates I intend to bring some of them to the attention of the hon. Minister, particularly the first one, in regard to school sanitation. In the report it says that during 1952 54.9 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What vote is that under?

Mr. Thomas: This is in the public health administration, 702.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Environmental sanitation, that would come under. Vote 711 is environmental sanitation.

Mr. Thomas: Would that be under that?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 702 agreed to.

On vote 703:

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, last year I raised the point of salaries of public health nurses. You may recall at that time, sir, I asked whether or not the salaries which were permitted under this schedule had anything to do with the shortage of some public health nurses throughout the province. Would the hon. Minister tell me whether or not there is a shortage of public health nurses at the present time? If so, what is the extent of the shortage?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think, Mr. Chairman, the answer would be yes. We can always use more public health nurses. It is like the whole field of nursing; it is very difficult to assess and it is very difficult to give a straight yes or no answer.

I have to repeat again that Ontario is better provided with nurse population than any other jurisdiction in Canada and most of the North American continent. We are still told by certain authorities that there is a shortage of nurses; again I think it is a matter of maldistribution. I think the public health nurse would fall in the same category. The public health nurses will come to the unit, or the public health organization in the heavily urbanized centres, far more readily than they will go to the outlying county health unit. I can only say, Mr. Chairman, the answer to

the hon. member's question is, "yes, we could use more."

We provide bursaries for public health nursing post graduate training; and have never turned down a suitably prepared candidate. There is more money available for bursaries if they apply for them. This is well known to the nursing profession. Every possible help is given to them to make it easy for them to apply and qualify for these bursaries, as long as they have the educational standing and the required nurse training.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would the hon. Minister say this was the full extent of encouragement from his department to fill these nursing vacancies in the outlying health units—assistance in the form of bursaries? What other steps are taken by The Department of Health to make sure nurses are available in these outlying areas?

I will say this to the hon. Minister: Since I brought this matter into the Legislature last year, I have talked to responsible health officials who tell me this salary situation is a very serious one. The very fact that urban areas are able to outbid the rural areas is having an effect on being able to retain these people. If that is the case, it seems to me that this would be a matter of concern to The Department of Health. It would seem to me it is not enough to just give the bursaries, if in so doing we are not, in fact, providing these areas with the health nurses.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we do not set the salaries, we do not hire the nurses. Indeed, the municipal boards of health are not at all reticent about hiring nurses away from my own department. They set the salaries; they employ the nurses. All we do is have the privilege of paying 50 per cent. We do not put a ceiling on them. If they set a salary schedule which they believe is necessary for them to attract and hold nurses, we simply pay 50 per cent of that cost.

Mr. Singer: Would the hon. Minister advise us how many vacancies there are at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We would not have any idea of that, because this is not information we see. It is really not our business. We do not run local public health. The nurses are employed by the municipal board of health and the latter do not have to report to us how many they are short.

Mr. Singer: Might I ask, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister satisfied that there are not—

I am looking for the right words—that the health of the people in the outlying areas is not neglected because of a situation like this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the health of the people in the outlying areas is not suffering for lack of, or because of a shortage of, public health nursing. The shortage is not so acute that that would happen. Several units, no doubt, could use another nurse or two, and probably would expand their programmes into other areas, but the essential public health service is not suffering from a shortage of nurses.

Mr. Singer: Do I gather from the hon. Minister's remarks, that there is a shortage, does he admit that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I admit that I am told there is a shortage. Because we are not in the business of hiring the public health nurses I am not in a position to say there definitely is a shortage. In my own opinion, personally, no, there is not a shortage. I have to listen to the boards of health who tell me they can use more public health nurses. Some of them do not get them because they do not offer high enough salary schedules.

Mr. Singer: You are the provincial Minister of Health who is responsible for the health of the province of Ontario. One moment he says there is a shortage, then he says he is told there is a shortage, and then he says in his own opinion that there is not a shortage. I would think, if there is any place where statistics could and should be gathered, it would be in the office of this hon. Minister. This hon. Minister should have standards, criteria, which would determine how many public health nurses we need in northern Ontario, eastern Ontario, western Ontario, rural Ontario, urban Ontario, all over the province. I would think that the Minister, when he brings his estimates before the House, would be able to say: In my opinion, because we have X nurses for Y population, there are enough or there are not enough; we are short one, ten, 100 or 1,000; or we are about equal or we are not. If we cannot get this information from this Minister and from this department, I suggest that the Minister and this department are not doing their job.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have heard the hon. member for York Centre, the alpha and omega, make the same assertion about every Minister who has come before him with his estimates.

I stated to the hon. member that, in my opinion, there is not a shortage of public health nurses; other authorities say there is. This is a perfectly valid and cogent professional difference of opinion. Who is to say how many nurses we need to what population? This is just the point that I have been emphasizing in this House: There is no agreement on what ratio of nurses there should be to population; there is no agreement anywhere that I know. I have never yet seen statistics to set down how many nurses should be available per 1,000 population.

I say, in Ontario, that we have somewhere in the area of one nurse to 174 population—the best supplied of any province in the Dominion of Canada, or the nation of Canada, I should not say Dominion now.

The figures, given voluntarily by all of the health boards of the province of Ontario, show a shortage of 35 nurses in this great province. I still maintain as my personal opinion that there is not a shortage of public health nurses. If that is not specific enough, I do not know how much more definite I can be.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report it has come to a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will take the second readings that are on the order paper, and continue with the estimates of The Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House stands adjourned until three of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

The House adjourned at 6.05 p.m. of the clock.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, March 5, 1963

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 5, 1963

Eighth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Morrow	1339
Statement re 1962-1963 winter works programme, Mr. Spooner	1339
Statement re rate-filing regulations, Mr. Auld	1340
Retail Sales Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	1344
Public Service Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Allan, second reading	1344
Public Lands Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading	1345
Line Fences Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	1345
Local Improvement Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	1345
Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	1345
Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	1345
Town of Hearst, bill respecting, Mr. Brunelle, second reading	1351
Town of Wallaceburg, bill respecting, Mr. Parry, second reading	1355
Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued	1355
Recess, 6 o'clock	1366

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1963

The House met at 3.20 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to tell the House why we were delayed. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay) collapsed in the hall outside this chamber just prior to 3 o'clock. He has been examined by his doctor and has been taken to hospital. There is nothing obviously wrong with him. His doctor says he will stay in the hospital for the requisite period of time until he can be completely examined, but it is nothing that is obvious on the surface, and he appeared to be resting very comfortably when he was taken away.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West), from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's eighth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr51, An Act respecting the county of Lincoln.

Bill No. Pr53, An Act respecting the St. Catharines General Hospital.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr35, An Act respecting the township of Toronto.

Bill No. Pr60, An Act respecting the town of Burlington.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a statement which I would like to present to the House which is in regard to the 1962-63 federal-provincial-municipal winter works incentive programme. As the Minister responsible for the administra-

tion of this programme, I feel it is of interest to the House this afternoon.

As the result of receiving many requests from municipalities and local boards for an extension of the 1962-63 winter works incentive programme and because the unusually cold winter has delayed the progress of many projects which were approved by The Department of Municipal Affairs under the programme, I am authorized to inform you that your government, after very careful consideration, has authorized the extension of its portion of the programme from April 30 to May 31, 1963.

The government of Canada has made a similar announcement.

As the hon. members of the House are aware, the purpose of the winter works incentive programme is to encourage municipalities and local boards in Ontario to construct projects during the winter months, rather than during the warmer seasons of the year, to increase the amount of employment available during the winter months when the problem of unemployment has been most difficult in the construction and building industries.

The municipalities and local boards of Ontario have certainly responded to this programme.

A review of the programme since its inception discloses that the number of man-days has increased from approximately 310,000 during the 1958-59 programme to approximately 705,000 during the 1961-62 programme—in excess of a two-fold increase.

A comparison of the monies paid to the municipalities under the programme discloses that the municipalities and local boards received approximately \$2,940,000 under the 1958-59 programme, whereas they received approximately \$8,180,000 under the 1961-62 programme—almost a three-fold increase. On the basis of the applications received to date, we estimate that the participation of the municipalities and local boards in the current programme will be approximately the same as their participation in the 1961-62 programme.

On the basis of the 1961-62 programme, \$5,870,000 or 53 per cent of the funds were allocated to water, sewage and drainage projects, whereas \$2,295,000 or 21 per cent of the funds were allocated to park and playground projects, \$1,660,000 or 15 per cent of the funds were allocated to the construction or major repair of municipal buildings, and \$1,225,000 or 11 per cent of the funds were allocated to the construction or the major repair of roadways, streets and bridges.

I am sure that the hon. members of the House will agree that these few figures disclose that not only has the programme represented a considerable contribution towards the creation of employment in Ontario during the winter months, but it is also apparent that the municipalities have been able to undertake and complete many essential projects under the programme.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, some figures which I will hand to the *Hansard* reporter so they may be included in *Hansard*. I shall not read them at this time. (See Appendix)

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question in regard to the statement. Has there been an extension of the programme from labour costs to material costs in the past year?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, there has not been.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a statement to the House in connection with rate-filing regulations which were passed today.

Many years' study of rate-filing procedures in all jurisdictions have been conducted by The Department of Transport over quite a period. Meetings have been held with groups representing those affected, that is, the carriers, shippers, Ontario highway transport board officials and The Department of Transport staff, to discuss all aspects of this subject.

Rate-filing or rate regulations are common to many other jurisdictions. Quebec has complete rate regulation, and in the United States rate regulation is controlled by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as well as by many individual states. All Canadian railroad, air and water carriers have their rates regulated under the Board of Transport Commissioners. In addition, both Manitoba and British Columbia have rate-filing legislation and Saskatchewan and the Maritimes have a form of

rate-regulation. Thus, in effect, in Ontario we are surrounded by areas having either rate-filing legislation, or the more restrictive rate regulation itself.

The aim of the proposed regulations is twofold: To remove unfair discrimination in the prices charged by motor carriers and to give the road transport industry in Ontario a reasonable minimum of stability.

The requirement to file and publish rates will go far to eliminate unfair discrimination, where a carrier charges various shippers different rates for what is in essence the same service. This should be of particular benefit to small shippers. The latter have complained frequently that a few large shippers use the offer of a large volume of business to extract from carriers unduly low rates which remain hidden from other shippers.

Shippers' pricing will be simplified in two ways. Firstly, the compulsory publication of rates will make them known to all shippers and thus eliminate the need for them to "shop around" for the best rate, which is said to be an irritating and costly process and particularly difficult for the small shipper. Secondly, because it will not be possible to change a rate except under special circumstances, until it has been in effect for at least 30 days after filing, rapid fluctuations in rates will be prevented. This greater stability of rates will help traffic managers to estimate distribution costs, which are often a major factor in pricing. The frequency with which rates have fluctuated to date in Ontario is said to have made competitive pricing extremely difficult for shippers.

More stable for-hire truck rates will aid the formulation of joint rates by trucking firms and other transport media. These joint rates will be of great benefit to Ontario shippers, particularly in areas where a rail abandonment has occurred; the shippers concerned will be offered lower through-rates where rail-truck co-operation results in lower costs. The development of such co-operation depends largely on whether the railways can be assured that truck rates will remain reasonably stable.

There will be benefits to carriers as well. Carriers will benefit from the filing and publication of rates in that it will be far more difficult for certain large shippers to approach them separately and privately—playing one off against the other—and use their considerable volume of business as a lever to obtain specially low rates, which often do not fully remunerate the carriers concerned. Carriers, I may say, have emphasized that they are in no way opposed to bona-fide rate reductions

such as "quantity discounts," based on genuine operating economies; and these, of course, are still possible.

Rapid changes in rates, sometimes made from hour to hour, have been a feature of "fly-by-night" operators, who begin with insufficient capital and business experience. The elimination of such changes will encourage sound operators, who use safe equipment, pay good wages and take their long run costs into account.

The for-hire trucking industry has an important influence on production and employment in Ontario. Transportation costs are a significant part of the cost of goods. Therefore, any measure such as rate-filing, which promotes greater stability in the industry and eliminates undesirable rate practices without preventing healthy competition between motor carriers, must prove beneficial to the province's economy and population.

In these regulations there are certain exemptions. Exempted from the rate-filing legislation will be the owners of four vehicles or less, carriers of commodities covered by an F licence, and holders of E—which is milk—and FS licences.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) posed a question of me with regard to a workman who suffered from the bends as a result of working under compressed air on a tunnelling job, on Gladstone Avenue in the city of Toronto, being undertaken by McNally and Sons Limited.

In order to assist the hon. members of the House with respect to the facts of the situation, may I make a few comments on it?

First of all, bends, I am informed, is a condition that arises from nitrogen being introduced into the bloodstream of an individual working under air pressure, who comes back to normal atmospheric pressure at too fast a rate. The site of the job in which this work is being conducted is on Gladstone Avenue, between College and Bloor Street, Toronto, in a parkette. The contractor has sunk a shaft to a depth of about 50 feet and is tunnelling north and south of this shaft. Therefore, it is possible to refer to the two tunnels as the north tunnel and the south tunnel.

In undertaking this type of work where it can be foreseen that air pressure is likely to be necessary, and it was so foreseen on this job, an air-lock was taken down the shaft

and there assembled and placed at the entrance of the north tunnel. Similarly, an air-lock was also taken down and assembled and placed at the entrance of the south tunnel. After these air-locks are assembled and placed in position, it is necessary that the tunnel be sealed on the outside of the air-lock to make it airtight and therefore permit operations under air pressure.

An air-lock consists of a compression chamber through which everyone who is to get into the tunnel proper must pass; and, having come in at atmospheric pressure, the lock itself is closed and the pressure is gradually raised to the operating pressure in the tunnel. Similarly, on the way out, a person must spend time in the air-lock and is gradually decompressed back to atmospheric pressure. There is no other method of ingress or egress at these two tunnels. As far as we have been able to ascertain, the two air-locks on this job have been in proper operation and in good working condition from the time that they were installed and began to function.

I am able to state to the House that our investigations revealed that there were no mechanical faults with regard to the air-locks. The workman who suffered the bends, and who was taken to Buffalo, was Mr. John McGean of Agincourt, Ontario. As I understand the situation, this was his first day at work under compressed air.

Apparently on Monday, February 25, he went to the foreman on the job, and asked for work. The foreman stated that he could not put him on until he had a medical examination.

The foreman made an appointment for him to see the doctor for the job, Dr. F. J. Argue, on Tuesday morning February 26, at 11.30 a.m. He was permitted to start work on Tuesday at 7 o'clock in the morning, and went through the air lock where he was put under air pressure and then permitted to go to work at the face of the north tunnel. He worked until it was time for him to come back to the surface to keep his appointment for the medical examination, and was then decompressed and went to the doctor's office. He passed the medical examination, and came back to work around 12.50 p.m. the same day.

Normally he should have come out of the tunnel around 3 o'clock in the afternoon; he did not come out until 25 minutes past 9, or about 9.30 p.m. The reason given was that sand and water had started to run, and there was an emergency condition in the tunnel that required all five men who were working underground to deal with it. According to

the information which I have, Mr. McGean first noticed pain after he had changed his clothes. He started to go out to his car when he took a cramp in his groin. He was also bothered with his left leg. As he started to pull away he had pains in his right leg, and decided he better speak to the foreman, Mr. Pat Cleary.

Mr. Cleary, who has worked under compressed air for ten years in the United Kingdom and Canada indicated that Mr. McGean was suffering from the bends, and had him hoisted back down the shaft. He took him into the air lock, where both of them stayed for a considerable period of time under air pressure. When they started to go out the pains came back, and they took a further period for compression and decompression. After the second period of compression and decompression, Mr. McGean felt better and climbed a ladder 50 feet to the surface of the ground, even though Mr. Cleary wanted to hoist him up. Mr. Cleary himself climbed the ladder behind him to make sure that he was all right. Before Mr. McGean left the job, Mr. Cleary furnished him with an identification badge to indicate that he had been under air pressure which also mentioned the name of the doctor who was in charge of this project for the company. Mr. Cleary also told Mr. McGean if he had any further recurrence, he was to get back to the job as quickly as possible and not worry about the cost.

The information given to me is that Mr. McGean drove himself home from the job site on Gladstone Avenue to Agincourt, arriving there about 11 p.m. He had a shower, and something to eat. The pains started to come back, and they were more severe.

His brother-in-law, Constable Bruce Priestman, a member of the Metropolitan Toronto Police, Scarborough Division, happened to telephone his own home and spoke to his wife who informed him that Mr. McGean was unwell. Constable Priestman was not far from the residence of Mr. McGean. He went over immediately, and picked Mr. McGean up.

Constable Priestman contacted Constable Hilder, on duty as a radio police dispatcher, at the communications office on College Street, shortly after midnight. Priestman explained the circumstances and asked him to contact Dr. Argue and tell him the situation.

Constable Hilder spoke to Dr. Argue on the telephone, who informed him, that he, Dr. Argue, did not know the location of any decompression chamber. Constable Hilder

states Dr. Argue informed him there must be some mistake in calling him, and he could give him no assistance in the situation. Constable Hilder states he apologized to Dr. Argue for calling him at the late hour, and thereupon relayed the information back to Constable Priestman.

The conversation between Constable Hilder and Constable Priestman went out over the police radio network, and various suggestions came in over the radio system. First there might be a chamber in Pharmacy Avenue, next there might be one at the RCAF station on Avenue Road or at the RCAF station at Downsview.

Constable Priestman arranged to have a police accident car meet him at the Birchmount Road overpass from Highway 401, and proceeded with Mr. McGean and P. C. Arbour in his car to the RCAF station on Avenue Road, but found there was no air chamber there. At Downsview RCAF station they also found that there was none. Constable Priestman spoke to a flight-sergeant at Downsview and he advised that Mr. McGean should be taken back to the air lock on the job site.

At the job site, Mr. McGean was taken down to the air lock and put under pressure for 35 to 45 minutes. And then decompressed. When he came to the surface he seemed to be feeling all right.

The air force medical officer, Wing Commander H. B. Leach and Dr. McGinnis, an intern at the Toronto General Hospital, came on the scene at this time, and it was found that Mr. McGean was still suffering from the bends. It was decided that Mr. McGean would have to go down into the lock again for from six to eight hours. This was impossible because sand and water was flooding into the shaft.

Dr. Lamphier in Buffalo was contacted by long distance telephone from the job site, and arrangements made to have Mr. McGean taken to Buffalo. At 3.30 a.m. a call was put into the Toronto Fire Department Ossington Avenue station, and a station wagon equipped with oxygen went to the job site.

Mr. McGean was removed to Toronto General Hospital. He was taken by ambulance to the University of Buffalo where he was placed in the medical air lock. Constable Priestman and Dr. McGinnis accompanied him, leaving Toronto at 4.20 a.m. and arriving in Buffalo about 5.45 a.m.

Mr. McGean remained in the air lock for 38 hours at Buffalo. On Saturday morning he was brought back by ambulance by the

Workmen's Compensation Board to the Downsview convalescent centre, where he is apparently under observation.

Now, Mr. Speaker I must inform the hon. members of the House that this was not the only case of the bends arising out of this job. Investigation last week brought to light there was another similar situation which was not so serious as the accident involving Mr. McGean. Another workman who was a member of the crew on which McGean worked when he was afflicted with the bends last Tuesday, has also been affected. He is Mr. Amaro Brigado, 85 Oxford Street, Toronto. He did not report for work on Wednesday morning, and on Thursday morning he was called back to the job by Mr. Cleary, where he was treated by Dr. Kutasay in the medical air lock, and sent home. On Friday afternoon, the Workmen's Compensation Board arranged for his removal to the Toronto General Hospital for observation and treatment. He is there at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, those are the facts of the two situations, as we have been able to establish them. There is one point which has not been publicized, which I must report to the hon. members of the House.

There was, and is, above ground at the Gladstone Avenue job site, a third lock which was a medical air lock. My information is that this lock was in good order and all that was required was to couple a hose to the air compressor to put it into operation. It was not used at any time for the treatment of Mr. McGean, even when he was brought back to the job site Tuesday night last.

Now, I wish to deal briefly with the actual operation of the project by the employer and those associated with him. First let me state that for a great many years there have been regulations under The Department of Labour Act respecting the protection of persons in this type of employment.

These regulations cover the employer and all persons working on a job where compressed air must be used. It would be impossible for The Department of Labour to stand over every job of this character and watch every move that is made on the job. We must rely on periodic inspection of such projects. We must also rely on the good reputation and integrity of the employer to obey the regulations. We must also rely on the good common sense of the workmen on these jobs to look out for their own safety and the safety of their fellow workers. If they do not, all of them—employers, supervisors, and workers—render themselves to prosecution

under the regulations or the Criminal Code.

There are numerous requirements, Mr. Speaker, cast upon contractors, employers and employees under the regulations. For example:

Firstly, to file a plan and specifications of the project. Second, the periods of work at various pressures are prescribed. Three, the intervals of rest in the open air are fixed. Four, the rate of decompression at various pressures is prescribed. Five, the schedule of time of decompression is to be posted in each man-lock. Six, a record of time spent under air and in decompression for each workman and notes on any untoward symptoms of any worker must be kept. Seven, certain specifications for air locks and gauges are required. Eight, a competent man is required to be in charge of the valves and gauges which indicate the pressure in the working chamber. Nine, a lock is required to be lighted and equipped with emergency electric torches. Then, a suitable means of communication, such as a telephone, is required to be maintained between the working chamber and the powerhouse on the surface. Eleven, a sufficient supply of hot coffee and sugar is to be furnished to men working under air pressure at the termination of shifts and during rest periods. Twelve, a contractor or employer of men working under air is required to employ a physician to enforce certain requirements for the protection of the workers, among which are the following: (a) the employer is not to permit a man to work in compressed air before he is examined by the physician and reported physically fit for the work; (b) a person not having worked under air pressure previously is not to be permitted to work under a pressure in excess of 17 pounds until he has been tested by the physician in a medical lock; (c) a person who has no previous experience working under air is not to be permitted to work for longer than one-half day until he has been re-examined by the physician; (d) a medical lock is required to be established and maintained in connection with all work under compressed air when the pressure exceeds 17 pounds, which is to be under the control of the physician in charge; (e) an identification badge shall be furnished by the contractor or employer to all employees, advising police officials that the person is a compressed air worker, stating the location of the medical lock and stating that in case of an emergency the worker is to be removed to the lock and not to a hospital; (f) adequate medical service is to be available at all times while work under air pressure is in progress.

The last-mentioned requirements are to be enforced by the physician in charge of medical service on a project involving compressed air.

The information given to me is that there was some arrangement made with Dr. Argue to examine men accepted for employment under compressed air on this job on a fee-for-service basis. In other words, there was no arrangement made to supply a complete medical service as contemplated by the regulations.

Prosecutions are being instituted by the department.

Since the bends or air-compression disease is compensable under The Workmen's Compensation Act, I have requested The Workmen's Compensation Board to report on every aspect of the situation, the incidence of these cases, their experience with them, and the preventive measures which have been taken and what further can be done to eliminate or reduce these occurrences to a minimum. I shall also review the existing legislation and regulations to determine whether any further implementation is necessary to assist in the future.

The hon. member for York South asked a supplementary question as to the possibility of establishing a permanent medical lock in Toronto. I was sufficiently interested to inquire about the location of medical air locks in Canada. There are two; one at Halifax, Nova Scotia, and one at Esquimalt, British Columbia, both of which, Mr. Chairman, are owned and operated by the Royal Canadian Navy.

My information also is that the United States Navy has medical air locks on the east coast, at Boston, Massachusetts; Portsmouth, New Hampshire; New London, Connecticut and Washington, D.C. The air lock at Buffalo New York, was established there by the United States Navy at the University of Buffalo for research purposes. I am told, although I have no direct information on the point, that SCUBA divers in Ontario have suffered from the bends and have been treated in the air lock at Buffalo, even though they have been diving for pleasure.

As to a permanent medical air lock being established in Toronto, I am seeking expert advice on this subject. There would appear to be a community of interest on the part of such bodies as the engineering and medical departments of the universities, The Department of National Defence and The Workmen's Compensation Board, which I shall explore at once.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the hon. Minister for coming to grips with a situation which I must say is about as bizarre as anything that has been unfolded to this House in quite some time. May I have clarification on one point? This is just one of about a dozen and one questions which would come to a person's mind listening to the hon. Minister's statement.

The hon. Minister contended that the air locks on the job were mechanically in good operation. Does one conclude then that the reason for this incidence of the bends was the failure to implement other regulations, such as time for decompression and so on?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That would appear to be the conclusion to be drawn.

Mr. J. J. Wintermeyer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether or not it is his intention to call the committee on commissions? It has been drawn to my attention, sir, that this committee has not met this year, or at least this session.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have made arrangements. I do not know just what day it will be called—but I have made the necessary arrangements, and also for the committee on public accounts to meet.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister another question of the same nature? What explanation is there for delay in referring the amendments to The Representations Act to the standing committee on elections and privileges so that we can deal with the few details which remain?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There is no explanation—I will do this immediately. It is not being held up for any reason.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-61

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill No. 46, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-61.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, 1961-62

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 57, An Act to amend The Public Service Act, 1961-62.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves second reading of Bill No. 64, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LINE FENCES ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Line Fences Act.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I might give a short explanation because I did not explain these bills during first reading.

The Line Fences Act is an important piece of legislation in many parts of the province, and for many years there has been a provision in the Act that the clerk of the municipality was required to file a copy of the by-law with The Department of Municipal Affairs. Frankly, I have been unable to see the necessity for such action, and so I recommend to the Legislature the amendment to the Act, so that henceforth we in Municipal Affairs will not receive copies from the individual municipalities. All we have done with them in the past is file them.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill No. 67, An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, if I may explain some of the sections of this bill. The Local Improvement Act, of course, deals with many matters of local services improvements in municipalities. At the present time street lighting, for instance, can only be constructed as a local improvement on petition. We are deleting the requirement for the petition so that work of this kind can be initiated by the municipal council.

The second section of the Act deals with the matter of notice of intention to apply to the Ontario municipal board for the approval of works. In the past it has been necessary that this intention to construct be advertised in a newspaper. We now suggest that instead of publishing a notice that notice may be sent by prepaid mail to every owner appearing by the last revised assessment roll to be the owner of property abutting on the work to be proposed.

Those, I think, are the important pieces of this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this bill, this is an amendment which will make it clear that the approval of the Ontario municipal board is not required for the appointment of an engineer or a commissioner under The Municipal Drainage Act, even though eventually if the project is proceeded with the fees and remuneration of these officers will be included in the cost of the drainage works. Prior to this amendment it has been necessary for the applicant to obtain this permission from the municipal board. In many cases I feel that that has been unnecessary because many of these works are not proceeded with. Now that will no longer be required, but if the work is proceeded with then the cost of the engineer and/or commissioner will be included in the cost of the drainage works.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PLANNING ACT

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill No. 70, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, The Planning Act, of course, as everyone knows, is a very important piece of legislation in this province, and I believe that these amendments are going to facilitate the work of municipalities, and all those interested in orderly planning, in dealing with this Act.

At the present time the planning board is required to lodge the official plan in several offices. The amendment in this bill will require that the clerk of the designated municipality would carry out such duties instead of the planning board.

Section 4 of the Act is enacted to make it clear that the official plan in relation to the designation of a rehabilitation area must be an official plan in respect of land use.

We are extending by a further amendment the provisions of The Planning Act to make the section dealing with official plans applicable to counties.

Section 6 of the new bill contains amendments to make it clear that the consent by the planning board, and so on, is not given to a particular conveyance, mortgage or agreement but to all those that apply to the particular land involved.

Subsection 3 of section 6 of the bill provides that a consent given to the sale of land within an area of subdivision control shall lapse six months after the consent was given unless the land is actually sold within that period. The experience in the past has been that this consent has been given to the sale of land and the sale was not proceeded with for many years. I had one which came to my attention where the consent had been given some ten years before. We feel that if the sale is not proceeded with within six months, being a reasonable length of time, the consent should then lapse.

Section 7 of the bill provides that orders of the Minister with respect to areas of subdivision control shall be registered in the same manner as by-laws that designate areas of subdivision control.

Under section 8 of the bill, Mr. Speaker, now that questions arise as to arguments between the type of by-law which should be approved or agreement or whatever it may be, if a question arises as to a particular condition to be imposed by the Minister, the Minister is required to refer the whole matter to the municipal board. With this amendment it will permit reference to the board of a single question. There is no reason for the board to examine into all the points on which we have agreed, but only on those on which we disagree.

Subsection 8 of the Act provides for payment of cash in lieu of the conveyance of the five per cent of the lands for public purposes. The reference to an official plan which now exists in the Act is deleted and the amendment will permit all municipalities, when authorized by the Minister, to accept cash instead of a conveyance of the five per cent of the lands. At present all monies received on the sale of land that is conveyed to a municipality for public purposes under a subsection of The Planning Act are required to be paid into a special account which can only be used to purchase other lands to be used for public purposes. This amendment provides that any monies that have been expended by the municipality out of this general fund in respect of land so sold shall be returned to the general funds out of the monies received from the sale of such lands.

This comes about once in a while; a municipality will take its five per cent in the form of land and not in cash. Eventually it may be required to install services and it has to take money out of its general funds to install the sewer works or water or whatever it may be. As the Act stands, when those lands were sold, and of course they would be sold at a higher price if services were provided, then all of the money taken from the sale of the five per cent lands had to go into the special account. Of course, that was unjust in that the general taxpayer who had made an investment in the five per cent lands was not able to get his share of the sale money back. With this amendment that section has been corrected.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, restricted area by-laws may prohibit the erection of buildings or structures for residential or commercial purposes on land that is subject to flooding. We wish to widen the provisions to extend them to include any class of building or structure.

Under section 10 of the Act, it is provided that a building permit may be refused if the structure to be constructed would be contrary to any by-law of the municipality. As the definition of a municipality in the Act does not include a county or a metropolitan municipality it is necessary to included them specifically. This is what we have done. Subsection 2 of section 10 of the bill authorizes local municipalities to pass by-laws for the control of termities—that is a problem which is becoming more and more serious in a number of municipalities—and we feel that this is the proper place to provide the necessary authority to the municipalities.

At the present time, The Planning Act provides that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has to approve all appointments to a committee of adjustment. I believe that this is redundant because I have approved many appointments to committees of adjustment, and I have no way of knowing who the particular people are; and I can only depend on the recommendations that come to me from the municipality. Therefore, I feel that this is unnecessary; and in this bill I have provided that this requirement will be removed from the Act so that, henceforth, the local authority will be able to appoint their own committee of adjustment without the authority of the Minister.

In section 12 of the bill, we will authorize a committee to prescribe a tariff of fees on a graduated scale, instead of the same fee for

all applications now being in effect. Subsections 2 and 3 of section 12 provide that only one copy of the decision and one copy of the application, and supporting material, are to be required to be sent to The Department of Municipal Affairs instead of two copies which are now being provided.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these are rather important amendments to The Planning Act which will assist planning boards of municipalities in dealing with the Act.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister can tell us—particularly about The Planning Act, I am not too concerned about the others—whether this one is going to go before the committee.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I would plan that all of these bills should go to the municipal law committee.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would make some very brief comments in connection with the Act that the hon. Minister has just spoken of. I am not too clear in my own mind as to the purpose of this section 6. We change conveyance to conveying, and mortgage to mortgaging. I thought that you had in mind a blanket approval—you need only approval once, for one piece of land. But in the subsequent section you limit the effect of the consent to three months. What is the purpose of changing conveyance to conveying?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I do not have a copy of The Planning Act with me. Would you leave the question until we deal with it in committee?

Mr. Singer: All right. On section 8, the one where there is a referral, the hon. Minister stated that if the matter had to be referred, the whole matter had to be referred, and now you can refer particular parts. Who makes the determination, because my recollection of the wording of The Planning Act is that on request the Minister has to refer? Does the applicant make the determination, or does the Minister make the determination?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Either may make the determination. The applicant may apply to have the matter referred to the municipal board, or the Minister may apply.

Mr. Singer: Does this now take away from the applicant his discretion about how much can be referred, and give it to the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, it does not take away any of the rights of the applicant, his rights are still there.

Mr. Singer: The applicant can limit it, or—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: If he wants, or the Minister can limit it.

Mr. Speaker: I point out to the members it is very difficult on this type of bill to distinguish whether we should be discussing the items on second reading or in committee. The points mentioned would be better discussed in committee.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, they are—each one of these sections is a principle in itself. There is not an overall principle that comes out of the bill. We run into this difficulty frequently, and I was following the lead given by the hon. Minister where he explained each section, and each section deals with a different part of planning procedure.

Section 8 was the section I was referring to, that is the section dealing with five per cent monies in lieu of land. It has been a point that I have raised before and I wonder now that the hon. Minister has had a look at it, why he has not chosen to do something about it. There are municipalities that have all of the necessary lands, and then they get monies in, and the monies can only be used for the purchase of more lands. I would think it would be most appropriate if with whatever safeguards you want with the consent of the hon. Minister, or however else you want to phrase it, these monies could be used for improvements of these lands. I know of municipalities where they are just piling up a fund of five per cent monies, they do not need any more land, and they are unable to use these monies.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member, I have heard this rumour or substantially the same point as he has made. I have no knowledge of any particular municipality where that situation exists. When I was considering with my officials the amendment, the thought came to my mind that perhaps we should broaden someone's authority—the Minister's or the municipal board's or somebody else's. But not having any knowledge of any municipalities who found themselves in the position of having too much money in that special account, I thought I would leave the matter for a year or so, in the hope that the municipalities who feel that way might have occasion to mention it to me, or I might

know through meetings of the Ontario municipal association, or the mayors and reeves association or a similar organization. If the hon. member has knowledge of a particular municipality, I would appreciate if he would let me know, and I would give some attention to this suggestion.

Mr. Singer: There are several municipalities. One in particular comes to mind, the town of Waterloo. A few years ago a group of us visited there and sat down with the council and it advised us that at that time it had done a great deal in planning on acquisition of lands for future park lands and so on, and had a substantial sum of money in its five per cent fund. It has done an excellent job on its planning, and for the foreseeable future it needed no more land, but it had money and it could not use this money except to buy more land, and the money was just staying there. So that is one, and there are others.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I will be glad to pay attention to the matter.

Mr. Singer: The only other comment I want to make is on section 11, and I am glad the hon. Minister remarked that his power to approve the appointment of members of committee of adjustment is redundant. One of his predecessors told the House a few years ago that this was a very important power, that he personally checked the qualifications of every person whom it was proposed be appointed. He could not quite recall if he had turned anybody down. I asked him for some examples, but he thought this was a most important power to be preserved. I am glad to see that this hon. Minister has seen the light.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I cannot be blamed for—

Mr. Singer: No, I was not blaming you.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: —for the thoughts of my predecessor. As I have said, I have no way of checking the bona fides of these people and we have more work to do in The Department of Municipal Affairs than check on things like that when we have had a recommendation from responsible people. I am quite prepared to accept that, and unless someone gets into trouble, I would say that this is going to stay out of the Act as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to emphasize the fact that I had made this point

a couple of years ago, and it fell on deaf ears at that time.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, as has already been pointed out, this bill deals with a number of very important subjects. There is one only I would like to comment on, and that is the subject of termites, which this bill purports to deal with to some extent.

My predecessor for the constituency of Woodbine in this House used to make a speech every year on the question of termites. I have not previously referred to the subject at all in this House, not because I consider it unimportant but because I consider that the performance of my predecessor in regard to it contributed very little to the solution of the problem. He regularly made a rather humorous speech. This is a subject, unfortunately, which lends itself to humorous comment.

But it is far from a humorous subject, and during my term as representative of the people of Woodbine in this Legislature, I have devoted my attention to what I considered to be a more constructive line of approach. I have assisted people in the areas concerned to set up an association through which they could call their very serious problems to the attention of proper authorities; I have assisted them in drafting briefs and I have appeared with them before the board of control of the city of Toronto and committees of the city council of Toronto on a number of occasions. I think that through this procedure we are making slow progress, although I regret to say it is slower than the urgency of the problem would appear to me to warrant.

The sections of the hon. Minister's bill dealing with this problem are modelled, I believe, on private legislation, or proposed private legislation, brought forward by the municipality of North York. North York is to be commended for having taken some initiative in this matter, but I would point out to the House and to the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, that North York can consider itself fortunate in that it does not as yet have a really serious termite problem. I think there are a few instances of termite infestation in North York township, but they are very few. North York, quite commendably, came forward asking for legislation through which they can control the problem before it becomes serious. I certainly would support any efforts they make in this direction.

I would point out to the hon. Minister, however, that to rely entirely, as he appears to have done, on the proposals of North York

is really not sufficient to deal with the subject. The proposals he has in his bill are adequate for a municipality that does not as yet have a termite problem to any significant degree and is merely trying to ensure that it will not encounter such a problem in the future. The powers that he proposes to give to a municipal council would be quite adequate in that situation. There are, however, municipalities which have a very acute termite problem at this time, and of course the municipality which above all others suffers from this problem at the present time is the city of Toronto.

I think one could say that most of the termite problem in Ontario exists in Toronto, East York township and the township of Scarborough; those three municipalities have practically all the termite problem. I know there have been occurrences in Kincardine, in Oxley and so on, but I do not think they are a very serious matter. I could be wrong but that is my understanding.

But one thing I know for sure is that in the city of Toronto it is a very serious problem. It is very serious in East York township and it is becoming serious in Scarborough township. It is particularly serious in the east end of Toronto, in the constituency which I represent, in the constituency represented by the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris) and in the constituency represented by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Macaulay). It is an extremely serious problem in those three constituencies. In fact there are large areas in those constituencies in which almost every house is infested by termites.

It is spreading to the west. In fact it is now a well-known fact that every ward in the city of Toronto suffers from termite infestation to some degree, with the exception of Ward 7, and Ward 7 will soon get it unless remedial action is taken. The termite spreads slowly but it spreads ineluctably.

The problem started—nobody knows exactly where it started—but it is thought that it started somewhere around Cherry Beach in Toronto. It has spread to the east and to the west. You will find it all up along Parliament Street in the constituency of St. David—I think it is—and the constituency of St. George. Almost the whole of the eastern half of the city is affected, some areas more seriously than others.

My submission to the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, and I put it forward very earnestly for his consideration, is that the present provisions of his bill are not sufficient to meet a problem where the termite is already well entrenched.

Mr. Singer: Any suggestions?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, I have some suggestions and I am going to put them before the hon. Minister.

As I stated earlier, the group which calls itself the Householders' Association for Termite Control, which centres in the east end of Toronto around the Coxwell-Gerrard area, has made many presentations to the board of control of the city of Toronto and to committees of the city council. I have been present on all the occasions when they made presentations, and as I have said, I have had a considerable part to play in the drafting of their briefs. The city council, the appropriate committee and the board of control over the past year have given very serious study to the problem, based on the representations made by the Householders' Association for Termite Control.

The city of Toronto presented to this Legislature a private bill in which it asked for certain authority. Unfortunately, by the time the council had studied this matter to the point where they were satisfied that they were asking for sound legislation they were too late to bring in a private bill, and they made a request that the principle of their private bill should be incorporated in general legislation. Included in this private bill are not only the matters dealt with in the hon. Minister's bill but a further point which I think is very important. It is in the draft—in the schedule to their own by-law, at least to their own recommendation—of which I have a copy. It appears as item 4. I will simply read it to the House for the record. I am sure if the hon. Minister does not have a copy one can be made available to him. This particular section or item reads as follows:

(4) Where a person is an owner and occupant of a building either detached or in a row, used solely as a residence and occupied by not more than two families, the corporation may on the certificate of its commissioner of buildings that the cost incurred by any such owner in carrying out any work, matter or thing for the repair of or the prevention of damage by termites thereto is reasonable and proper, pay to such person in respect to such cost an amount not exceeding the lesser of \$250 or one-half of the costs so incurred and may advance to such person any or all of such costs, and any such payment or advance by the corporation shall be deemed to be made in pursuance of the carrying out of a purpose of the corporation.

Then there are a number of other sections which define more precisely how this procedure would be carried out and which also protect the city's interest in respect to any loans that might be made.

The essence of the proposal, Mr. Speaker, is that where the commissioner of buildings issues his certificate, a person who is living in his own house, and the house is not occupied by more than two families, may receive from the city a subsidy of up to half of the cost of termite-proofing or a maximum of \$250. He may in addition receive a loan on favourable terms for the balance of the cost.

Now I think this is very important where you have a widespread problem of infestation. The solution to the problem, the only known solution at the present time, is to get buildings termite-proofed. My submission, and the city of Toronto obviously agrees with this reasoning, is that one is most likely to encourage home-owners to undertake termite-proofing if the city is prepared to give them a certain amount of assistance, both by way of direct subsidy and by way of loans on favourable terms.

The sort of problem that one runs into is that there will be a building—a house, a home—with an assessment of perhaps \$2,500 or \$3,000. The owner discovers to his dismay that the building has been attacked by termites. He calls in a termite exterminator—and there are several reputable ones in the city of Toronto who do a good job—and he finds it is going to cost him \$400 or \$500 to have his home termite-proofed. The exterminator will give him a guarantee of five years subject to him paying a further inspection fee of \$20 or \$30 every year. Then at the end of the five years he may have to have the job done all over again, although frequently these jobs have been good for 10, 15 or 20 years.

To a home-owner in that sort of building this sort of cost is onerous. What happens is he usually puts the building up for sale and hopes that he can sell it to somebody who has not heard of termites yet and get out from under the whole thing.

That remedy is becoming less and less available because there are fewer and fewer people who have not heard about termites and do not know the areas in which they are particularly prevalent. But the problem is that the home-owner, especially the small home-owner in the small home with a low assessment, simply does not undertake termite proofing. Under the hon. Minister's proposed bill, the only remedy would be for the city

or the appropriate authority in the city to order him to do it. I suppose if such an order were issued, the provisions of part XXI of The Municipal Act would become operative. Then the city council could make advances to the home-owner, or at least could do the job and pay for it and collect the cost from him on the tax bill. But that particular procedure is available only if an order is issued, and to make a dent on the problem in the eastern part of the city of Toronto would mean that thousands of orders would have to be issued. I am very doubtful, and I suspect the city of Toronto is very doubtful, if it wants to issue thousands of orders to small home-owners requiring them to have their properties termite-proofed.

The city in its proposed private legislation took what I think is the more sensible approach. That is to encourage the home-owner to do it instead of ordering him to do it, to encourage him to do it by saying to him: "We will help to finance this thing. We will subsidize you for half the cost up to \$250, and then we will also advance money to you for the balance if you are having trouble raising the money. But let us get on with the job and we will give you some assistance."

Mr. Speaker, the city did not arrive at this idea of subsidization out of any excess of generosity; it arrived at it as a strictly business proposition. Last year the Householders' Association for Termite Control took ten assessment appeals as test cases and won every single one of them. In every solitary one of them it got on an average a ten per cent reduction in assessment, meaning a lower tax for the householder concerned. Now, if the association wanted to press this principle, it could undoubtedly get thousands of reductions of assessment on exactly the same basis in the city of Toronto.

The city of Toronto is worried about its assessment structure being undermined. It is not being unnecessarily generous to a few people. It is looking at it from the point of view of trying to clean this problem up over a period of time and to protect the assessments.

I would make one more point in that connection, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development in presenting his programme on housing last year, emphasized quite properly the importance of preventing decay before it happens.

Slum clearance and such projects of urban rehabilitation may be necessary. But they are very expensive undertakings, and it is the essence of good planning to prevent decay from taking place, so that it is never neces-

sary to undertake large-scale slum clearance and urban redevelopment.

Perhaps the most serious threat to present property values, to present residential neighbourhoods in the city of Toronto—well-established attractive neighbourhoods—is the termite problem. If it is not approached in an imaginative way, it will result in widespread urban decay which will ultimately make huge expenditures necessary for redevelopment. One can see the beginning of blight now in these termite areas, in very good, working-class residential areas. The homes there are not pretentious by any means, but nice, well-maintained homes that the occupants have been proud of for many years. Now one can see the beginning of decay in the case of owners who no longer feel it is worthwhile trying to maintain their homes and let them run down.

I would appeal to the hon. Minister to look at the problem from this point of view, and to broaden the present provisions of this Act so that the city can do what it wants to do, and so that it can give leadership and encouragement to these people to maintain their homes as they have done in the past, to assist them to lick the termite problem at least as far as their individual dwellings are concerned. It can be licked in most cases, but it is necessary to assist the owners to encourage them to do it. I think the long-term effect will be to protect these residential areas, to maintain them as attractive places where people want to live. There is no doubt in my mind that it will also help, in time, to control the whole problem of termite infestation in the city of Toronto.

The hon. Minister has said that this bill will come before the committee on municipal law. I think I will arrange to have representatives from the Householders' Association for Termite Control come down and talk to him there. I am not going to organize a mass deputation, but I think the hon. Minister might be interested in hearing the views of the people affected by this problem.

I would suggest to him again that it is the city of Toronto that is asking for this sort of legislation. It is merely permissive legislation, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. Minister puts a provision similar to the one that I have read into The Planning Act, along with the other provisions he is proposing, no municipality will be required to do anything, but at least a municipality like Toronto which has studied the problem and considers this to be a sound approach, will be able to carry out that sort of programme. I believe that the city of Toronto should be allowed to carry out a

programme of this kind if it wants to. I would appeal to the hon. Minister to give this matter further consideration, to see if he might not consider it appropriate to enlarge the present bill to cover this further request that has been made to the government and to this Legislature by the city of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member and might say that in considering this question of subsidy for work of this kind, I think one has to look at the whole financial picture of the municipal assessment of Toronto with respect to residences. However, when we get into the municipal law committee I think we will have the opportunity of discussing this again. I would appreciate it if you would have some representatives from the termite control organization speak to the standing committee.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister opens up a very interesting point. Is he going to consider at some time the whole question of assessment in this part of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: You can never tell what I am liable to consider. Just give me a little time.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF HEARST

Mr. R. Brunelle (Cochrane North) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr38, An Act respecting the town of Hearst.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. Pr38 is a bill from the town of Hearst asking that Levesque Plywood Limited be allowed a fixed assessment. This bill was presented to the private bills committee, ably presented by the hon. member who just moved the second reading. He brought with him certain municipal representatives of the town, the solicitor and I think there are others with him. The solicitor, who presented his case very well, presented certain affidavits which set out the history of this matter. What happened there, according to the information given to the committee by the solicitor, was that the town had invited Levesque Plywood Limited to build its building within the town limits and promised that if it would do that the town would ask, from the people of the town, the ratepayers of the town, a vote to approve of a fixed assessment for this industry.

Prior to the vote being put, The Municipal Act was amended and the privilege of granting fixed assessments was taken from all municipalities in the province of Ontario.

I argued that if this bill was approved or reported by the committee we would be establishing a new principle, sir, which would be very difficult to control, in that we would be derogating from a decision made by the Legislature just a few months previously when the privilege of granting fixed assessments was taken away by general legislation in The Municipal Act.

With a few objections, a couple on that side of the House and a couple on this side of the House, the majority approved and reported the bill.

The bill was reported substantially on the basis that it was most important for the town of Hearst that this fixed assessment be allowed to continue. Mr. Speaker, I can sympathize with the position in which the town of Hearst found itself. I can sympathize, too, with the fact that if Levesque Plywood Limited found that it was unable to carry on in business in the town of Hearst it might have to close its doors and many people would be put out of employment. The town would suffer materially through loss of revenue.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the remedy that should be attempted by passing a private bill. If the town of Hearst finds itself in this difficult position, there should be built into the grant system through The Department of Municipal Affairs some methods of taking care of such municipalities as the town of Hearst and other municipalities that find themselves in this same position. I think this is a most important principle.

When the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) brought in The Sales Tax Act, certain people were caught with the goods on hand on which they had to pay sales tax. We did not see a rash of bills brought in to say that because people had bought goods ahead of time, and suddenly were caught up in The Sales Tax Act that private bills should be passed to relieve them.

When The Income Tax Act changes from time to time in Ottawa, when The Customs Acts change, when tariffs change and duties change, you do not see a number of private bills brought in to protect people who unfortunately were caught up in such legislative changes. A decision has to be made as of a certain time. This Legislature in its wisdom, I think, took a proper step, little over a year ago, decided there would be no more fixed assessments in the province of Ontario. Then we had this request from the town of Hearst.

The request comes before the committee, as I say, very ably presented by the hon.

member who moved second reading of the bill, and by the solicitor from the town, in the form of affidavits. The presentation was a short one and it was made before the committee. The committee, other than coming to certain conclusions from the documents that were presented, or read through, had no way of telling what negotiations might have gone on beforehand; but they had in front of them the obvious evidence that there was no by-law passed as of the date The Municipal Act was amended.

I suggested to the committee at the time, that if the door was opened in this regard there would be a rash of bills that would follow one after the other. Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 39—is that the one? No, there is a bill concerning the town of Wallaceburg; perhaps it will be called later today. Bill 50 follows Bill 38 before the committee as the next item on the agenda and Bill 50 enunciates exactly the same sort of principle.

Mr. Speaker, if the province does not believe in its own legislation then it should not have passed this legislation. If the government of this province is not prepared to stick by what it said a very few months ago, then what is the point in amending the statute? If there is a problem in the town of Hearst, if it is the intention of this government to allow bargains that were partially concluded to be carried on not withstanding the statute that was passed such a short time ago, then surely the general statute should be amended?

Surely there should not be provisions just made for Hearst and just made for Wallaceburg. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Gomme), I do not know if he is in his seat, made the point that in his town there is a big and important industry, Hershey Chocolates. They had sought, and the municipal council in Smiths Falls had been anxious to give them, a fixed assessment; but just at the time Smiths Falls wanted to give them the assessment the Act was in the process of being changed and the council at Smiths Falls was forced to say to Hershey Chocolates, "No, we cannot give you a fixed assessment."

In the town represented by my hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Manley)—Cornwall—it would be a great delight to the people who are without jobs there if the local council there could give fixed assessments to attract industries which would put people to work. In the city of Windsor there are many people unemployed, and perhaps new industry could be attracted if fixed assessments were going to be granted in the city of Windsor. In the

city of Toronto, on King Street, on Wellington Street, there are all sorts of vacant buildings. These buildings, I suspect, have been vacant for a long time, but perhaps if there was a fixed assessment some new industry could move into them.

How, Mr. Speaker, can you pick out the town of Hearst and say we are going—notwithstanding what we did a year ago when we abandoned fixed assessments—to resurrect the old system and start all over again? My hon. friend from Cochrane North, Mr. Speaker, says there are extenuating circumstances. An agreement was made. They were caught up; they did not know about the change in the statute. It would be fair and honourable that the agreement having been made, notwithstanding the statute, the private bill should go through.

Well, then we move from Bill 38 to Bill 50, and it was not quite so clear an agreement was made. There were no affidavits. There was sympathy. The committee on private bills is usually most sympathetic to any member who comes before the committee with a problem from his own area; there is always sympathy. But surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be a positive way of proceeding in matters of this sort. If we have abandoned fixed assessments then we have abandoned them; and if the Act has unfortunately done harm to certain areas then the method of changing it should be a change to the Act.

I would have hoped that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, having heard the remarks made at the private bills committee, would have said, "Well, perhaps we were too hasty in passing that section of the Act as it was written. If it can be established to my satisfaction, that is my satisfaction as the Minister, that there were such negotiations in advance, that there were commitments made, then such a privilege can be extended." Or perhaps let the persons who are concerned go before the municipal board and establish before the municipal board that these discussions had taken place and that agreements had been signed. But, Mr. Speaker, the private bills committee had no way whatsoever of ascertaining what happened.

The private bills committee meets for a few hours once or twice a week, listens to a few persons. It is not a fact-finding body, it is not a body that is trained to receive evidence or trained to analyze evidence. It is a body that reacts largely on a sympathetic basis. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if this bill is allowed to pass the House in its present form, notwithstanding the position in

which Hearst unhappily finds itself, that the door is open wide to a succession of private bills asking for fixed assessments for a variety of reasons. And if it has been given to Hearst why should it not be given to Wallaceburg; and if it is given to Wallaceburg, why should it not be given to Cornwall, and Windsor, and Smiths Falls?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The circumstances are different; that is all.

Mr. Singer: Yes, the hon. Minister says the circumstances are different. I am suggesting to him that if the circumstances are different, and if these are circumstances that warrant a remedy, then the remedy should be written into the general legislation and made applicable to all municipalities that find themselves in the same circumstances. I do not think my hon. friend from Cochrane North would object to that.

If those are the circumstances that warrant relief, then write them into your general Act and make them apply across the province. You only cast suspicion on your own government when you grant special favours to special people having, only a few months before, laid down a general principle in legislation.

I know my hon. friend from High Park (Mr. Cowling) is going to violently disagree with me in a few minutes. He says he is sick and tired of principles; that is what he said to the committee. He says each situation should be dealt with individually. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think you can run a province on a series of individual situations.

When the responsible Minister brought in an amendment to The Assessment Act doing away with fixed assessments, he enunciated a principle and the hon. member for High Park supported that. If he did not support it then he should have talked about it at that time. A principle was enunciated then and I think these principles are important, Mr. Speaker; for those reasons I would urge upon the hon. members of this House that this bill be not given second reading.

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the private bills committee, perhaps I should say a few words in respect to these two bills that the hon. member has mentioned—Bill No. Pr38 respecting the town of Hearst, and Bill No. Pr50, an Act respecting the town of Wallaceburg. As he has said, these two bills came before the private bills committee last Thursday and they asked for authorization to fix

the assessment of certain industries in their respective municipalities, although, as he said, the general legislation repealed fixed assessment in the 1960-61 session.

The committee, Mr. Speaker, made it quite clear to the parties on this occasion that this did not necessarily establish a precedent for the future. I agree most times with my hon. friend from High Park, I have been a member of this committee for a great many years, and I think we should deal with these bills as they come before the committee. If a municipality cannot get relief or recourse to what they are looking for because of the general legislation, that is what the private bills committee is for, to come there with a private bill.

This, sir, is actually the only way in which these municipalities could get the relief for which they were asking, to come before this committee with a private bill.

We, the members of the committee, granted the council the permission to authorize by-laws fixing the assessment regardless of this general legislation, with amendment, if they do so with the consent of the electors qualified to vote on money by-laws. In both of these cases, Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned by the hon. member, these councils entered into what they thought were legitimate agreements with these respective industries, Levesque Plywood Industry in the town of Hearst, and Wally Enterprises in the town of Wallaceburg, which it was quite legitimate for them to do before the 1960-61 amendment to the general legislation.

They entered into these agreements in good faith and induced or persuaded these industries to come to their respective municipalities and start operations. The council, which is quite normal for them, thought they were morally bound to honour these agreements. When this general legislation came about—as they said, like a bolt from the blue—they did not have time to pass the necessary by-law so they had no other recourse than to come before the private bills committee. They felt they were morally bound to honour these agreements.

After hearing both sides of the story, the committee, Mr. Speaker, felt the same way about the matter. They reported both of these bills, the one concerning Hearst and the one concerning Wallaceburg, as I say, with the amendment that the councils first obtain the assent of the electors qualified to vote on money by-laws; if the local people of these municipalities have any doubts about the actions of the council at that time, they are in a position to take the required action.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, I recall that when I was elected to city council of the city of Windsor, I was very enthusiastic and very energetic and so forth, wanting to do my best for the citizens of Windsor, I approached the then consultant we had for the board of control—a former employee of the province of Ontario, the late R. J. Moore.

Mr. Speaker, I discussed with him exactly what these two municipalities have done, asking why can't the city of Windsor offer tax concessions to some industries in the province or elsewhere in order that they would settle in the city of Windsor. He said, "Maurice, there is an unwritten law in the province among the municipalities that this will not be done."

I also approached the general manager of the chamber of commerce, Mr. Lasseline, and spoke to him about this. He said, "Oh, do not ever bring up an affair such as this. This would not be fair to the established industries we have in the municipality at the present time."

After a while I realized that they were right. Now I find this occurring right here in the province. It appears that through the private bills committee it can be had. We are opposed to this. You can rest assured that when a bill is presented by a member of the government it is almost sure to pass through because of the fact that he is a member of the government.

Well, I can see it. You tell me different. I saw this happen again this morning in the case of the Toronto township bill. It was mentioned by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) that this bill would not benefit or harm education actually but that, finance-wise, it was going to be a detriment to the people of some sections—even industry. So we voted against this bill. But a government member introduced the bill and it passed. It seems to me that this is not the right type of legislation we should have. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this is not the right type of legislation to introduce. I am opposed to it.

Mr. Morrow: Mr. Speaker, if I may say one word on these remarks. The hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich is, I think, a little bit unfair when he says only the supporters for the government vote for a particular bill when it is introduced by a supporter of the government; because in this particular case in which he now speaks, both of these bills, hon. members of your party voted for the bills as well as hon. members of the other Opposition party in the House.

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): On the morning of the meeting of the private bills committee I was unavoidably late in getting there. The bill for Wallaceburg had already been approved, and I got there late for the other bill, Pr38. I did not hear too much of the discussion but when the hon. Minister said he was prepared to approve this bill with the assent of the electors, those eligible to vote on money by-laws, I thought I would go along with this. But information has come out this afternoon that I did not know of that afternoon. One is that the company had entered into an agreement with the municipality, then found out that they could not do that. Now the agreement has been entered into between the two partners, and I wonder what chance a plebiscite would have of being opposed in this particular instance. I think there would be many pressures that would try to influence the electors in giving this company a fixed assessment.

I think I agree with the hon. member for York Centre that if it is desirable at all, it should be general legislation. In the light of the information that has come before the hon. members this afternoon I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I must oppose it too.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF WALLACEBURG

Mr. G. W. Parry (Kent West) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr50, An Act respecting the town of Wallaceburg.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make the same speech again on Pr50 as I made on Pr38. Let me say only that insofar as the case of Bill No. Pr50 the evidence, if it can be called evidence as it came before the committee, was much less conclusive.

The reason given by the people from Hearst—they produced no witnesses—was that it was too far a distance to travel and too small a municipality to be able to afford those travelling costs, so they produced affidavits. In the case of the town of Wallaceburg, which is much closer than Hearst and a little more affluent, there were no affidavits, there were no witnesses, it was merely a summary of the so-called evidence, a presentation by someone on behalf of that municipality. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the committee has no way of ascertaining what were the facts surrounding the applications to the council so far as the town of Wallaceburg is concerned.

This is the immediate extension of the bad

principle established by the passing of Bill No. Pr38. I think the government is wrong in not amending the general legislation if they want to take care of such situations. I think they should be condemned for not supporting their own legislation passed only a few months ago.

Mr. Morrow: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to correct one thing that the hon. member for York Centre mentioned. I do not want to get into this bill at further length myself, but the mayor of the municipality of Wallaceburg, present at the time of the negotiations, stood up in the committee and said: "Yes, those agreements were entered into." The present mayor of the municipality was present and he also substantiated the same thing. They were there in person whereas the people from Hearst had their solicitor produce affidavits to this effect.

Mr. Singer: If I may, my hon. friend has refreshed my memory in this. There were no agreements presented to the committee. There was no evidence as to what meetings had taken place, when they had taken place, what agreements had been entered into. Other than the verbal statements of a couple of people as to what had gone on, in their impression, at a meeting. There was nothing else there.

Mr. G. W. Parry (Kent West): Mr. Speaker, I think it was agreed at the meeting, by the delegation from Wallaceburg, that there would be a referendum taken next December. Now, to me it is only permissive legislation until you hold an election. Let the electors of Wallaceburg decide this issue.

It is all right for us to come here, after somebody made the commitment, and try to throw the thing out. These commitments were made in good faith and I think the time has come to support this bill. I think it is something I owe to my riding and I have no apologies to make to anyone.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

House in committee of supply; Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West) in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 702:

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, at the time we adjourned the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) had just made a statement, in fact a very surprising statement,

that he did not know if there was a shortage of nurses in the province or not. He seemed more emphatic and insisted there was not any shortage. I do not know if I misunderstood him, but he seemed certainly to have his head in the sand.

There is one thing about the present hon. Minister of Health, in that occasionally, when it has been pointed out that there is a shortage of hospitals or hospitals for retarded children, he has attempted to do something about it. In fact he has not been afraid to admit that things have been wrong and could be improved. That is one reason why so many people in the health field do not blame the hon. Minister for what is lacking, but they often blame the administration.

Over the past years of this administration so little has been done in this health field that people who are interested are now happy that something is being done. But one area where the hon. Minister seems to be lapsing into the former way of doing things in The Department of Health is by ignoring problems. To say that there is no shortage of nurses in the province of Ontario, is utterly ignoring the problem.

I have often heard it referred to by doctors, often read about it in the press and I would just like to bring to the hon. Minister's attention not only what individual nurses have to say, but what has been printed by various publications in the province of Ontario and in Canada. I hope to some extent I can show the hon. Minister that he is entirely wrong. He should wake up to the problem that there is a very serious shortage of nursing staff in the province of Ontario.

Just recently we in the Opposition received a letter from a nurse. I will not give her name or the hospital, but if the hon. Minister ever wanted to see the letter, to see that it is a genuine letter, I would be glad to show it to him. This nurse says:

I am writing you to find out if you know about the conditions under which the nurses in our hospitals are working. I am presently employed at—

And she names the hospital. It is outside the city of Toronto but in a fairly prosperous community in the province.

I am working at such-and-such a hospital and have been on night study for the past two and a half years. We have 26 beds on the floor that I work on and we are always busy.

I have one assistant and have been informed tonight that when this nursing

assistant has her nights off, she cannot be replaced so that I would be alone at least two nights a week. This in my estimation is an all-time low in hospital care as it would be impossible to give anything but minimum care to patients with all the paper work nursing now entails.

I do hope that someone will come to our assistance. As a group we have been taken over absolutely by the present Ontario government and I feel that it is a shame. The people of Ontario have no idea to what extent they are paying for this absolute disregard for their protection.

I would appreciate hearing from you if there are any suggestions you might offer to give us any ray of hope for our profession in this predicament.

Sincerely—

That letter was written very recently, Mr. Chairman, and if I am to take any attitude of the government from the words of the hon. Minister I can write this lady and say that there is no ray of hope as long as this government is in power, that the only thing that can be done about the predicament of the nursing profession in Ontario is turn the government out of office and put in a Liberal administration.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: In the May, 1962 issue of *Chatelaine* magazine there appeared an article "What's Wrong With Nursing Today". It is too bad the hon. Minister has not read that article. He could not have read it or he would not have made the statements he made in this House yesterday. The *Chatelaine* article of May, 1962 said this:

A 1961 publication of the Registered Nurses Association of Ontario quotes a well-known Canadian economist as saying: "Recently the supply of Canadian-trained nurses has been totally inadequate to meet the demand. The Ontario Hospital Services Commission is asking people to shorten their stay in hospital to help overcome the shortage of nurses."

Then the magazine asks:

Where are the nurses? In his first New Year's message Ontario's Premier John Robarts promised more hospital beds for the province, yet in at least two Toronto hospitals whole wards are unoccupied because there are not enough nurses available to staff them.

An hon. member: Shame!

Mr. Trotter: To continue:

Canada is still losing nurses to higher U.S. salaries, nearly 13,000 between 1946 and 1960 according to the January 1962 Department of Labour reports. And Canadian hospitals are still recording dangerous nursing shortages and a recent survey found 56 Quebec hospitals closing 672 beds through lack of 1,900 nurses.

Certainly we can see that there is a shortage in Quebec and here in the city of Toronto. It amazed me, Mr. Chairman, how the government can ignore this situation.

If the hon. Minister had the courage to admit there was a real problem and gave some indication that he was going to do something to solve the problem it would not be so serious. We realize that he has inherited a situation where nothing has been done for years, but he should at least have the courage to admit nothing has been done and to set to work to clean up the situation.

There can be a serious situation through the lack of nursing, there can be sometimes amusing situations. Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from this one instance—there are many instances shown in this *Chatelaine* magazine—but one is as follows:

There was that day, for instance, when two flustered little nurses bustled into the maternity ward with the news that the nursing supervisor was making an inspection tour. My fellow patient, needing a bed pan, was implored to wait until later. Drowsily curled in a crumpled cocoon of comfort I was summarily aroused to have my bed tidied, my person neatly laid out in the orthodox position. By the time the supervisor appeared we were just as scared as the nurses.

I can hardly imagine you, Mr. Chairman, in that situation, but it could happen to any of us. This illustration was used and it goes into some detail where nurses have to carry on various duties other than nursing: taking care of trays, counting pills. In other words, it is a lack of organization in the modern nursing profession. If in our training courses and in our administration of our hospitals we reorganized and took care of this situation, the nurses that we do have available could be used for nursing and not just for counting pills or serving trays.

The magazine *Chatelaine* has gone into the background of nursing and has shown that this situation, our difficulty of obtaining sufficient numbers of nurses, has existed for years; in some cases as a result of not having proper training facilities, poor pay for nurses

and sometimes the supervising nurses being too autocratic during the time the girls were in training.

There was in 1932 a Dr. G. M. Weir, who prepared what is known as the Weir report on nursing in Canada. The conditions that existed in 1932, *Chatelaine* magazine goes on to show, exist today. *Chatelaine* magazine says:

Though the wastefulness of this system—that is our present system of teaching—has long been recognized, proved by surveys and loudly deplored, nursing education in 1962 continues along lines called archaic, primitive, antiquated, and chaotic as long ago as 1932 in an intensive survey by Dr. G. M. Weir, head of the department of education of the University of British Columbia. A massive 591-page study of nursing education in Canada, the Weir report documented conditions that no other profession would tolerate.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with this vote.

Mr. Trotter: You are on public health administration.

Mr. Chairman: Are you talking about public health nurses or nurses in general?

Mr. Trotter: I am talking about nursing in general; it comes under vote 706, the nursing branch. He said the special training of public health personnel, he said it includes grants; it could be included here, it could be included in 706.

Mr. Chairman: I think perhaps you could elaborate further on this subject under vote 706.

Mr. Trotter: Are you sure? You would not want me to repeat it all under 706?

Mr. Chairman: I would not want you to do that.

Mr. Trotter: It could also come under the main office. There are two or three places it could come under.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: I see the hon. Minister is mumbling, but we might as well get it in here as in 706. All right then, fine! I know it is maybe a laughing matter to you, but this is a serious problem.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It does not belong to this department at all. This is what I am trying to tell you.

Mr. Trotter: What, nursing? It does not belong to The Department of Health?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The training of nurses? No, it does not.

Mr. Trotter: Well, certainly the shortage of nurses does.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, it does not.

Mr. Trotter: It is time the hon. Minister woke up to the fact that the shortage of nurses has a lot to do with these—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is time you learned something about—

Mr. Trotter: I knew—this ridiculous argument, you are trying to evade the whole problem.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh nuts!

Mr. Trotter: That is an appropriate comment—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister without Portfolio): What happened to the Hepburn government?

Mr. Trotter: For the information of the hon. Minister without Portfolio, I do not care what happened to Mr. Hepburn or Mr. Whitney. And Mr. Drew, who is prancing and dancing with the lords and ladies in London, as long as he is happy I do not care—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Keep on the subject.

Mr. Trotter: I have this one final item I would like to mention in regard to the training that we give nurses. It says in this article in *Chatelaine*:

That the kind of training we give our nurses is the basic problem can be seen not only from the Weir report and others, but by such experiments as the metropolitan demonstration training school established in 1948 in Windsor, by the Canadian Nurses' Association and financed by the Canadian Red Cross Society. This was an attempt to prove that an independent school could produce nurses more efficiently and more quickly when the education needs of the nurses were not controlled by the services needs of the hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard so many nurses claim—and I have heard others, such as R. B. Cowan, the Member for Parliament for York-Humber in Toronto in the last federal Parliament, claim—that our system of teaching nurses today has discouraged many from going into the profession. The fact that lawyers and doctors and architects go to a school, but a nurse must live in and work as she is being trained, is outdated.

It would do well for our Department of Health to look into the situation of how our nurses are trained by seeing to it that possibly nurses' colleges or schools of nursing are set up where they study full time.

So if there is some doubt as to what department the importance of nursing comes under, I suggest that the hon. Minister of Health get together with whatever department, be it The Department of Education or what else, to see to it that something be done to overcome the shortage of nurses. We in the city of Toronto have had a shortage of nurses, if the hon. Minister does not know it, in Riverdale Hospital. There has been a shortage in Northwestern Hospital, a serious shortage where whole wards have been closed down, and I imagine by the time the hon. Minister hears from other hon. members here in the Opposition, that there are many other towns and cities where wards have been closed down in hospitals throughout Ontario because there is a shortage of nurses.

It is time that The Department of Health took on its responsibility to see to it that this shortage is overcome. I do hope that the hon. Minister will not be quite so cocky and say there is no shortage of nurses, but that he will get down and do some work about it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: At least I try to learn a little bit more about my topic before I discuss it. It is very obvious that the hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

In the first place, the closing sentences of his speech are directly taken from *Hansard* of last year, the speech made by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald). Much of what he said I agreed with, and if the hon. member had been reading the newspapers, even *Chatelaine* and the nursing magazines, he would have seen the storm of criticism that the hon. members, in my own words, brought down upon our heads.

We were discussing public health nursing, Mr. Chairman, and I did state that to the best of our information we were 35 nurses short in the province of Ontario. We have 74

nurses in training so that shortage will be taken up.

I can tell the hon. member that the ratio of public health nurses in Ontario's population is one to 5,000; the best ratio in the United States of America is one to 8,000. I think I have good grounds and good justification for stating that in my opinion we do not have a shortage of public health nurses in Ontario.

However, the hon. member has brought up the subject of nurses. First of all, the training of nurses is not the responsibility of The Department of Health. We have three schools of nursing and we have five schools for the training of certified nursing assistants. In those three schools—and he is so certain that this department and this government is doing nothing about it—the year I became the Minister of Health, we graduated nine nurses from our three schools of nursing. This year, four years later, we will graduate 66 from the schools of nursing. I think by any count that is a pretty large increase in a very short space of time.

We have increased the turn-out of certified nursing assistants. The total figure for the province in 1961, there were 30 approved schools, in 1962 there were 40 approved schools—that is not a bad increase for one year, in my opinion—and we will turn out 6,475 certified nursing assistants this year.

In 1956, the total number of students enrolled in all the schools of nursing in the province, 6,079; in January, 1963, that figure had risen to 7,997, again not an increase to be sneezed at altogether.

The hon. member spoke about Dr. Weir's report, and Dr. Weir's report was good, but the hon. member is quite behind the times, sir.

The metropolitan school has shown and did show its worth, but this government three years ago established a school of nursing to show to hospital schools throughout the province the value of a different concept of nurse-education, rather than nurse-training. The first class of that school graduated this past summer—every one of them with very high standing—every one of them, I think, capable of demonstrating the value of this approach to nursing education.

I have to point out to the hon. member that the schools for training nurses are operated by the hospitals, and that the hospitals in Ontario are not operated by this government. They are operated by independent boards who have a right to run their own

affairs very much as they choose and in keeping with the standards laid down now by the Ontario College of Nurses.

Mr. Trotter: Well, it is still the hon. Minister's responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is one man's opinion and it is the opinion of a man who very obviously does not know what he is talking about, because it becomes more and more clear, Mr. Chairman, that our hon. friends on the other side of the House seem to allocate to government the responsibility of breathing down the necks of those charged with responsibilities in no matter what field. You want us to dictate to municipal councils. You want us to dictate to school boards. You want us to dictate to hospital boards. Is the hon. member of the opinion that nobody knows anything but him, who happens to have been fortunate enough to be elected to this Legislature?

Mr. Trotter: No, I want the hon. Minister to do something.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do not believe in this. We believe that, if a municipality elects members to take on a certain responsibility, our job is to help them and we have never refused in this regard. But our job is not to breathe down their necks constantly as if Big Brother is looking over their shoulder all the time.

We do not have the conceit to believe that we know everything. We can learn much from these school boards and trustees who are charged with the responsibility of running schools of nursing and we will give them all the help and advice that we can. But I cannot see that government should take over the business of operating all the schools of nursing in the province. We have set an example. Now we hope that the schools will take on the responsibility.

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): As far as I am concerned, I have been very reluctant in the past to quarrel with the hon. Minister, who is a qualified physician. But it is starting to get a little bit under our skin over here when the hon. Minister comes to this House and continually gives this House the impression that there is no shortage of nurses in Ontario.

Now I respect the hon. Minister's right to have an opinion. He says that they can learn much, this government does not try to force anything down anybody's throat, and we can learn much from various sources. But it

seems to me if we are going to solve the problem the first elementary step is to recognize the problem.

Now I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, some of the information which has been given to this House this afternoon is somewhat misleading, perhaps not intentionally. But nevertheless there is a shortage of nurses in this province. I think this is borne out by many of the doctors themselves. Some who have spoken to me privately, have stated that they did not want to be quoted because they did not think it was the best public relations to be quoted. But I did take the trouble, Mr. Chairman, to look up the brief which came to all of our offices, which was prepared by the Ontario Medical Association to the Royal commission on health services.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that this would be an authoritative report, it was prepared by a very responsible organization, the Ontario Medical Association, and I am sure the hon. Minister would not quarrel with me that the information contained herein would be reliable.

I would like to put a few paragraphs on the record from this report, which I think substantiates some of the statements that the hon. member for Parkdale gave to this House, which has been continually brought to the attention of the hon. Minister each year in his estimates.

I should like to quote first of all, sir, from page 2-B of that report and I quote paragraphs six and seven as follows:

In contrast to what is happening in industry where automation is creating a lessening demand for personnel, the complexity of health services requires a constant increase both in number and in their qualifications. The difference of course is because health services are personal services, whether they be rendered by a physician or a nurse or a physiotherapist.

The physician is dependent on other members of the health team. If there is a shortage of personnel in one category, it can affect the quantity and quality of available health services. We find this, for example, in our hospitals where wards are sometimes closed because of shortage of nurses.

How can the hon. Minister tell this House there is not a shortage of nurses, when the hospitals themselves are being closed because they cannot get sufficient nurses to staff their wards? I think it demands an explanation a little bit more than the one that was given this afternoon by the hon. Minister when he

said there is one to 5,000 here whereas in the United States there is 1 to 8,000. We did not—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member is confusing two completely distinct and different issues.

An hon. member: That is what they are trying to do all the time—confusing.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. Sir, I took the information down. The hon. member says I am trying to confuse the facts. I submit to you, sir, that it is that side of the House that is doing the confusing. If I erred in quoting the hon. Minister, it was because I took it down here while he was speaking and I misunderstood him, and if I am wrong I stand corrected. But I do not think I will stand corrected on some of the other paragraphs contained in this brief.

There is a loss of para-medical personnel through emigration, and this is to be regretted. The more serious loss, however, is from marriage. By tradition the vast majority of workers in the para-medical field have been female. Attempts to attract men into this have not been very successful to date. This is difficult to understand from a physiological point of view. The answer again has been given as inadequate salaries both during and after training, so that a man with a family responsibility seeks other employment.

The hon. Minister said this government does not force anybody to do anything. With this example I am in substantial agreement, but surely there are other methods of attracting trained personnel into this profession than by forcing them, and one of them would seem to me to be by means of encouragement. Perhaps salaries is one place where it could be done. The brief says further that salary levels be made such as to retain our health workers and to attract more male workers into the field, and that provision be made for necessary staff and facilities to meet future needs of personnel in the health field.

These are all recommendations that were submitted to the Royal commission, and submitted by responsible people. Let me quote, Mr. Chairman, from page 51, paragraph 172 of this same brief:

A questionnaire directed to our branch societies gave sufficient returns to substantiate shortages in many categories of health workers which have been brought to your attention. The supply never seems to keep pace with the demand. The primary reason

is lack of long-range planning to cope with expanding horizons, and medical practice, and a rapidly increasing population.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, this is the responsibility of The Department of Health to make these long-range plans and to encourage sufficient nurses into the profession so that they will be available to meet the need when it occurs. I shall quote again:

It is unfortunate that hospitals are built and furnished only to find there is insufficient nursing staff to open some of the wards for indefinite periods.

Mr. Chairman, how can anybody say in this House that there is not a shortage of nurses when the fact is that hospitals are unable to open? I am told that in some areas in this province operations are held up. It was not possible to proceed with surgery because there were not sufficient nurses on hand on that particular date to staff the operating room. If that is not the truth, I think it is the responsibility of the hon. Minister to deny it. But I think it is somewhat borne out by the report of the Ontario Medical Association in this brief. I quote again from the brief:

As in the case of physicians, we have been dependent upon workers trained in other countries to augment the inadequate supply from our own schools. This is a tenuous position to be in.

Another area of concern is the emigration of trained health workers. One thousand, three hundred and sixty-five nurses emigrated to the United States in 1960. The report, Mr. Chairman, suggests the remuneration and working conditions need a thorough review. This is particularly true in the light of the fact that it is almost impossible to interest males in this field. This means we have a higher attrition rate than would pertain if we had a better balance between male and female workers.

Mr. Chairman, all we are trying to say on this side of the House is that we have now had this matter brought to our attention from various sources. It has been brought to our attention by the nurses. It has been brought to our attention by the Ontario Medical Association, in its brief to the Royal commission. Surely, Mr. Chairman, this calls for more than the hon. Minister giving us the number of nurses in this province as compared to other jurisdictions. If there are not enough nurses in other jurisdictions that is one point, but if there are not enough nurses in this jurisdiction this is our responsibility as members of the Legislature.

Ontario hospital costs are going up by leaps and bounds. It may be that if we made the maximum use of the facilities that we already have that we would not need to build so many hospitals. But certainly I do not think the answer is to blind ourselves to the fact that there is a shortage, to go around with our heads in the sand, so to speak, continuing to imply that there is not a shortage while the facts speak otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not know where the hon. member gets his information. He has read part of it from the OMA brief to the Royal commission, but my advisers here are the Hospital Services Commission, and they know of no hospital in Ontario that failed to open, or is closed because of lack of nurses. They know of certain wards and parts of wards—just a moment—you should never judge work until it is finished, but this is your specialty. There are wards and parts of wards closed because there are not sufficient registered nurses, and for parts of the week only.

One of the great problems facing many general hospitals in the province is that they cannot work at full capacity at the weekend because so many of the nurses are married and will not work at the weekend. This is something that everyone in the profession is well aware of. If you can tell us how to make married women come away from their homes and work on the weekend then you are really going to be able to do something.

Nor does the commission have any information concerning any necessary operation ever held up for lack of nurses. I think this is a very dangerous and damaging statement, and if you have such information, I think we should have it so we have an opportunity to investigate the whys and the wherefors. I, too, have spoken to hospital administrators, and I have had hospital administrators deplore so much publicity concerning the shortage of nurses—not the administrators as a business group but the boards of governors and trustees. They have told me that with organization and proper management in the hospital, the shortage of nursing is not so acute as it would appear.

My hon. friend spoke about the complaint of one individual nurse, because she had 28 patients on her ward. What kind of patients? She certainly was not in charge of a ward with acutely ill patients—28 acutely ill patients—with only one assistant.

If she were in charge of a chronic ward, elderly folk, or folk who were chronically ill and wanted to sleep during the night hours,

she did not need more than one person to help her. Indeed, she hardly needs one to help her. She herself can surely keep going for an eight-hour shift to watch 28 sleeping folk. But, I can assure you, there is no hospital ward in Ontario where there are 28 seriously ill patients left to the care of one nurse.

However, I would ask the hon. member's indulgence to leave this matter of general nurses until the hospital services commission estimates come up, because then I will have the advice of those who are closely in touch with this field and put me right where I may be going wrong.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to do that.

I would like to answer the hon. Minister's question. He says he knows of no cases where hospitals were unable to open because of a shortage of nurses. I am told that it was necessary for the hospital in Burlington to recruit nurses over in the British Isles to get sufficient nurses to open the hospital. I am told that the same situation took place at the Chedoke Hospital in Hamilton. I am told this by doctors.

The hon. Minister says I made a serious charge and that I have a responsibility to make it public. Of course I cannot make it public and he knows it, because I am not a doctor. I told the hon. Minister that doctors have told me that they were unable to perform an operation because the facilities were not available. He knows as well as I do that if a doctor makes it public it is going to affect his privileges, certainly his co-operation in the hospital concerned. He knows that as a medical doctor.

To suggest that I am the man that should bring the information forward is wrong. The charge has been made over here and it is the responsibility of The Department of Health to investigate the charges.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is an entirely different thing. We were talking about nurses. Now, he says because facilities were not available. I say to this House, sir—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Nursing facilities!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: As a doctor, many a time I have had a patient requiring surgery and I would expect the operating room and all the staff to be ready to jump as soon as I spoke. We all want to do every operation as soon as it is necessary, but much surgery can be left and set at a time when it is suitable for everybody concerned.

Now, if that is the sort of thing the doctor is talking about, I can have no concern nor sympathy over it. But, if he is speaking about emergency operations that are held up for lack of nursing staff, there is quite a difference between nursing staff and facilities, because there are many facilities enter into the performance of an operation and unless I knew which facilities the doctor in question was referring to I cannot answer.

I do not ask the hon. member to make it public. I know perfectly well he cannot do that, but I think that doctor has a responsibility to let the commission, or let us know, where he is being held up, where emergency or absolutely essential surgery is being held up for lack of nursing staff.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, would you let me correct one word. Apparently I said "facilities" when I intended to say "nursing facilities." My information is they were held up because nurses were not there to perform the duties that were necessary. Now, I think I make that abundantly clear.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a point here, and I will leave the substance for later if the hon. Minister wants it.

I wish some time we could decide on the appropriate place to discuss various items. It would seem to me that the nursing branch is the appropriate place to discuss the whole problem of nursing. The hon. Minister says that he wants it under the hospital services commission. I have a whole chestful that I want to get out on this issue of nursing shortages and what should be done about it, and to what extent it is the government's responsibility. I thought the appropriate place was in the nursing branch. Now does the hon. Minister want it in the nursing branch or does he want it under the hospital services commission?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This branch, Mr. Chairman, is concerned with the training of certified nursing assistants.

Mr. MacDonald: That only?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Then if the hon. Minister wants the general discussion on nursing—because I will have to warn him right now that it is not over—it will come under hospital services commission?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay!

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something about one of the best health projects ever undertaken by any government. I refer to health units, organizations set up for the sole purpose of providing the best possible in public health, to look after the supply of pure drinking water, adequate sewage disposal, proper pasteurization of milk, the control of infectious disease, school health programmes—in short everything that affects the health of our people.

The development of health units has progressed a long way since the first one was established nearly 30 years ago in the riding, I believe, now represented by my friend, the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Manley). That was then a new experiment, but now the hon. Minister has pointed out there are 36 of these health units and another one about to be started.

In my area, the great riding of Welland, I think we have about the best unit possible. The medical health officer who directs it is Dr. Leo Sturgeon, well and widely known for his leadership in health care, assisted by an excellent staff. He has done an excellent job and now I understand his area of activity is to be greatly expanded by assuming responsibility for the much enlarged new city of Niagara Falls.

Sometimes, Mr. Chairman, it is said that these units are too costly. This is wrong, since the average cost is roughly \$1 per capita, matched by this government with the same amount. For this small amount a complete public health service is provided.

I want to commend the hon. Minister of Health, Mr. Chairman, and this government for the efforts of The Department of Health in encouraging the establishment of health units. I would also say to these hon. members, especially the hon. rural members, if your county has not yet established a health unit you would do your people really good service if you would encourage the establishment of these health units.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the administration of The Home Workers and Nurses Service Act would come under this vote, would it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, that comes under The Department of Public Welfare.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This vote only has to do with public health nursing.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the vote, I should like to draw the hon. Minister's attention—I am sure it has already been done—to part of the brief which was submitted by the carpenters' union, which submitted a brief on January 31 to hon. members of the Cabinet dealing with the matter of The Public Health Act. I presume this is the proper place to discuss this matter. I would like to read that, because I think it is indicative of the situation which—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Is this industrial hygiene? I thought this was public health administration.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What does it have to do with?

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Would you allow me to read it? It says:

Regulations of The Health Act. Regulation 199-51 prescribes sanitary conditions as amended by regulations 50, 52 and 200-53, prescribing medical service in camps.

And it goes on to give the conditions in camps. May I proceed?

Mr. Chairman: It is in vote 710.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, you are ruling that I raise this in vote 710?

Mr. Chairman: That is right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister can tell us if there is presently being built or organized a public health unit in Sault Ste. Marie.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, there is not.

Mr. Nixon: Is there one planned at this time, is there any demand for it, of which the hon. Minister is aware?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Discussions concerning it are going on now.

Mr. Nixon: Would the hon. Minister tell me with whom he would be carrying on discussion?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: With the boards of health of the municipalities proposing to come into the formation of the unit. This

should not be confused with the fact that we stated we would establish an office of our own in Sault Ste. Marie and Moosonee. That is part of our service to the unorganized areas, but the discussions concerning the establishment of a unit are going on with those in organized municipalities.

Mr. L. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, before passing vote 702 I would like some further clarification on a point that was raised yesterday by the hon. member for Kent East (Mr. Spence) when he inquired about the number of dentists who were graduating. As a matter of fact, Dr. Hastings made a similar report here recently and he was quoted, under a sub-heading of "Can't Staff Clinics: The dentists are in such short supply that the Ontario health department is unable to staff this railway dental clinic used to service the north." I wonder if the hon. Minister would like to comment on this.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This report is completely in error, Mr. Chairman. Both the railway cars operated by this department are staffed and have been staffed and are out on the line now, but I think it is only fair to state that Dr. Hastings called our office when this report appeared in the papers and explained to us that he was misreported, that he had asked the newspapers for a retraction, which I have not yet seen published, but it may well have been published. He did advise us that he was misreported. There is, I think, a further piece of wrong information in that same article. I think you will find that he said something about the cost of these people getting into our mental hospitals being so great that they could not get in. This is completely without foundation. In fact it does not cost anything—

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Chairman, it went on to say here that the borderline and minor mental illness cases in outlying areas are being handled by family doctors, clergy and public health nurses because of both the absence of local psychiatrists and the cost of sending patients to the mental hospitals.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think it is quite understandable that a specialist in any branch of medicine would feel that everything should be handled by a specialist. I do not know anyone better equipped to handle minor emotional illnesses than the family doctor and I would defend that position very, very strongly because it is the soundest position that we can have. If we are going to have specialists for every branch of medicine to

deal with the ordinary run-of-the-mill cases it is quite impossible of attainment and it is a quite unrealistic attitude.

Mr. Thomas: Are you finished or will you give me the following information? How many county health units are operating at the present time and were there any formed last year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Thirty-six.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister made some reference to health service in unorganized townships. Do you supply health service to unorganized townships?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We established units in northern Ontario.

Mr. Troy: Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In the Nipissing and Parry Sound district last year.

Mr. Troy: There is a unit in North Bay but it does not—is that the one you mean?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, that is your own for North Bay, Widdifield, and what other—

Mr. Troy: And West Ferris.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: West Ferris, is it?

Mr. Troy: Where is the health unit for Parry Sound, Nipissing? Where is its headquarters?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Here at the present time. At our head office at the present time. We expect that it will be located in North Bay. The field office is to be in North Bay.

Mr. Troy: Thank you. I hope it gets transferred to North Bay very soon because there are many problems there in regard to health in the unorganized townships.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 702 agreed to.

On vote 703:

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could accept a question on air pollution at this moment?

Mr. Chairman: That is vote 710, industrial hygiene.

Mr. Downer: I am afraid I will not be able to deal with it later, and I would like to put the question before the hon. Minister. It was reported last week in the press that The Department of Health advised the city of

Toronto that the degree of pollution of the air was very bad. It has also been stated that air pollution in Toronto and certain other industrial cities in the province is as bad as it was in Pittsburgh before the clean-up took place over there.

The first question that I want to ask is this: has the province considered adopting the same methods as were used in Pittsburgh and I understand are used in other places in the United States? The second: does The Department of Health assist in the control of air pollution in this province, and can the hon. Minister outline any plans for the future?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, do I have your indulgence to deal with this at the present?

An hon. member: That is an embarrassing question.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, it is not the least embarrassing.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: You should come up to Port Arthur.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: First of all, I think it should be understood, Mr. Chairman, that the report which we are supposed to have submitted to Metropolitan Toronto was not a special report for the Metropolitan Toronto area but part of a report that was sent out concerning many areas in the province of Ontario.

Now, on the question of the hon. member as to whether the province has thought of adopting a system adopted in the United States, the province's system is exactly the same as that which has proven so successful—I think outstandingly successful—in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where the budget is largely a municipal one. This is largely in the United States a municipally handled matter, just exactly the way we have done it here.

I believe in some States the legislation is mandatory for the municipality, but of that I cannot be completely sure. I am not sure, in Pennsylvania, if the legislation is mandatory for the municipality or if it is like our own—permissive—but it is rather interesting to note, I think, that many municipalities in Ontario have availed themselves of the permissive legislation set up under The Air Pollution Control Act, and have done a very great deal of useful work with it.

Toronto and Hamilton—and is it Windsor? Toronto and Hamilton I am certain of—still choose to operate under a section of The Municipal Act which no longer obtains but

they were established under that and they continue to operate under that. It is our belief—just Hamilton and Toronto. If they passed by-laws under The Air Pollution Control Act, they would do a far more effective job, but their engineers do not agree with us on this. I think their opinion, to them at least, is quite sound.

What do we plan to do in the future? We believe that the next step in control that the province might undertake, which would be of great benefit to the municipalities and would help them greatly in the future, is that we would ask that plans for all new installations be submitted to our department, and that permission to build these new installations would not be granted until the plans had been approved by the department.

We are also at the present time in discussion with the Ontario Research Foundation on certain projects which we believe will also be of great help in this regard. There are many types of filters—and I will use filters for want of a better term, because they are not all filters in the true and exact sense, but methods of controlling pollutants—about which even manufacturers have little knowledge themselves, particularly about the efficacy of them.

We think that we can do a useful and worthwhile service in this regard and we, through the department are discussing the possibility of research in this matter to be undertaken with our support by the Ontario Research Foundation. These are steps that we propose to take in the matter of control. I hope that before this House rises, we will bring in a necessary amendment to the Act to allow us to go into this matter of approving plans for new installations or for the replacement of old and obsolete ones.

I think the amount of money spent by this department, by the cities and by the municipalities, related to municipalities on the other side of the border, stacks up very well. For instance, in Philadelphia, 8.4c per capita is the budget. Whereas in Metropolitan Toronto it is 15.8c and in Hamilton it is 15.1c. Here, on this side of the border, the municipalities along with us are doing very much the same type of thing that is being done and has been proven successful on the other side of the border.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, if I might just pass a remark about air pollution. I do not know whether you have the air pollution percentage by cities here in the east, but I am going to tell you that Port Arthur was the purest city in Ontario, as far as air pollution is concerned.

I just wanted to say to my friends opposite, that we are not at all stingy in divulging our method of keeping that way. Just ask and we will tell you. We sometimes pass some of Port Arthur's pure air over to Fort William to my hon. friend, Mr. Chapple's constituency, over there, and Mr. Minister, I think you will find that my statement is so. Figures show that the purest air in Ontario is in Port Arthur. We will divulge to you, at any time,

our methods of accomplishing that record. So, Mr. Minister, if any other questions are asked, I will be only too glad to answer and give you our recipe for acquiring the reputation of having the purest air in Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: It being 6 of the clock, I now leave the chair.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

WINTER WORKS INCENTIVE PROGRAMME

(Reference by Hon. J. W. Spooner, Minister of Municipal Affairs, on page 1340)

I

Five-year comparison

	Period		No. of months	Number of man-days of work
	To	From		
1.	Dec. 1, 1958	May 31, 1959 (1)	6	310,500
2.	Dec. 1, 1959	May 31, 1960	6	382,700
3.	Oct. 15, 1960	May 31, 1961	7½	743,300
4.	Oct. 15, 1961	May 31, 1962	7½	705,600
5.	Oct. 15, 1962	May 31, 1963 (2)	7½	1,100,000

II

Programme	Total direct payroll costs	Canada	Ontario	Total
1958-59	\$ 3,990,000	\$1,955,000	\$ 945,000	\$ 2,940,000
1959-60	4,890,000	2,445,000	1,175,000	3,620,000
1960-61	10,750,000	5,375,000	2,575,000	7,950,000
1961-62	11,050,000	5,520,000	2,660,000	8,180,000
1962-63 (2)	19,800,000	9,900,000	4,950,000	14,850,000

III

Work by local boards

Type	1960-61		1961-62	
	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage
Water, sewage and drainage	\$4,698,000	44	\$5,870,000	53
Parks and playgrounds	2,642,000	24.5	2,295,000	21
Municipal buildings	1,936,000	18	1,660,000	15
Roadways, streets and bridges	1,458,000	13.5	1,225,000	11
	<u>\$10,734,000</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>\$11,050,000</u>	<u>100</u>

(1) First year that the government of Canada participated in the programme.

(2) The figures for the 1962-63 programme have been estimated from the applications received in The Department of Municipal Affairs prior to February 15, 1963.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Sixth Legislature

Tuesday, March 5, 1963

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable William Murdoch

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1963



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 5, 1963

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued	1369
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1406

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1963

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 703:

Mr. R. C. Edwards (Wentworth): Just one question, Mr. Chairman. The salaries that are shown under this section, is that half of the salaries for public health nurses that the hon. Minister was speaking about the other day? On 703, item 1: salaries \$65,000. Would the hon. Minister tell us what those salaries are? Is that the 50 per cent of the salaries paid the public health nurses?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): No, no.

These salaries are just the salaries paid to our own nurses. The 50 per cent item I mentioned as being paid toward health units appeared in the last vote. This is paid for our own group whose job is to act as consultants and advisers to municipal boards of health when their help is needed.

Mr. M. Belanger (Windsor-Sandwich): On vote 703; in the report of the hon. Minister, the very last paragraph under research, you state there that you have a member of staff on the nursing advisory committee of the Wellington county health unit for the study of home care needs in Wellington county.

Home care needs has been discussed in my municipality. I remember before we opened up the new wing at Hotel Dieu there was quite a bit of discussion on this because of the fact that it would release hospital beds, they felt that patients could be taken out of the hospital and given home care. I wanted to find out whether you have any report so far of that study or whether it is something that is going to be implemented in the future, with more stress on it. Will there be more stress on home care needs to relieve the hospitals' shortage of beds?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we have an interim report on the first phase of a study of that kind conducted in Toronto, but we have none from outside of Toronto.

I believe that at least two other studies are going on relative to this problem, although they are not quite exactly the same. The one that is referred to in connection with this vote is public health nursing, the other is home care to relieve the hospitals, as the hon. member has mentioned, such as assisting in getting patients home from hospital a day or two earlier than might otherwise occur if the proper home care is provided for them. That is the sort of study that was carried out in Toronto, an interim report of which is being studied or perused now.

Mr. Belanger: But there will be a report?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, it will come when the study is completed, but the study is not complete.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 703 agreed to.

On vote 704:

Mr. T. D. Thomas (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, on vote 704. I was looking through the report of the hon. Minister—the blue book. The page is not numbered, it is table 4-A, maternal mortality, and the rates seem to vary per 100,000 live births.

In 1957 there were 36.4; 1958, 45.9; 1959, 46.5; 1960 they dropped down to 34.5; and then again in 1961 they climb up to 42.5.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on the increase?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Table 4-A? I have it now.

The only comment I can offer is that from 1960 to 1961 there was an increased maternal mortality in the province of Ontario. It rose from 34.5 to 42.5, but what reason there would be for that I am not in any position to state.

Mr. Thomas: Quite an increase though, isn't it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes. It is. Quite an increase, I must admit. I frankly had not noticed it previously. The teaching hospitals have not indicated any concern about this

sort of thing and really I cannot explain why it has happened. It has fluctuated. In 1957, for instance, to 1958, there was a very great change; then there was a very marked drop from 1959 to 1960; 1960 dropped markedly from 1959 and now the total has jumped again. There was no unusual outbreak of disease to which it might be attributed so I am really not in a position to say what the explanation would be without studying the vital statistics.

Mr. Thomas: A difference of nine points.

Mr. P. Manley (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, in the public accounts on Page F-17, I notice an account here with KCS Limited—\$7,672.55. The next item is Queen's Printer—\$40,369.37. Would the hon. Minister care to explain what those are for?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What was the item, please?

Mr. Manley: F-17 in public accounts, KCS Limited.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: F-70?

Mr. Manley: KSC Limited—\$7,672.55. And then the next one was Queen's Printer—\$40,369.37.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That expenditure had to do with the perinatal study, a research project that was sponsored by this department and spread over three years.

Mr. Manley: Have you got the report?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Pardon?

Mr. Manley: Have you got the report?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, there is no report yet. This company sorts out the statistics, it does the data processes. There will be a report from that. This was carried on by the teaching hospitals. They submitted interim reports, but the final report and conclusions are not drawn yet because a very great deal of analysis has to go on concerning all the statistics and data which is collected. But there will be a report submitted to us as soon as the teaching hospitals have completed this analysis.

Mr. Manley: Well, Mr. Chairman, will this report be available to the members of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would presume, Mr. Chairman, it could be made available. It will be a highly technical thing, but I would

presume, sir, it can be tabled in this House. It is a scientific research project and I really would see no reason why it could not be made available.

Mr. Manley: Do you expect to have the report complete before the end of this session?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh no, I would be quite wrong to promise that. They finished the study last year, but this analysis has been going on for nearly a year already and there is a tremendous mass of information to report. There were 400 questions pertaining to every case—every live birth—and there were 25,000 babies involved in each of the three years studied—400 questions about each one of those and all of this material has to be analyzed. So you can see that it is a rather massive undertaking.

Mr. V. M. Singer (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, the public accounts revealed that a total of \$132,401.21 was spent in the year ending March 31, 1962. For these estimates, the hon. Minister asked \$129,100. Comparing those two figures, it is down some \$3,000. Have you cut out services, or what is the explanation for the reduction in the amount?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Actually the total services increased but there is a reduction because the costly part of this study is all over now. The work in connection with the study of babies is no longer going on, that part of the expenditure is out. It does leave an overall increase in the estimated expenditure for this year. This study cost one hundred and some thousand dollars the first year. Over the three-year period the estimated cost was around \$200,000 and that is practically finished now. The only cost is the analysis of this mass of statistics.

Mr. Singer: What was the purpose of the study?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: To see if from studying a large number of births we could learn enough to still further reduce the infant mortality rate in Ontario. While it is good—we ranged fifth or seventh in the world—we believe we should do better than that. With this in view, we instituted this carefully controlled study to see if we could learn some way of reducing still further the infant mortality.

Mr. Singer: What process goes on in the department when you determine to do a study into a project like this, rather than a study into nursing facilities, or something

else? How do you determine that this is a worthwhile effort this year, or for a three-year period?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I suppose it is really difficult to put that sort of thing in words. We are always concerned about our infant mortality rate. I think the figures are very much before the public eye at all times, and they are of very great concern to the profession and of very great concern to all people. Our rate had reached sort of a static level, and it still was not satisfactory by any means. We, as I have said, cannot understand why we should remain fifth or seventh in the world instead of first or second. This was partly the reason for involving ourselves in the study, and the fact that the professors of obstetrics and gynaecology were very much concerned about this too. The teaching schools and teaching hospitals were very much concerned about it.

We proposed the project, we submitted the project to our advisory committee on matters of this kind, and it was taken up as a worthwhile project. We try to pick on these projects that seem to have the greatest impact on the health of our province, and try to allocate some type of priority to them.

Mr. Singer: Would it be reasonable to imagine or to hope that after you get this one out of the way some sort of study on the availability of nurses would be embarked on? The thing we were talking about earlier.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is under almost constant study by the nurses, themselves, who are now responsible for the education of nurses. This is not a thing that is being taken lightly by anybody in that field, I hope that we have not left that impression. This is constantly under consideration. I would like to have more to say about the nurse situation but this is a matter that is very, very much a concern of all of us in the health field, and very much under continuing study by the college of nurses themselves, and prior to the establishment of the college, by the nursing association.

Mr. Manley: Mr. Chairman, I questioned the hon. Minister earlier on the amount to the Queen's Printer of \$40,000. I asked him what that involved. This is 704.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This was in payment of all the printing, and all the printed forms, stationery and that sort of thing used by this study group, in the undertaking of the perinatal study.

Mr. Manley: Is this allotted to different printing firms in the province?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would not have any idea of that, that is left to the Queen's Printer, it would be my opinion that this is what they would do, but I really could not say.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 704 agreed to.

On vote 705:

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, in regard to dental services, do you operate mobile dental clinics in The Department of Health, or are yours just dental cars operating on the railways?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We only operate the dental cars on the railway.

Mr. Troy: In what section? Is it north of the CNR main line?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: One on the CN and one on the CP.

Mr. Troy: On the transcontinental?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The CP car travels from Cartier—Cartier is the eastern limit—to Ingolf on the Manitoba boundary along the CPR line. CN runs along the CNR lines in northern Ontario, from Goodwin on the Quebec border to White on the Manitoba boundary and from Capreol to Rainy River.

Mr. Troy: It does not operate them on the eastern line of the CPR through the district of Nipissing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Apparently not.

Mr. Troy: The small town of Kiosk is on the main line of the CNR just at the edge of Algonquin Park.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The CN goes from Quebec, and yours is on the CP—is that it?

Mr. Troy: On the CN, sir, on the main line of the CN.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It does run from Goodwin on the Quebec border to White on the Manitoba border.

Mr. Troy: That is right. It should, then it passes through Kiosk.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is quite possible that we could make some arrangement to have the car stop there if you have a chat with our people about that; if there is need there.

Mr. Troy: I think there is need. I do not know what the dentists in North Bay would think about that; I think there is certainly need.

In regard to grants for school services in the public accounts of 1962, some of the district health units—one is \$17,000, I notice, a grant. How do you get these grants for health services in schools and townships, and in unorganized areas?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: These grants are paid under a certain section of The Public Health Act. They are provided by a contract system where the dentist supplies the equipment, etc. or larger centres may furnish a clinic and the dentist receives a salary. The applications then come through the local health unit, through the board of health, or it can come directly to The Department of Health.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. Minister is aware of the recommendations of the Deutch committee about the establishment of a new dental college, I wonder if he can tell us anything about what progress is being made in connection with it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: As I intimated yesterday, Mr. Chairman, in case of both the medical school and the dental college, we have reached that stage in our discussions where we are almost prepared to appear before the university affairs committee.

Mr. Singer: A new dental college?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That does not rest in my hands, in the department's hands, Mr. Chairman, we make recommendation to the university affairs committee. Medical and dental education is carried out by the university.

Again, as I have said, there is so much question and doubt in our minds as to who is responsible for instigating it, but the department did have discussions with the profession along this line, and we have mutually reached the place where we are prepared to make a submission to the university affairs committee, and then it rests very largely with them and the universities concerned.

Mr. Singer: Is the government prepared to do more than talk about it, are they prepared to put money into this sort of thing? It is not going to go ahead without government money.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid this is not in my area and I could not give the hon. member an answer on that question.

Mr. Singer: Arising out of this, it is pretty obvious that there is a shortage of dentists. Can the hon. Minister tell us what figure would be a reasonable figure for the number of dentists in Ontario as compared with what we have today?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I really could not. We believe that if we get an increase of 60 graduates a year, I would be wrong to say that it would give us a plenitude, but at least it will meet the situation, in the opinion of the dentists. I think the figure graduating in Ontario now per year is something of the order of 110 to 125, I believe it runs in that range. There is only the one dental school of course.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister was commenting the other day about the fact that while there are many medical doctors, say in the Metropolitan Toronto area, they are not properly distributed in other parts of the province. I think the same thing would apply to the dentists. What form of thinking has the government done, if any, and what sort of inducements are being offered to dentists to locate in areas which are short of dentists?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The same arrangements have been made as in the case of medical people. We have set up ten dental bursaries in the hope that we can induce young graduate dentists to spend a time in under-served areas, hoping in this way to at least do something towards making a dent in the problem.

Mr. Singer: Those bursaries are in this estimate, are they?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, they were in item one. We provided ten last year, about 20 this year.

Mr. Singer: How many applicants have you had for bursaries?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Eight out of the ten.

Mr. Singer: You set up ten and only eight applied?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. Singer: And were all the eight accepted?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, eight have been awarded. I should not say that eight applied, some others applied, but four could not meet the condition, or would not meet the condition.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, on this particular topic I think if there is one area where the need for a public health programme, or a public education programme is evident it is in the dental field. I happen to find myself cast to the dental wolves, so to speak.

In the discussion on Medicare—where I was outnumbered about four to one a few months ago in a panel discussion here in the city of Toronto—the one point in debate that struck me as very disturbing was the argument advanced by dentists against an overall health programme that would involve dental bills, namely that in their experience with programmes that provided overall coverage, only 35 to 40 per cent of the people who were covered, and for whom therefore the dollar sign was removed from the dental services, bothered to go to the dentists.

I found this a bit peculiar, that the dentists were using this argument, because I thought the dentists had a slogan that you should go to your dentist every six months, at least, certainly once every year, quite apart from brushing your teeth every day and all their other little suggestions. The fact that only 35 to 40 per cent of the people who were eligible for free dental care were availing themselves of it, I think reveals what I suspect is the case, namely, that there are conditions, as far as teeth are concerned, often with disastrous effects on the health of a person, that would not be tolerated in many other forms of bad health. I think the department should long since have launched the necessary public health programme to come to the situation and see if you could not reduce the incidence of the problem.

About the only area in which there has been any public discussion of tackling this has perhaps been the fluoridation area. I hate to raise that with this hon. Minister because this gets him into a serious conflict of interest between his own personal views and government policy, so I will leave that aside. I am just curious as to whether or not the hon. Minister feels that a public health programme in the dental field is one that should be launched in a big way, since you have such a significant proportion of the population who apparently are willing to tolerate conditions that must be undermining their whole health condition.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is a very interesting point raised by the hon. member for York South, Mr. Chairman, for the department *per se* does not sponsor or broadcast a policy of public education. It does stimu-

late it through the agencies, in this case the public health units, and the medical officers of health. There is a great deal of education carried on by them and many of the units have a vigorous dental health programme. My deputy tells me that there is the poorest response to this of any other facet of the public health programme, bearing out very much what you yourself have said.

It is a vigorous programme, but the response is very poor. For some reason, people do not think to go to the dentist or do not want to go to the dentist. It cannot be for lack of knowledge, because I know of no profession that has had the benefit of so much gratis advertising or sponsorship than has dentistry, and sometimes to their embarrassment. I can think of one dentifrice company—ever since I can remember listening to the radio in this country—telling us to use so-and-so twice a day, and see your dentist twice a year. I do not know what better or what more effective advertising any profession could get than that, but in spite of it, there is not the response that we believe there should be.

The health educators are concerned about this, the public health officers deal with this, I suppose at nearly every one of their annual meetings. We frankly do not know how more effectively we can tackle an educational programme. One of the phases is our stimulation of this school programme, hoping that by getting the children—and this is where the public health units have tried to do the most effective work—when they are in their early days in school and training them or educating them in dental care, that this will carry over into adulthood. Frankly, we would be glad to know if there is any other way we can stimulate this, because I think public health authorities have used about every means at their disposal.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, on this item, I think if the hon. Minister could do away with the drill then he would get everybody into the dental chair. That is the big hindrance right there. I think it is certainly a deterrent for not going to the dentist.

But, Mr. Chairman, something I wanted to ask the hon. Minister about dental services: it has been drawn to my attention that more and more people are taking advantage of the Ontario hospital plan for going into the hospital to have dental work done. To me that seems sort of out of line, that people would take a day in the hospital to get a tooth extracted or get in a couple of fillings,

my information tells me that this is actually being done and that people are now entering hospitals to have the dental work done.

I would like to know if he is aware of that or if he knows that it is going on, because I think this would be quite an abuse of the hospital services to be going in to have teeth filled and so on.

Mr. MacDonald: They cannot go in without their doctor's sanction.

Mr. Cowling: We are talking about dentists.

Mr. MacDonald: I know, but they cannot get in without their doctor's sanction.

Mr. Cowling: Thanks very much. I appreciate that, but I would like to hear what the hon. Minister has to say about it too.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South is quite right, they cannot go into a hospital without their doctors sending them there, and I believe the hospital services regulations state they can only go in for dental treatment on the advice or specific prescription of the doctor. They can only be admitted by a doctor and then when medically necessary.

I do not think we need to worry about them going into hospitals to have fillings because very few hospitals are equipped with dental facilities to do this. But I would say, as a physician, that there are many times when I have felt, indeed, I have oftentimes recommended, that patients should go into hospital, particularly if they are going to have massive extractions. I frankly think that this is a major operation and is deserving of hospital care when they need it.

Mr. Thomas: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister how these grants are apportioned—on a per capita basis, these dental grants to the different municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Does the hon. member mean the school dental programme?

Mr. Thomas: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is on a per capita basis; percentage formula on a per capita basis. When it is done under the public health unit it is all part of the programme. For townships and municipalities of less than 5,000 population the grants are 30 per cent; with a population over 5,000 the grant is 20 per cent; there is a maximum of \$2,000 grant per annum for any one municipality.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, I see Ottawa had the maximum, \$2,000.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, they would get the maximum grant.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, since a few moments ago when I was talking about the number of dentists, there has come to hand this report which I think is important enough to read into the record. It is a report of the bureau of economic research of the Canadian Dental Association. The figures set out in this are really quite fascinating in that they indicate much more dramatically than I could before the difficult situation that exists insofar as the number of dentists now available and who can be expected over the next several years. It says this: "Of some 2,385 dentists in Ontario in 1960 285 are known to be 65 years of age or older."

Then it breaks down these age groups. From 65 to 69 there were 161; from 70 to 74 there were 61; 75 to 79, 34; from 80 to 84, 19; from 85 to 89, 9; 90 and over, 1. That totals 285. 40.3 per cent of Ontario dentists were 50 and over; 38.2 in cities of 10,000 and over; and 48.4 in smaller communities. Then this report goes on to say:

During the next four years the University of Toronto will graduate a maximum of 371 dentists. 42 of these are from outside Ontario. During the same period 226 dentists will reach the age of 65. Approximately 80 more will die without reaching the age of 65. Therefore, Ontario will have a net gain of 23 dentists, and that is all. In the years after 1964 the University of Toronto will graduate a maximum of 124 dentists a year. Probably about 11 per cent of these will be from outside Ontario, that is approximately 14 dentists. Almost 50 each year will reach 65 and about 20 will die each year before reaching the age of 65. So that would give a net gain in each of those years of 40. If Ontario gains 40 dentists a year—

And that was the figure the hon. Minister used a little earlier this evening.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, 60.

Mr. Singer: Sixty, was it? I am sorry, I thought the hon. Minister had used the figure of 40. He says he used the figure 60, that is fine.

If Ontario gains 40 a year, in each year between 1965 and 1980, it will have 600 more dentists by 1980—that is keeping in mind the mortality rates and so on. Ontario now has about 2,100 dentists under 65.

The expected increase, 1961 to 1964, is 23 dentists. An increase of 600. 1965 to 180 would bring the total number of dentists to 2,723.

But the interesting thing is this, they then go to the Gordon commission report, and the Gordon commission's upper estimate of Ontario's population in 1980 is 10,100,000. This would result in a dentist population ratio of one to 3,709 as compared with the 1961 ratio of one to 2,898 for dentists under 65.

In other words, at the present rate the dentists are coming out of school, taking into account those who are over age and those who are dying, that the ratio is going to be changed in a harmful manner for proper dental care from one to 2,898 to one to 3,709.

Now, if these figures are correct, and I would think they should be because they are prepared by and for and on behalf of the Canadian Dental Association, it indicates a pretty serious situation in the dental profession. I know the hon. Minister said that the Deutch report is being discussed, but I think the real urgency that exists is highlighted by these very carefully prepared figures.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 705 agreed to.

On vote 706:

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, regarding The College of Nurses Act which came into effect on January 1, I understand that nurses will now control their own profession, and I know that some of my fellow board members at the Toronto East General Hospital are concerned about this and I am sure there are many other trustees throughout the province that are concerned, because they do not have any representation on the council of this college, and yet these men are responsible for these nurses' training schools.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister two questions: Has he any information on this matter and, secondly, if so, is anything being done to deal with it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, yes. I have information on this matter, very much as the hon. member has put it before this House. The representatives of the boards responsible for looking after the schools of nursing, providing the schools of nursing, have seen me and expressed their concern about this, through the Ontario Hospital Association, mainly, and individually for their own particular hospitals and other cases.

I have put this before the college of nurses

and asked them to meet with these people and my department is also sitting in on the meetings. I feel quite sure that some amicable arrangement will be arrived at where those responsible for directing the schools, or for providing the schools, will have knowledge at least of what is to be done and what will go on in the college, if they do not get direct representation on the council.

No fixed decision has been reached; discussions are still going on. This was among the regulations withheld, about which I was berated the other day.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, in the public accounts of 1962, under miscellaneous in regard to the cost and expenses of training certified nursing assistants, page F-18, what service does James Lovick and Company Limited provide? The amount paid to them was \$9,143.59.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This was done two years ago. James Lovick is an advertising company which sponsored an advertising campaign to assist us in the recruitment of certified nursing assistants. You will recall, at that time, that I was directed by this government to greatly increase the training of these certified nursing assistants, to recruit them and to assist in the establishment of another school. This company was retained to do the advertising work.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, I was reading the report in regard to the certified nursing assistants. As has been mentioned the pages are not numbered, but it is under that section. The figures do not seem to carry any pattern other than maybe indicating that the facilities for the courses are filled up and there is a backlog. The report indicates no placement of those receiving certificates.

If you notice in the report, it says during 1962 three provincial examinations were held for a total of 1,351 candidates; and during 1962, 6,475 persons received certificates. I cannot follow the significance of the other two tables, but I would ask the question, after a brief explanation of just what these figures mean: are the facilities for the courses filled up and is there a backlog of applications for the courses?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Our schools are kept filled up, this is true, but I have no knowledge of a backlog of applicants. A great many more people apply to take the course than are admitted because they have not the qualifications. These are actually, in my opinion, not

but they are certainly as low as we dare let them drop.

The figures on the last page—6,475 persons received certificates—those people were registered to practise as certified nursing assistants. The new ones total 2,079, and the registrants who renewed, 4,396, are those who had graduated previously. They must renew their certificate annually. Was that the problem?

Mr. Gisborn: The question I raised first—I had one specific problem I wanted to raise—but it says first that during 1962 three provincial examinations were held for a total of 1,351 candidates. Now I agree that maybe they did not pass, but then in 1962 there were 6,475 who received certificates, so they must have taken their exams prior to 1962.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The new registrants, yes, and their renewals, naturally had taken their exams prior to that time, because they must register every year. The 1,351 were the candidates who graduated in 1962, who finished their course of training and wrote their final examinations for the first time—or I should not say wrote their final examination. I should just stop there—wrote their final examination in 1962. Now those who passed would register as new registrants. After they have been registered for a year, they will come in the second lot with the registrants who renewed.

I wonder if the hon. member is asking if we are establishing more schools in the department. If that is what is in his mind, the answer is "no." Frankly, I do not believe that we should expand this any longer. What we are now trying to do is encourage hospitals that are too small to maintain a school for the training of registered nurses, to get into this area of training certified nursing assistants. I think the efforts have been worthwhile. As I pointed out, ten new training schools were opened during the past year.

Mr. Gisborn: In relation to the specific problem I ran into, I acted on behalf of a constituent whose husband was in custody in a penal institution, and of course she was receiving mother's allowance. On first contact with the provincial welfare department in regard to the problem, they indicated that if she received the compensation allowed by taking the course—\$60 or \$90, I am not sure of which it was—it would be deducted from the mother's allowance. I followed it up through the deputy Minister of Public Welfare who was most gracious and obliging in looking at the matter. He assured me this was

not the case, that allowances could be made. But the question is that after her making her application to the local agency and being accepted, I find now that in a letter from the deputy Minister of Public Welfare that she would not be able to start taking the course until February, 1964.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Till February, 1964? When did she apply?

Mr. Gisborn: Well, the answer back from the deputy Minister was January 24, 1963, and I quote one part of the letter, in which he says:

I understand that a course would not be available before February next year. But you may be sure that every consideration will be given in making the most favourable arrangements at that time.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Who sent the hon. member that letter?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Band, the deputy Minister of The Department of Public Welfare.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would have to say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not think Mr. Band would have any knowledge of when she could be admitted to our school. That would rest with our branch. If she has proper educational qualifications, I feel quite certain she would not have to wait until 1964. Does she live in Toronto or Hamilton?

Mr. Gisborn: Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Hamilton. Of course, we start three courses a year in both Toronto and Hamilton, so that she would certainly not have to wait until 1964. I feel quite sure there must be some mistake there.

Mr. Gisborn: I thank the hon. Minister; I will pursue it. There may be a misunderstanding, and I feel sure that Mr. Band would have consulted with The Department of Health on this.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If the hon. member would like to let us have this information, we certainly will have a look at it. But I feel there is some misunderstanding.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might get a few more details in this general picture; but before I do that I wonder if I might plead with the hon. Minister, when this annual report is put out next year, that the pages be numbered.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have just pleaded myself.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know how the government operates with unnumbered pages.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is only the preliminary copy, for the benefit of the hon. members during these estimates. It is not the final copy of the report.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the point I wanted to raise in connection with this is: If the hon. Minister will recall, two or three years ago we had a debate in the House and there was some mystification, if I may put it that way, as to why these nurses' aid courses, which were offered free, could not compete with the courses that were being offered in what might be described as trade schools—free enterprise institutions which were in the field at that time. There was some effort to clean up that situation because they seemed to be operating on a high pressure basis—sometimes pretty close to misrepresentation. Now, what I would like to have from the hon. Minister is the up-to-date picture, relatively speaking. Has the number of nurses' aides being turned out by the government course during the last year or two been going up? What is the relative position between that and the numbers that are being graduated from private institutions?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The number was going up for a while but the mortality rate is pretty high. Of 611 enrolled, only 431 were able to graduate. There is a very high examination mortality rate. This is concerning us a good deal, and this prompted what I said a few minutes ago that I feel the standard is really too low, that we really should be elevating the standard. When there is such a high attrition rate with the examination we give them now, it seems to me we are getting about all that are available to us. The total for the whole province, for all of the schools concerned is going up steadily. Two years ago, it was 650 for the year, this year it is 1,347. I think it has about doubled in two years.

But, sir, how much further we can go with this, by examination results of this kind—

Mr. MacDonald: Am I correct, Mr. Chairman, that of the 1,300, 400 and some odd came out of the government's course?

Hon. Mr. Dymond. Six hundred and eleven were in our course. Four hundred and thirty-one graduated, only 431.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the 1,300 figure the entrants or the graduates?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, wait a minute, 1,300 wrote their examination, 431 graduated from our schools and 416 graduated from the hospital schools, for a total of 847.

Mr. MacDonald: What about private institutions, the trade schools?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: None.

Mr. MacDonald: None? Are they all out of the field now?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: As far as health is concerned, yes, and have been for three years.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I think that is good, quite frankly.

Mr. Gisborn: There is one question. Has the department records on the placement of those who become registered or certified assistants? What is the placement situation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, we do follow them, and as far as I know none are seeking jobs. They are all readily picked up.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to bother the hon. Minister with a number of figures. I know he has been dealing with that for quite a while here. But, I would be interested in knowing the ratio of certified nursing assistants that you have to your registered nurses.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would be picking the figure out of the ether, but as far as I recall it is about 48,000 to 6,000. There are over 40,000 registered nurses, and there are just in excess of 6,000 certified nursing assistants. Now that figure can be very misleading, because this does not mean that in either case they are accurate. I do not believe I can give you the figures for those in active duty.

Mr. Belanger: The number of certified nursing assistants is increasing to counteract the deficiency in the number of nurses you have.

Mr. Chairman: Is this vote—

Mr. Singer: No, no, Mr. Chairman. About the item in public accounts of \$7,270 for Henry Birks and Sons, F-18, I was wondering what that is for.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is a practice that started when the plan of training certified nursing assistants was started in the province.

The government, through The Department of Health, awards a graduation pin to every graduating certified nursing assistant in the province—not only in our own schools, but to all of the graduates.

Mr. Singer: I understand that my hon. colleague from Nipissing asked about the James Lovick accounts. Is that the firm that Dalton Camp, the director of certain activities, in a certain political party up in Ottawa was connected with?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I really would have no idea. The hon. member knows that, he is far more knowledgeable than I am.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 706 agreed to.

On vote 707:

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I would raise a question on behalf of a call I got last night, and I do not wish to raise any alarm. Are there any cases of hepatitis in the Cedar Springs school at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will get that information. I am advised that there are none in Cedar Springs at the present time.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 707 agreed to.

On vote 708:

Mr. Troy: With regard to the public accounts page F-20, does the clinic at Sudbury provide for all northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Troy: VD clinic, at Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, there is one at Timmins. There will be one at North Bay, since you have your own health unit now. Many general hospitals operate VD clinics.

Mr. Troy: Yes, but I noticed that it says local boards and municipalities. It says there are \$4,415 and some odd cents for Sudbury. What is the incidence of VD? Is it increasing?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we are finding a moderate increase here as we are in other jurisdictions. It is not as startling as is being reported from some jurisdictions, but it is startling enough that we are very much concerned about it.

Mr. Troy: I understand it is increasing rapidly among teenagers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is not increasing rapidly. I think it is very unwise to say it is

increasing rapidly. Any increase in venereal disease is of very grave concern to public health people wherever they may be, but I think that we should keep this in proper balance. It is not increasing rapidly, and we should not leave the impression that this is a great menace at the present time. One case of an increase is of concern to us.

The total number in the province in 1962 is 798, or 12.5 cases per 100,000 population. The Ontario rate for 1962 came down lower than 1961. In 1951 and 1952 there was a rate of 17 per 100,000; in 1953, 15; in 1954, 18; in 1955, 12; in 1956, 8; in 1958, 8; in 1959, 9; in 1960, 11; in 1961, 15, and in 1962 there was actually a decrease to 12.5 cases per 100,000 population.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 708 agreed to.

On vote 709:

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Mr. Chairman, I think last week the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) in this House asked whether private sanatoria were run for profit. Was that not right, Mr. Chairman? I would like to ask the hon. Minister two or three questions. The first is if The Department of Health provides the cost of maintenance of patients in the sanatoria for tuberculosis?

And two, are these sanatoria privately owned institutions?

An hon. member: Give him one at a time.

Mr. Letherby: I am giving one at a time now. Three, if the government pays the bill for patient care and is the amount given such that the sanatoria can make a profit?

An hon. member: That is a good question.

Mr. Letherby: Oh, it's loaded.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I missed the first question.

Mr. Letherby: The first one, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, is this: If The Department of Health provides the cost of maintenance of patients in the sanatoria for tuberculosis?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer to the first is, yes. Since 1926, I believe it is, the department has paid for the maintenance of patients in the sanatoria. This is the complete cost of patient care.

Now the sanatoria are privately owned—in the same sense as a public hospital is privately owned. They are established under The

Sanatoria for Consumptives Act. They are non-profit organizations, they are established under this Act by a board usually of public spirited citizens. They have been built in a large measure by funds either donated as bequests, endowments, given by public subscription, given by municipalities, aided by grants provided by government.

Does the province pay such per diem grants so that the sanatoria can make money? The answer is without question, no. The sanatoria are reimbursed on an average cost basis. By that we take the cost of maintaining patients in all the sanatoria across the province and this is equally divided, and each sanatorium is paid that per diem rate.

It may well be that certain sanatoria will have a deficit in this rate, whereas others may have a margin of gain in it, but there is no question of any sanatorium being able to make a profit.

There was one other part of the question, I believe?

Mr. Letherby: Number three, sir, was: If the government pays the bill for patient care, is the amount given such that the sanatoria could make a profit?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I just answered that. The sanatoria cannot make a profit whatsoever.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, in the annual report of the Minister there is a record of immigrants admitted to sanatoria in Ontario, and it says:

During the year 1962 a total of 200 immigrants were admitted to sanatoria who had been in Canada less than five years, of these 68 had been in Canada less than one year.

Now, I presume that the 68 that had been in Canada less than one year would be a joint responsibility of the federal and provincial governments. That would leave 132 who had been in Canada five years or under. How many of the 132 would be participants in the hospital programme?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid I could not tell. It would be a matter of record in the hospital.

But as you know about three years ago, where a family had been broken up because one member in the country of origin had tuberculosis, or some sign of tuberculosis, we relaxed our restrictions in order that the family might be reunited. We will allow those people to come in on the understanding

that they enroll immediately in the hospital plan. They would, therefore, for the first three months, be someone else's responsibility. They would not be the responsibility of the federal government and our own. I believe we changed our regulations so that we only share now for six months, and the province takes over the complete cost after that time.

Mr. Thomas: Can you get that information?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, 12 months still exists.

Mr. Thomas: I wonder if we could get how many of the 132 were participants in the hospital programme?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I really could not tell you that.

Mr. Thomas: Could the hospital commission not give it to you?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We could get it from the sanatoria to which they were admitted. It would take a little digging but it could be found. The commission would not know because the commission has nothing to do with patients admitted to sanatoria for tuberculosis, they are paid from this department.

Mr. Thomas: No, but they would have the name of the hospital where the patient was committed, wouldn't they?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They would be admitted to a sanatorium for tuberculosis and the commission has no responsibility for them. That is, we look after that part of the operation.

Mr. G. W. Innes (Oxford): Mr. Chairman, I was glad that the hon. member for Simcoe East broke the ice on the sanatoria, but last year, sir, I did ask the hon. Minister of Health how the grant to the various sanatoria in the province were appropriated. I think he replied that they did make requests and that it was granted generally by need and that they were scrutinized very carefully.

This year I have had an analysis made of the various statistics and they certainly reveal some real weaknesses in the present arrangements and certainly very flagrant variations in the grants to the various sanatoria. In order that the hon. Minister can follow these I am going to send him over a copy of the statistics because they are rather involved and extensive and I hope he will bear with me when I read this out to him.

The voters' interest in these statistics centres on how money voted by Parliament is being used. In the case of the provincial sanatoria it is the provincial grants to each hospital which will be considered. In general it may be said that money allotted to this use by Parliament should be used only for treatment of tubercular patients, since it is on the assumption that this will be so that the money is voted. It should also be apportioned in accordance with some objective standard of performance, particularly since in the case of these hospitals funds are given to private owners for the administration of hospitals over which the government exercises only a minimum of supervision.

Obviously the possibility of improper use of public funds is much greater in such circumstances than when Parliament requires supervision or ownership of hospitals to be actively carried on under its direction.

It is clear from these statistics, however, that a number of weaknesses exist in the present arrangements. I am going to list these and give hon. members some breakdown on them later.

(a) No standard of payment exists with respect to the allocation of provincial grants to the sanatoria;

(b) Either the statistics are prepared carelessly—with respect to treatment statistics—or there are unreasonably large variations between cost to the government in relation to beds per hospital and number of days' treatment per hospital;

(c) Aside altogether from the medical question of whether hospitalization of tubercular patients is necessary or desirable, the statistics indicate an embarrassing under-utilization of resources in spite of the indication that many patients are being kept under observation beyond a reasonable time;

(d) Hospitals are being used, it seems clear, for custodial care of non-tubercular patients—in many cases those who would otherwise be cared for as geriatric cases in general hospitals or in nursing homes.

Now let us go into (a). That no standard of payment is used in the apportionment of provincial grants is evident from the following tables. The figures include all provincial payments, not just direct grants, and exclude hospitals which are now closed. (See Appendix 1)

The grant per bed in 1959 had a high of \$3,550 and a low of \$1,080, a median of \$2,100 and a mean of \$1,980.

In 1960 the grant per bed had a high of

\$3,040 and a low of \$1,090, the median \$2,130 and the mean \$2,080.

In 1961, grant per bed, the high was \$3,180 and the low was \$960, the median \$2,660 and the mean \$2,180.

The grant per day stay: in 1959 the high was \$9.60 the low \$4.20, the median \$8.20 and the mean \$7.60. In 1960, the high was \$11.70, the low \$4.60, the median \$9.10 and the mean \$9.30. In 1961, the high was \$16.60, at one hospital; another hospital had a low of \$4.50. The median was \$9.30 and the mean \$9.50.

The high or low is not the same in each case. The following figures show the erratic nature of these costs with respect to certain hospitals. The percentages are the relation to 1959 of the later year's cost.

Now in Hamilton the grant per bed in 1959 was \$1,080. In London, for instance, it was \$2,400; Fort William, \$1,500; Kingston \$2,140, and the average was \$1,980. And in 1960 in Hamilton it was \$1,080, or 101 per cent; in London, \$2,860, or 120 per cent; in Fort William \$1,120, or 75 per cent; and in Kingston \$2,140, or 100 per cent, an average of \$2,080, or 105 per cent.

In 1961, in Hamilton, the cost was \$900 or 83 per cent; and in London, for instance, \$3,180. Actually in Hamilton it was three times less and in London it was three times more than Hamilton. Fort William was \$920 or 61 per cent, and Kingston, \$3,070, or 140 per cent. The average \$2,180, or 110 per cent.

Now in the grant per day stay in Hamilton, it was \$4.90 in 1959; in London it was \$9.60; Fort William \$4.20; Kingston \$8.20, with an average of \$7.60. Now in 1960, in Hamilton—this is the grant per day stay—in Hamilton it was \$6 or 122 per cent; in London it was \$10.60, or 110 per cent; in Fort William it was \$4.60 or 109 per cent and Kingston \$9.80, or 120 per cent, with an average of \$9.30 or equivalent of 122 per cent.

Now, in 1961, the average grant per day stay in Hamilton was \$5.90 or 120 per cent and in London \$11.40 or 119 per cent. In Fort William, \$4.50, or 107 per cent; in Kingston \$16.60 or 202 per cent. The average of \$9.50 or 125 per cent.

Such results raise a number of questions. Why are some hospitals apparently more efficient than others? What attention does the government give to such inefficiency in determining whether hospitals continue to be deserving of grants? How reliable are treat-

ment statistics? What value is there in preparing such voluminous statistics if they do not result in control over the factors being measured? Are hospital administrators in any way responsible for efficient operation and use of the money entrusted to them?

In (b) there is some indication that the statistics are carelessly prepared and therefore of little use for controlling costs. (See Appendix II)

The grossest example of this are those statistics relating to Kingston for the three years.

This is for the year 1959 and the number of beds, 134. The number of collective days' stay was 35,000 and the total provincial grant was \$288,200. Now, in 1960, with the same number of beds, namely 134, the number of collective days' stay was 29,300, and the total provincial grant was \$286,900. But in 1961, with the same number of beds, 134, the collective days' stay was down to 24,800 and the grant, mind you, was \$412,000—about a third greater than it was the year before with the same number of beds and the collective days' stay was lower. If these figures are accurate, they are evidence of the most flagrant mismanagement.

(c) In average terms, under-utilization of resources is very significant. Of course, averages are hard to deal with since an average under-utilization may be necessary in order to accommodate peak loads. Nevertheless, the statistics are surprising.

The following table summarizes the number of unoccupied beds on December 31, 1961, using the percentage occupancy during the year ended on that date to calculate the figures. (See Appendix III)

Since the average number of days' stay is declining year by year, the actual number of unoccupied beds at the end of the year is probably a little greater than would be indicated by using an average for the entire year.

Now you are going to have to bear with me for some more statistics, but I think they are quite revealing. I will list the hospital, the number of beds is for December 31, 1961.

Weston, 578 beds, and the average occupancy was 70.7 per cent, number of filled beds 409 and number of vacant beds 169. In Hamilton, with 387 beds, the average occupancy was 42.1 per cent, 163 filled beds, 224 vacant beds. Fort William, 328 beds, 56 per cent occupancy, 184 filled beds, 144 vacant beds. Ottawa, 279 beds, 50.8 per cent occupancy, 142 filled beds and 137 vacant beds. London, 220 beds, 74.1 per cent occupancy,

163 filled beds, 57 vacant beds. Sudbury, 163, 66.5 per cent occupancy, 108 filled beds, 55 vacant. St. Catharines, 107, 57.1 per cent occupancy, 93 filled, 14 vacant. Windsor, 104 beds, 44.8 per cent occupancy, 47 filled beds and 57 vacant beds. Brantford, 70 beds, 68.2 per cent occupancy, 48 filled, 22 vacant. Cornwall, 65 beds, 79.8 per cent occupancy, 52 filled and 13 vacant. Kitchener, 45, 72.7 per cent occupancy, 33 filled and 12 vacant.

Now the total number of beds: December 21, 1961, 2,480, 61.2 per cent occupancy, 1,518 filled beds, and, Mr. Chairman, 962 vacant beds.

It is apparent from this table that the number of filled beds in the last eight hospitals, namely London to Kitchener, inclusive is less than the number of empty beds in the four major hospitals. These eight hospitals have a gross investment of \$13,368,679, representing a yearly interest cost of \$668,434 and provincial grants totalling \$2,399,703 in 1961.

Surely it would be cheaper to transport patients from their home areas to the major hospitals. Assuming that they are really in need of hospitalization.

No one who is not a doctor can adequately analyze the medical statistics or answer such questions as whether hospitalization is really necessary in particular cases. In spite of this, however, there is evidence of practices which surprise even the layman. It seems surprising, for example, that a patient might be maintained in a tubercular sanatorium for more than five years without ever a trace of tuberculosis, and that patient, still uncured, might be discharged from hospital for disciplinary reasons. What this suggests to a layman is that there is need for a careful review and audit of admissions and hospital inmates, by persons competent to evaluate prescribed methods of treatment and diagnosis.

Finally, it seems necessary to point out that the production of statistics does not in itself serve any useful purpose. The unbelievable detail of those here, and the indications already noted of lack of any positive control by those who might be assumed to be interested in controlling the expenditure of public funds, suggest not only that the government is content to squander funds on hospitals which are not necessary, but also that it is willing to put large sums of money into clerical labour for the production of such statistics without regard to whether the results have any value.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised that my hon. friend has

not learned after four years that his ghost writer has certainly led him up the garden path in many ways. My hon. friend and I both know, of course, who the ghost writer is.

Let's look at this very carefully. Let us review this entire thing. First of all, I pointed out the sanatoria are not, I repeat are not, privately owned. They are public institutions, they are non-profit institutions. They are operated by a board just as the Woodstock Hospital and Ingersoll Hospital and all the other hospitals across this province are operated by boards of public-spirited citizens. The difference between the sanatoria boards and the boards operating the general hospitals lies really in this one thing—that the boards which are responsible for operating the sanatoria undertook an almost impossible task in the early days of this disease. They undertook the task of providing hospitalization when there was no government support, when there was no government interest, when there was no interest at all. They undertook to provide hospitals for people who were, to all intents and purposes, outcasts. Certainly they were social outcasts, shunned because they were sufferers from tuberculosis.

Over the 60 years, I do not think any more glowing page has been written in medical history, than has been written by these men and women who have operated these sanatoria. In taking a disease that was certainly looked upon as something akin to the plague, they have put themselves out of business in less than 60 years. I think that this in itself is one of the finest commendations one can give to any group of people. Remember that this whole movement was, in the main, started, encouraged and stimulated by lay people.

No standard of payment exists with respect to the allocation of provincial grants for the sanatoria. These figures are certainly not an analysis of the figures we gave you. They are certainly not a digest of the figures we sent over to you, or to your office, because you found no such figures as these in the statistics we provided for you. I do not know what you mean by the allocations of provincial grants to sanatoria. A patient, per diem rate is provided and here it is as paid in 1962: For Hamilton, the standard or provincial per diem rate was \$16.45; Weston \$11.45; Fort William \$11.67; Ottawa \$13.85; Windsor \$15.15; St. Catharines \$11.09; Sudbury \$11.38; Kingston \$14.35; Kitchener \$11.58; Brantford \$9.69; Cornwall \$10.94. London is not mentioned in this because when the government purchased Beck Sanatorium, because of the changed circumstances

in that institution, it was necessary to separate the tuberculosis aspect of its function and we put it on a budget. I can find out what the per diem budget is but it is not listed in this. It is very nearly the same thing. I think one only needs to point out that these hospitals looking after the tubercular patients, who are freely admitted, are not nearly filled. I think the occupancy is about 44 per cent, or the vacancy is about 44 per cent of the total bed state now. Yet their average per diem rate is a little in excess of \$11. Compare that with the average general hospital per diem rate which is something of the order of \$23 to \$25. I do not think that anyone can point the finger and say there has been wastefulness or extravagance in the provision of patient care.

The London average daily rate is \$13 per day. That too, sets up against the per diem rate of any one of the general hospitals in London or the surrounding territory, and I do not think that anyone needs to point the finger at the board of administration of London Sanatorium and say they have been extravagant or wasteful.

I have no idea in the wide world, Mr. Chairman, where these grants of \$35, \$50 and all the rest of it came from, because we pay no such grants whatsoever to these sanatoria. The only grants we pay them are if they make any alterations in building; cost of alterations, sir, is shared three ways—the local board, the federal government and the provincial government each pay a third for these alterations. If they build new structures, they are subject to the same grants as every hospital is, but no sanatorium is building now. The only provincial monies that are paid are the per diem grant per patient maintenance.

Let me say, quite aside altogether from the medical question of whether hospitalization of tubercular patients is necessary or desirable, that the statistics indicate an embarrassing under-utilization of resources, in spite of the indication that many patients are being kept under observation beyond a reasonable time. This is certainly not a medical opinion.

I do not know whose opinion it is. I have an idea. But it does not matter, it certainly is not a medical opinion. If it were, I would be forced to tell my hon. colleague that it is not based on sound scientific fact.

The in-hospital stay for tubercular patients is reduced to about a third. Indeed now some of the sanatoria superintendents are telling me they are getting patients out in weeks, where it used to take years. Certainly

the average stay is far below a year now, compared to what it was even five years ago. Hospitals are being used, it seems clear, for custodial care of non-tubercular patients, in many cases those who would otherwise be cared for as geriatric cases in general hospitals or in nursing homes.

I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that the only comment I can make, and I make it in all kindness, is that this is absolutely false. No standard of payment is used in the enforcement of provincial grants. The statistics which will appear in public records and which will be subject to public scrutiny by any who wish to look at them indicate that this is not the case. We have nothing to hide in these figures, they appear for all who want to see them.

London, I have already indicated, is on a budget. How reliable are treatment statistics? I can only say to you, Mr. Chairman, once again, in this field Ontario has great cause to be proud. This is not boastful nor is it political in any sense. As a physician, I am very proud of our record in this field.

Our statistics are looked upon by the world—not by Canada, not by other provinces, not by the United States, but by the world—because we have the best showing, or practically the best showing. From the standpoint of mortality rates we lead the world. I think it is 2.14 cases last year. It was 2.2, but there has been a very slight reduction.

Our treatment methods are looked upon and copied by medical authorities in many jurisdictions. One cannot attend a health conference anywhere in this country, certainly we cannot attend a health conference having to do with the care and treatment of tuberculosis, without being impressed by the high esteem in which our medical people in this field are held by those in similar fields throughout the whole of Canada. We are looked upon and envied in most jurisdictions on this continent.

Are hospital administrators in any way responsible for efficient operation? Anyone who has any knowledge of hospital operation need hardly ask that question. I only repeat to you that the average per diem rate in our general hospitals today is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$23 to \$25. The average per diem rate in our sanatoria is just a little over \$11. If that does not call for efficient administration, then I do not know what would. Any one of you who has gone through any one of the sanatoria in the province of Ontario could not fail to be impressed by the very splendid condition of the maintenance of the buildings themselves.

There is some indication that the statistics are carelessly prepared, and I can only say that the DBS are not very careful themselves because they accept our statistics and our statistics are accepted and quoted by statisticians and statistical authorities, again, all over the world. The figures here given, I think, if they were multiplied out for the number of beds, the number of collective days' stay, and the total provincial grants would total provincial payments because this is patient care payments. There are those who are not the responsibility of the province, because the province is not responsible for all patients in the sanatoria, such as DVA patients, and Indian health service patients. Indeed, this was our biggest single customer for a long time, the Indian health services, where we looked after Indian children and Eskimos in very large numbers, and workmen's compensation board also. Remember, these are the only sanatoria for tuberculosis in the province.

The province pays only on the total patient days and this will vary as does the proportion of patients who are the province's responsibility.

That is the only comment I can make about the carelessness of the statistics, Mr. Chairman. They have been accepted for a long time, and again I repeat, are quoted and looked at and looked upon as accurate by all those engaged in this field.

Under-utilization of resources: I suppose one can say this is true, but this is something about which none of us should shed tears. I think rather every hon. member in this House should stand up and cheer that the people engaged in this field have been able to put themselves out of business, as it were, in such a short space of time. It is an amazing page, I repeat, in the history of medicine that this dreadful disease has been conquered, to all intents and purposes, in such a very short time.

Our figures for bed vacancies are even higher than those of the hon. member for Oxford, sir, and we have no apology to make for this, because every one of these sanatoria, or practically every one of them, is engaged in some other area of the practice of medicine.

Hamilton has just opened, in one of its vacant buildings, a school for the training of medical technologists trying to meet the need one of my hon. friends mentioned this afternoon. I believe it was my hon. friend from Wentworth, Mr. Chairman, who mentioned the report. My hon. friend from Wentworth mentioned the need for many

trained people and this is one of the areas where the sanatorium has gotten into. They are about to utilize another of the vacant buildings for another medical purpose.

At London, another building of the Beck Sanatorium has been vacated and we are now in this with another phase of our research project in retarded children. Fort William is carrying on discussions at the present time with the welfare authorities, having in view converting the vacant wing they have in their institution to the infirmary care of the aged people there.

Kingston is still a problem and I am afraid that Kingston is going to continue to be a problem because it was a temporary building in the first place. It was a war assets building that has served an excellent purpose, but I can see no useful purpose to which my department can put it. We have looked at every possibility in respect of this building and I can see no useful purpose in the hospital field to which this can be put.

St. Catharines has been carrying on for several years one of the most unique mental experiments yet undertaken. It is a specialized hospital for chest diseases. Windsor: we are coming to the close of our discussions with them, having in mind the conversion of their vacant accommodation to a psychiatric care unit. Cornwall is in chronic care, Brantford is in chronic care, Kitchener is in chronic care. Sudbury, we hope, is going to be converted, their vacant space is going to be converted to a psychiatric unit too. This is our hope at the present time.

Ottawa has already been converted to a psychiatric unit and they have just recently advised me that they expect to render more beds vacant so that they can expand their psychiatric activity. Weston is now in chronic care, and I heard a rumour, and I must admit it is only a rumour, that they may be going into the general hospital field.

I cannot agree with my hon. friend that it may be cheaper to transport patients from their home area. Indeed, this has been given a great deal of consideration, the medical wisdom of closing up all sanatoria and collecting the patients in one or two hospitals. I can think of nothing more devastating upon the morale or the welfare of a sick patient. These beds can all be used for some purpose as soon as they have served their purpose in the field of tuberculosis and I can see no reason for closing them up. This would have to become a far more uneconomic matter than it is now, indeed, I cannot see by any stretch of the imagination where it can be looked upon as an uneconomic project now.

I think that the method being followed is a good one. We closed two sanatoria, one in Haileybury and one in Cravenhurst, and I can see no justification for closing any more of them.

Now, I cannot understand—it seems surprising for example—that a patient might be maintained in a sanatorium for more than five years without ever a trace of tuberculosis. The only one equipped to make such a statement, I would think, with such assurance, would be a medical person, and I know of no doctor in the province of Ontario who can tell me that a patient has been kept for any length of time in the sanatorium without good medical reason and patients still uncured discharged from hospital for disciplinary reasons.

They are not discharged from hospital, they are transferred to the security unit at Fort William. There are those patients, of course, who leave hospital without the formality of a medical discharge, who go out on their own. They are admitted freely and they can sign themselves out, and, in certain cases, it is necessary for us to take them back in and the machinery is provided for us to do that. If they are not a menace to the public health, we do not make use of this machinery.

A careful review and audit of admissions and hospital inmates by persons competent to evaluate prescribed methods of treatment and diagnosis? I know of no people better equipped and more competent to evaluate prescribed methods of treatment and diagnosis than the medical people who are looking after these patients themselves. Indeed, this is one of my grave concerns. Because of the shrinkage of the number of patients, because of the success that has attended the efforts of the doctors, they are very much concerned that we will soon reach the point where few doctors will be going into the matter of chest medicine. Then, I think, we will be in a very serious situation.

Indeed, there are quite a number of young doctors today who would be sorely put to it if they were faced with a case of minimal tuberculosis, knowing how to diagnose it and how to treat it. I think these people are looked upon as authorities in this field, again not only by their colleagues here in Ontario, but by their colleagues all over the world.

There is a careful review and audit of the patients. The people from my tuberculosis prevention division are constantly after them to keep their patient stay down as low as possible, compatible with good medical care. Indeed, sometimes my people get a little

concerned that the doctors are getting a little too progressive and might tend to discharge the patients too soon. I do not think again any finger of blame or criticism can be pointed in this regard.

I really do not see that there is much point, Mr. Chairman, in trying to answer these points as they came up, I see very little that I could add to it.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has certainly indicated that he has given this quite a good deal of thought and consideration. But I must say that he must admit that to the average layman, the provincial grants to Kingston in the sums of \$286,000 in 1960 and \$412,000 in 1961, with a lower collective days' stay, with the same number of beds, gives concern. Has the hon. Minister a sound answer for upping the grants in the hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think my hon. friend is getting a little confused.

Mr. Innes: No, I am not.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: A smaller number of patient days not a lower days' stay.

Mr. Innes: I mean a collective days' stay.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In 1961 to 1962, \$229,674.81. The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, without going through all this, that I had the—

Mr. Innes: You did mention, sir, that you did have some trouble with the Kingston Hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We paid the Kingston Hospital in 1962 a total of \$245,256 or \$14.25 a day. The actual cost to the Kingston Sanatorium of maintaining a patient was \$16.23 per day. The board of the sanatorium had to find out of its own resources the difference between that and what we paid it—\$14.25 and \$16.23. There is no evidence of our giving them money that is not being spent well, and again I repeat: compare this with per diem rates in all of the general hospitals across this province and, again, I do not think there is much cause for criticism.

Mr. Innes: I do not have the 1962 figures because they were not brought out. I think he can understand that there is a great variance in some of these grants. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I confess to having a rather bad case of statistical indigestion at this point. I do not feel well

enough to assess either the case made against The Department of Health by the hon. member for Oxford or the apparent demolition of it by the hon. Minister. However, there is one overall question of policy that I would like to ask the hon. Minister. It is possible that he has answered it in the later parts of his comments. Can the government have an overall policy for the full utilization of these facilities once they become free?

I am a little puzzled if the figures indicate that only 44 per cent of the beds are being used now. The hon. Minister also gives quite an impressive listing of alternative uses to which these hospitals are being put, in terms of unique medical experiments, chronic needs, psychiatric needs, and so on. Are you saying that the 56 per cent that were not being used are now in fact being used, or are the alternative uses that you have just listed in institutions that have in effect closed their doors or portions of the institution for the purposes of TB cure and moved into this alternative function?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is partly right and partly not. When a floor can be made completely vacant, it is declared no longer needed for tuberculosis and can be converted to some other use, but we cannot mix other patients with tuberculosis patients. You will understand that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, would the 56 per cent not being used—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Forty-four per cent not being used, sir, with the exception of Kingston. An alternative use from the standpoint of health can be found for all of these vacant beds, when they come in blocks where we would not be mixing tuberculosis with something else. Some other use may well be found for Kingston but I cannot see a hospital use for it, and we have looked at every possibility. But the other sanatoriums will be practically completely utilized. I say it in this way, having made my point, I hope, that we cannot mix a floor to take patients on it.

Mr. MacDonald: If we are moving to alternative uses of these beds in blocks that is obviously a very understandable proposition. You cannot start mixing TB and other cases. I do not think there is any real basis for complaint, which was the underlying point—and it was a point worth making if it was valid—by the hon. member for Oxford.

My feeling would be that since we have already moved some of them into the chronic

and convalescent facilities if you are very worried about what you are going to do with these buildings, this offers the other answer. It has been my impression in moving around the province that we could reduce the congestion in many of our hospitals and make their superior facilities more available for the use to which they should be put—namely for more serious health problems—by developing more chronic hospitals. The more quickly the sanatoria become available, the more we can develop chronic hospitals or convalescent hospitals, and the more we will relieve the rest of our hospital system.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This will give you some idea of how we have moved in this direction: Of the vacant sanatorium beds we already have converted 341 beds. I should not say that “we have,” as we have not done it—it has been done by the board. Three hundred and forty-one beds have been converted to general hospital purposes, 430 to chronic hospital purposes and 562 to mental hospital purposes. One hundred and twenty beds were abandoned to make room for training certified nursing assistants. Parts of a building at Hamilton were converted to the Institute of Physical Medicine. Another building at Hamilton is used for crippled children and another building, as I have mentioned, for the training of laboratory technicians. I believe they have in mind the establishment of a district school for the education of nurses in one of their other buildings now.

Mr. MacDonald: That answers my question.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the statement of the hon. Minister in respect to per diem rates. The per diem is struck and if the cost of maintenance is above that it is met by the local board. Now I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the local board members are elected or appointed, and how they raise their funds.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The most of the sanatoria—no perhaps I am wrong in saying that—several of the sanatoria have endowment funds. Some of them were quite heavily endowed and they were the object of good donations by many people. They take the funds out of the reserve they have built up.

I must make very clear that nothing has been added to the reserves through per diem rates granted by the province because I do not believe in very many cases have our per diem rates ever exceeded the actual per diem rates. Looking down, for instance, at Weston. The actual rate was \$11.21 and we paid them

last year \$11.45; so they made a profit of 24c. per day, an amazing profit. Nowhere else is our per diem rate greater than their actual cost.

I suppose some of them put on financial campaigns, I really do not know how they raise the rest of their money. They do not have to tell us, they are an autonomous board, but I think that most of it would come from friends or donations. None of this comes out of seal sale campaigns. None of that money is used for patient maintenance and hospital. I can assure you of that. That is used for welfare, education, some rehabilitation training and other matters. They have also been, up until the present time, providing the finances in certain areas to give patients follow-up treatments. This is the sort of thing I mentioned in the Budget speech when I said that the province was going to take this over now to make sure that these patients were adequately followed-up. I again would make clear to you that this is not to be construed as covering total medical care for patients who have been in sanatoria, but simply to give them a periodic check which many of them already receive from the home base hospitals. In those areas where this is not given, this follow-up is to ensure that all of the patients get their periodic check and that the medical people are satisfied that they are continuing to take their drugs, because the drug-taking period outside of hospital is actually longer now than the period within the hospital.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, I was seeking information.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe that every one of these is an association and they hold their annual meeting at which officers can be elected. Whether they are or not, I do not know. Most of the boards are, as they have been since I became Minister, although the provincial representative on some has been changed. We have a provincially appointed representative on every sanatorium board.

Mr. J. Chapple (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the hon. Minister would give me some information. I believe he mentioned that in Fort William they were going to use the 80-bed wing that is vacant at the present time, for the home for the aged. Is this true?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, I did not say they were going to. I said I believe they had entered into discussions with The Department of Public Welfare up

there with a view to using the wing as an infirmary for the older people, but how far they have progressed in this I do not know.

Mr. Chapple: Does the hon. Minister deem this advisable?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I certainly do, I would give it my complete and unqualified blessings.

Mr. Chapple: And does the hon. Minister think people will agree to this home for the aged?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, I have no idea of what the hon. member's people will do. I hope they will.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister how much was paid for the Beck sanatorium at London, and how much for the land, and how much for the buildings?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The Department of Public Works would have a figure, but as I recall it, Mr. Chairman, it was \$1.5 million total.

Mr. Innes: Yes, well, now, where does that money go?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It belongs to the London Health Association and I believe it is their plan in the future to build a general hospital.

Mr. Innes: Is that a corporate body? What happens to the funds of this health association, if it ever, let us say, folds up? Where do they go?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have no idea where their funds go, Mr. Chairman. It is a duly chartered corporate body and I presume that some provision has been made. For instance, we paid \$1.25 million, I think, for Gravenhurst. Again Public Works would have to verify those figures. That belonged to the national sanatorium association and they are using a goodly part of their money for research.

That money, of course, cannot by any stretch of the imagination be construed as provincial money. We bought a property that did not belong to us and on which we had no hold prior to that. The London Health Association, I presume the trustees of that association, are charged with the responsibility of allocating those funds in some way. I do understand that it is their intention some day

in the future as soon as they get approval, to build a general hospital in London.

Mr. Innes: But the hon. Minister would suggest that these funds will be used to build another hospital of some description?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have little doubt. They are not going to get out of the field of treatment of tuberculosis.

Mr. Innes: But actually the hon. Minister does not know how they could be allocated, they could be allocated for almost anything? They have complete jurisdiction over what to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is right, it belongs to the association. These are not public monies. We got value for our monies.

Mr. Innes: That is certainly a lot of money.

Mr. J. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, under item 4, I was wondering if that \$74,000 was a misprint. Last year it was \$6,000.18, and the year before \$6,700. Now it is \$74,000.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Which is that?

Mr. Trotter: That is item 4: "Payment for pneumothorax treatments, x-rays and medical supervision."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, that is a new programme I just mentioned. It is the follow-up of patients who have been discharged from sanatorium on treatment. Heretofore, these were fewer in number and the cost of the follow-up was paid for by the various tuberculosis societies out of the seal sale campaign. This is a rather uncertain source to look to or depend upon for funds needed for an important purpose of this kind, and I believe that this is our responsibility in controlling tuberculosis. \$69,000 of this \$74,000 is allocated to that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, may I read to the hon. member for Oxford section 24 of The Sanatoria for Consumptives Act:

No part of any property acquired or used for the purposes of a sanatorium shall be sold, leased, mortgaged or otherwise disposed of without the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in council.

So, from that, I would say the Lieutenant-Governor in council, the government of Ontario, will have some say in the allocation of those funds, even if they are not ours.

Mr. Innes: Could we ask a question possibly later and find out how these were utilized or how they were distributed?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are not distributed, I know where they are now, they are invested.

Mr. Innes: They are invested?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are invested, because they expect to have to raise a lot of money for a general hospital.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 709 agreed to.

On vote 710:

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, on 710: I believe that this section of The Department of Health in this day and age is one of the most important in the department. What with the increasing technological changes in industry, new techniques, it demands more attention by this department. I would suggest, and I raise a question or two, there should be more data information provided to some of the groups connected with industry. I would like to quote three or four paragraphs from a paper of the compensation committee of the Stelco plant to indicate just what I mean:

The plant problems of the industrial worker of the present day are of extreme importance healthwise inasmuch as they are exposed to many kinds of atmosphere invasions, radiation, chemical fumes, dust and the like. Opposed to this are the effect of noise, light, heat, cold, monotonous and repetitious work and the like. And because of the modern-day techniques and the exposure to the above conditions, it increased by way of speed of production and the introduction of new chemicals of which little is known until it is too late. Many new chemicals are of a narcotic nature and government control is very lax with regard to the hazards of depressive effects on workers, while on the other end of the scale speed of production and the introduction of automation is creating hazards of emotional anxiety nature among workers.

In Ontario with the legislation at present in effect it is not the practice of The Department of Labour factory inspection branch or the department of industrial hygiene to notify any union of the results of requested inspections of suspected hazardous conditions. In any event, even were these departments required to notify the union concerned, the answer would be that the conditions in question were either hazardous or the reverse.

Now in the report, Mr. Chairman, it indicates that the industrial hygiene branch of

The Department of Health is doing a real good job. But the thing that is missing is the availability of their findings to the bodies that are interested. I notice in the report it sets out, and I quote:

Technical data sheets on nine different toxic materials were prepared and distributed to persons associated with the practice of industrial hygiene.

And further on down:

In addition medical examinations were supervised in 137 plants handling toxic materials.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, we have had quite a problem, the compensation committees have quite a problem. They have information from the United States, information they could not gain here, pointing out the fact that these oils, new chemicals, dust and radiation in the industries, coupled with the high speed of the equipment contribute to the common cold almost as much as the virus does at the present time. It contributes to pneumonia and to other lung diseases and to body rashes.

But they cannot get the information here, there seems to be a conflict in opinions between the medical division of the workers' compensation. I feel that this department, under The Department of Health, could release more of this material, make these papers available, so that the groups interested in the protection of the industrial workers' health is available. I raise the question on the directors' department itself, I was led to understand, and I cannot vouch for it, that there are nine doctors in the directors' department, that there are two vacancies in the department and the director is in retirement.

Sir, I ask the hon. Minister: Is this the case? If it is the case, are provisions being made to fill the vacancies in the department, so that we have this particular and very important department operating at full staff?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of any reason why reports were not made available to the people interested. I am just told now that our division is sending out more reports than perhaps any other single division. If the hon. member will let me know what reports were asked, and what he has not got, I will certainly try to track them down. The director is not, by any means, in retirement. He is active. I think he is sitting over here, but he is very active, and as far as I know, not thinking of retiring. There are no vacancies that I know of in the branch, my deputy assures me there are no

vacancies, so that I am afraid this is misinformation.

Mr. Gisborn: I am afraid it is. I will check it from the source where I received it. This is the information I have received from committees that are working almost full time in the field of compensation and industrial occupational diseases. If it is not the case, if there is available data on the application of this sort of industrial hazard affecting the employees, I will approach the department and find out.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word about air pollution here in the province. I believe this comes under this vote. We have had reference from time to time about the very fine report that was made by a committee of this Legislature in 1957, and unfortunately, despite the fact that it was a good report, and has been spoken of highly on many occasions and in very many journals, the government has taken little or no action. One of the weaknesses of enforcing the laws on air pollution here in the province, is simply because the province has left the enforcement of air pollution up to the local municipalities.

I once again submit that the enforcement of air pollution should be carried on by the province of Ontario, because you can have one municipality enforce the law and yet a neighbouring municipality, if it does not wish to co-operate, can contaminate the air of the whole province. It is true that in the long run this could be an international problem, especially in border areas such as Windsor. I should like to give you some idea of how this air pollution affects Toronto, and why I feel that stronger action should be taken, either through city government, or more preferably by the province bringing its authority to bear on the cities and on the municipalities. After all, the municipalities are the creatures of the province. I think that the province should use its authority and its influence. There appeared in the *Toronto Telegram* on February 16, an article written by Ron Poulton, and he said this:

In 1957, a select committee of the Ontario Legislature, filed one of the best reports on air pollution. It concluded there was no way to get away from foul air. The only answer was to stop it at its source. The trouble, the committee said, lies with our laws and the efficiency with which they are enforced. Today's statistics indicate that growing cities like Toronto are at best merely keeping up with the problem. Some 688 tons of dust still fall on every

mile of midtown Bloor Street every year. Some officials are more adept at parrying complaints with bland evasions than they are at doing anything about the smog-bound air.

Last December, when fog swamped Toronto, two officials told the writer there was nothing to worry about. It was not until January that Mrs. R. H. Scrivener, chairman of the Ontario division of the community planning association of Canada, was able to dig out the fact that 59 babies had been admitted to Toronto's Hospital for Sick Children during the same fog. Dirty air had sickened them all.

Mr. Chairman, this is a problem that is still not being met, and I think that the hon. Minister of Health, it being his major responsibility to look after the health of the people of this province, should see to it that our municipalities are enforcing the laws. I think the best way that this can be done is if the province took upon itself to enforce the law for air pollution.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, you will recall, on a point of order, I commented on this already this afternoon.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, are we given to understand that this would come under industrial hygiene, air pollution?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I commented on the matter, raised by my hon. friend, and it will be recorded in *Hansard*. Any other questions by all means.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman. I was a member of that select committee appointed on air pollution, and I am very happy to know that it was regarded as a very good report. I am afraid that this department has done a very bad job in respect to air pollution. When you consider, Mr. Chairman, that the total amount spent by the department on industrial hygiene is about \$630,000 and that it is taking care of air pollution inside the factories and all over the province of Ontario, I think the department has fallen down badly on the question of air pollution.

The hon. Minister said this afternoon that some arrangement would be made between The Department of Health and The Department of Labour to inspect plans for new factories. I understood that that was taking place 12 months ago. What else is the department doing for air pollution? All I can gather it is doing is to provide a model by-law. If a municipality sends in a request for

some information on air pollution, the department will send out a model by-law.

I agree with the hon. member that the government has to do something more than that. It has, in some way, to help financially the municipalities to put such by-laws into operation. It is all very well for the department to send out model by-laws, and they are approved by the local council, but the most contrary thing about the whole business is the question of enforcement. If we are going to do anything with this at all then I think that the government should take under advisement some form of subsidization in order to help the municipalities to put it into operation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of comments on this, bearing in mind the objective of getting more effective control of this situation.

A moment ago when the hon. member for Parkdale raised the suggestion that if we were going to come to grips with the problem it could be done only if the provincial government is willing to act, immediately there was a chorus of protests from the back benches: do you want to move in and take away the autonomy of the municipalities?

Mr. Chairman, I have often been accused of quoting at too great length from clippings, but I just wish at the moment that I had a clipping in my files. Professor Rodney Adamson, speaking to some planning or community conference in the city of Halifax, about a year or so ago, said this was the last refuge of the bankrupt politician, this taking refuge in municipal autonomy. Really, what you are trying to do is to evade coming to grips with the problem that is right on your doorstep.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (York-Humber): That does not apply to pollution.

Mr. MacDonald: It does apply to pollution, because obviously, Mr. Chairman, it is nonsense to suggest that in our growing industrial society one municipality can meet the problem of air pollution when cheek by jowl with it is another municipality that does nothing. What is the point of this municipality trying to come to grips with the problem? It is comparable to the problem in rural areas when you have one farmer who will look after weeds and the next farmer will not. The result is that the man who is doing the job is the victim of his neighbour who is not doing the job. The net result is that municipalities are not willing to take the initiative because you cannot tackle this kind of a prob-

lem on a piecemeal basis. If you do, you are beaten before you start because obviously there are no border lines up 100 feet or so into the air between various municipalities if you are seeking really—

Mr. Lewis: Metropolitan Toronto is doing quite a job, I would say.

Mr. MacDonald: Metropolitan Toronto—well, I will come to Metropolitan Toronto in a moment. This is the point that I want to make. If we really want to come to grips with this it has to be tackled at the provincial level, or on a regional level if we ever get around to some sort of regional government in these areas that are so built up now. Otherwise you are not going to solve it.

However, there is another aspect of this that I have often wondered about. Let me quote an editorial in the *Toronto Telegram* on February 15. The *Telegram* seems to be preoccupied with this problem in the same two or three days. The problem is that in this instance, as in so many instances, in that we appear to become concerned and serious about solving a problem but then in terms of penalties for those who violate the regulations we make the penalties so small that a violation and the penalty attached to it, is merely a licence to continue violating. This, I repeat, happens in many instances and I think it is happening in regard to air pollution.

On February 15, in the *Telegram*, there was an editorial entitled "Subsidy for Smog," let me read you a paragraph or two from it.

Supplying smog seems to be a profitable business in Metro Toronto, thriving with the blessing of the courts. If this were not so the latest report for October-November, 1962 by the Metro Works Commissioner on convictions for polluting the air would not have been possible.

This report indicates that magistrates are kind to the smog suppliers and it suggests that offenders find it more convenient and less expensive to pay the modest fines than to install smoke abating equipment. Of the 20 convictions in October, nine fines were well below the meagre maximum of \$50 for the first offence; four firms had one previous conviction in the past 12 months. For their second offence, three paid the full penalty—a mere \$100; one paid only \$75.

In November, 23 companies were convicted of polluting the air; 15 were first offenders, only three of them were fined the maximum of \$50, others were fined \$25, \$15, \$10. Six of the 24 had had previous convictions in the past twelve months. The

maximum fine for a second offence is \$100. Only two companies were required to pay it; one company paid \$75, another \$25, and two got away with only \$10.

Included among the 23 were two companies who had more than two convictions in the past twelve months, and who were up for at least the third time.

And the editorial concludes:

This is no way to discourage violations; it is no way to rid the air of dirty, disease-laden smoke and fumes. In the first place the scale of fines is much too low, it should be raised. Low as it is at the present time, the scale is not being strictly applied. Observance of the law depends a great deal upon the way the courts demand respect for the law. Magistrates who take a lenient view of offences encourage laxity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there can be any doubt at all that there is considerable validity in this. I would be curious to know—and perhaps the hon. Minister can fill in my lack of information at this point. I presume that these convictions are under a by-law in the city of Toronto, and therefore do not directly come under the jurisdiction of this department, am I right?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Are there comparable kinds of penalties in provincial legislation? I could have found this out for myself if I had looked up the statute, I presume; are there comparable kinds or levels of penalties in any provincial legislation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, there is no provincial legislation to bring the violators of the by-laws before the courts. If they are in violation of a municipal by-law then the penalty, I would presume, is written into that, or at least it would be available to the courts. Whether it is left to the discretion of the magistrate, really I do not know.

Mr. MacDonald: Obviously the hon. Minister is correct now that I think the thing through. If it is left to the municipality they must pass a by-law so each municipality has these,

But my case is simply this. The government's policy at the provincial level is hopelessly inadequate because you are not going to solve this problem on a piecemeal basis. Then when you get down to the municipal level we say we are serious but we are, in fact, not serious. Because I submit to you

the Toronto *Telegram* comment indicates that paying fines is merely a licence for continuing to operate without doing anything very serious about it. At least the record in those two or three months seems to confirm that very much.

The hon. member for Wentworth East and others in the House, Mr. Chairman, have pointed out the growing seriousness of this in terms of a health problem and I submit that some time, sooner or later, the government through the appropriate department in this Department of Health has got to put teeth in this legislation and do something about it because at the moment we are only toying with the problem.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 710 agreed to.

On vote 711:

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, on vote 711. I believe the administration of The Cemeteries Act comes under this vote, am I correct, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Belanger: Recently in the city of Toronto there was a national convention of the tombstone people, the people who make monuments, and sell monuments to be erected on the graves. At this convention one of the aldermen for the city of Windsor was present because of the fact that he and his dad are in this business. I had the opportunity of meeting quite a few people who were at this convention and a number of them came from the province of Ontario.

I was told, how true the report is I do not know but it was substantiated by quite a few members who were present at the convention, that one of the officials of your department connected with this work—I do not remember his name, it was given to me—that his thinking was and he was advocating this to quite an extent that the tombstone should be a thing that should be done away with.

In other words, he favoured cemeteries without any tombstones and these people were quite concerned that some official of the department was taking this attitude. They felt that they were in business, a legitimate business—and it is a business that has been going on for years—and at least if the people did not want to erect tombstones on graves it should be left to whoever was concerned. But definitely they were quite put out by the fact that somebody of your department in this work was advocating and encouraging this.

Also, they were of the opinion that the administration of this should be under The Department of Municipal Affairs because cemeteries often have to do with the question of zoning.

I recall that in the city of Windsor we have quite a problem with one of the cemeteries there. We are trying to get them other land where they could locate because their cemetery is full and they have to go somewhere else. They want to remain within the city of Windsor and it is quite a problem.

I would like to find out from you, sir, whether these charges are correct. Whether it is the opinion of the department that tombstones should be done away with and what is your feeling with regards to putting this under The Department of Municipal Affairs?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I hope that my hon. colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) has heard every word that my hon. friend has said. I would gladly give him the administration of The Cemeteries Act, I have been trying to slough it off onto almost every one of my hon. colleagues for the last five years but I have not been able to sell it.

I hope, sir, that you have been more successful. I would very, very gladly give it to anybody who would take it over.

If one of my officials expressed the opinion that headstones should be done away with he was expressing a personal opinion and certainly not reflecting departmental policy. We have no policy in this. I do not think that is my concern, I do not think that is the concern of a government at all. If a family wants to erect a tombstone in memory of a member of the family, that is their concern and I have nothing to do with that whatsoever. Again I repeat, if an official of the department said that, he was giving voice to his own opinion. Again, I hope my hon. friend heard what you said, sir, recommending that he take over the administration of this Act.

Mr. Belanger: Would the hon. Minister say that if these people felt that this should be under The Department of Municipal Affairs that they should make representation to the government, to him, or to The Department of Municipal Affairs, or what would he say? They would like to have some direction.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will receive them with open arms.

Mr. Belanger: Thank you very much.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister how many persons there are employed in the department to inspect and supervise cemeteries? Second, how many profit-making cemeteries are there in the province of Ontario and how many financial reports were received from these profit cemeteries for examination last year?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are two inspectors of cemeteries. Last year there were 34 profit-making cemeteries in the province. What was the other one?

Mr. Thomas: How many financial reports were received and examined?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They do not have to submit a financial report to us every year. They have to give us a statement of a surrogate court audit once in every five years.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 711 agreed to.

On vote 712:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions that I would like to address to the hon. Minister. I am curious to discover what the status of the Christie Street Laboratory is and to get some detail as to the government's plan with regard to what I understand is on the drawing board, namely the building of a new laboratory somewhere out on Highway 401 on the outskirts of Toronto.

Now, my first question is, and perhaps I can get this on the record immediately, is that I think we are entitled at this stage to know what the government's plans are in this connection. I am a little curious in the light of our earlier discussion in the estimates about research as to what role this institution is going to play in the government's future research programme, because I understand that research is going to be a major portion of the objectives of this new institution.

Now, related to this is the underlying policy. I am not only curious but also a bit disturbed by it. As I understand it, the lab set-up that we have in the province of Ontario at the present time is made up of the central lab here in Toronto, 12 regional laboratories and five associated hospitals and that to these institutions there came in the past year the rather impressive total of 9,418,998 units of work. These laboratories have represented a major contribution to public health by this government, an institution to which doctors sent specimens to have lab tests made. As I understand it, in the city of Toronto restrictions have been placed on the Christie

Street Laboratory, particularly at holidays, when normally it was opened almost 24 hours a day and available for doctors. In other words, this is a service that has been provided free up until this time. The objective of the government, if my information is correct, is now to transfer a considerable portion of this work to commercial laboratories or on to hospital laboratories.

Now if this is a correct assessment of the government's intentions, my information is that government laboratories simply are not at the present time in a position to be able to cope with them. Secondly, that while commercial laboratories might be in a position—they certainly could expand their facilities—what, in effect, you are doing here is to switch from a public service that presumably was paid for by the public purse up to now into commercial enterprise a very important aspect of the whole question of the practice of medicine in this country.

Whether or not this is a desirable thing, what the overall result of it would be, as a layman I do not pretend to be fully aware. Does this mean, for example, that doctors, instead of getting free laboratory tests, would now have to pay for them in each instance if it goes to a commercial laboratory and that, therefore, this is going to be added to the bill to the patient? In other words, this impinges on overall public policy.

Another point in this connection on which I would like some clarification is that even if my assessment of the government's objective is correct here in Toronto—that you are going to pass this work over to commercial laboratories and to hospitals and that the new laboratory that is going to be built out on Highway 401 is going to be much more of a research institution—what is going to happen to the hinterland—if I may borrow that phrase that we were using yesterday in another connection—in the rest of the province? Are the rest of the regional laboratories going to continue on exactly the same basis, or are they, too, going to start to pass over to commercial laboratories the tests that up till now have been done for the medical profession and for the protection of the people's health?

There are really scores of other questions related to this, but I would appreciate very much if the hon. Minister would give us some details as to the government's plans in this connection, and more important even than that, its underlying policy thinking.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the status of the Christie Street Laboratory is crowded to capacity and what has been

turned away it has been perforce, certainly not by intent, for there is no intention of turning work away.

The status of the new laboratory: I believe that tenders are about to be called most any time and I would think they will be beginning to dig this spring to establish the laboratory. The new laboratory is being built basically for the same reason as Christie Street is now maintained, as a service to the public. Its prime role is not going to be research. More research is going to be undertaken because this is an area where our lab people have felt we have been deficient, but we simply could not get into it because of the lack of physical space, but there will be no reduction in the amount of work done.

The reason that we did close the laboratory was because we just simply did not get the calls between midnight and 8 o'clock in the morning. We did remain open 24 hours a day but about three years ago we closed at midnight.

When the lab moves out it is our intention to have a receiving station in the east block, one door of which, I believe, is open 24 hours a day, so that any doctor downtown wanting to deposit his sample himself will be able to do so at the east block. I think that is about as convenient a centre as possible, it is even more convenient than the present Christie Street Laboratory.

Now, on the amount of work: my hon. friend read the number of units, and it is 9,418,988 units of work. I must admit that I am not quite clear in my own mind just exactly what a unit of laboratory work is. But this is a very large amount of work and is about 10 per cent above last year. My deputy tells me it is 15.4 per cent. We have been increasing at about 10 per cent, but it increased 15.4 per cent last year over the year before.

So again, I would repeat that if we had to turn work away it has been simply because of the fact that they did not have space to do it. There are certain tests, particularly in virology, that we believe we should be in. This was one of the other reasons why we made our decision so urgent to get new quarters; that, and the hope and intention of our people to get into a little more research than we have been able to do.

The regional labs will continue. The associate labs have gradually been disappearing, but this is not by our intention. The associate lab often was set up as a service to the hospital and to the public. The hospital was not big enough to maintain its own laboratory but with the public health work and clinical

work that we could attract, then a lab could be maintained.

One or two of those have already reached the stage where they are big enough to maintain their own laboratory, so we were able to drop one at Kirkland Lake, I believe, last year. We moved that work over to Timmins because the hospital was able to do its own work. The only place where there has been a decrease in the amount of work, or of customers if I may put it that way, is in the small hospital; they are growing in size now and when they reach a certain size it is feasible for them to do their own lab work. We have no intention of cutting down; we have no intention of turning the work over to commercial laboratories at all.

Mr. MacDonald: I am relieved to learn that there is no intention of doing this because I think this is one field where we certainly have made a contribution in the past. I think it is important enough a field that the government should stay in it.

May I have clarification on this one point? Is it the hon. Minister's intention to maintain the Christie Street lab as well as the new one, or is the new one going to replace the Christie Street lab?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We will utilize a good part of it for industrial hygiene. The radiation lab is up there now, and it was only recently established. We will be able to expand our industrial hygiene laboratory facilities.

Mr. Thomas: I had a question on vote 711, on school sanitation. I wonder if I may have permission from the hon. Minister to revert back to that vote just for one question? In his annual report it says that during 1962 54.9 per cent of the schools in the province were dependent on private wells for their water supply. It was reported by the medical officers of health that 20.7 per cent of these well water supplies were unsatisfactory. I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on that. We heard tonight—there was one thing he mentioned was the finest in the world—what has he to say about this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: These 24.7 per cent of well water supplies found to be unsatisfactory—this is the opinion of the local medical officer of health. I would not be in a position to say whether the water was bacteriologically impure, whether there was something wrong with the well, with the pumps, or with the means of dispensing. I have not got the bacteriological reports, and this is the thing which would concern us the most. If the water were bacteriologically impure, then the

medical officer of health would close down the well or institute some purification method before he would allow the water to be drunk. Then I presume he would undertake a study of the soil to see if it were contaminated, to see where the source of contamination was, and take steps to remove that. This is not a very good report; I do not like it. But we report to the medical officer of health and he has the duty and responsibility to take active steps to see that it is cleaned up.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 712 agreed to.

On vote 713:

Mr. Innes: On vote 713, last October the hon. Minister will recall a very unfortunate accident which occurred in the city of Woodstock when a constable there was shot—well, I can read the report to give you a little better description:

The city was shocked at the sudden tragic death of a Woodstock policeman shot to death in the line of duty by an Ontario Hospital patient yesterday. Today it pondered how and why it all came about. Constable Thomas Beck, a ten-year veteran on the city police force, was mortally wounded by a bullet in the neck from his own revolver in the hands of Norman Big-nall, who, with a companion, John Leaver, 36, had left the Ontario Hospital grounds without permission.

That was in October. In December we saw where two other boys left the mental hospital at Aurora.

These hospitals, of course, have an open-door policy, which the hon. Minister has said on various occasions he thinks is a wonderful idea which has done much to ease the tension of the patients at the various hospitals. This I certainly agree with, but on the other hand I do feel that there certainly should be a little more strict regulations on patients who they know are susceptible or prone to wandering a little bit. These two people, of course, were in the process of being reprimanded by the constable—by two constables, actually—one chap became excited, took the gun of Constable Black and shot him in the neck.

The local *Sentinel Review* of December 6 wrote an editorial criticizing the hon. Minister of Health to some extent. It says:

NO POLICE—DR. DYMOND STUBS HIS TOE

The public and police at Woodstock will neither applaud nor agree with Dr. M. B. Dymond's advice on how to handle patients who escape from the Ontario Hospital. The Ontario Minister of Health said here, "We

would prefer attendants of the hospital be called to assist in the pick-up of a patient." On the face of it this suggestion has some merit but in terms of realism it won't always work.

Recollection of the circumstances preceding the tragic death of a brave Woodstock policeman is too fresh in mind. There was no time to call the hospital and have an attendant come several miles to the bus depot where two escapees were about to board a bus for Toronto.

Dr. Dymond must know the facts. They were, or at least it is so presumed, reported in detail to him just a few weeks ago. Perhaps he has been too preoccupied with blueprinting the government's someday Medicare programme. Perhaps he should have another look at the file. Nor will his complacent assumption that the open-door plan for Ontario hospitals is just fine as it exists, sit too well with the citizens of a community so recently shocked by what is admittedly a rare incident.

In principle, the open-door policy is admirable and in keeping with the principles of humanity and modern psychiatry; that does not mean the system is sacred, as Dr. Dymond implies it is. All systems should be subject to periodic restudy and if need be, either liberalization or modification.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has instructed his superintendents in the various hospitals to give a re-assessment on the basis of the incidents that I have mentioned. Has he asked his superintendents at the various hospitals to run a little bit of a check on the various patients who are currently in these institutions to ascertain if there are any other patients who have free access to the open-door policy, and who take advantage of it to the result that they do not want to come back or who could get into trouble or create disturbance in the various communities?

I have mentioned that I feel the open-door policy, as he has admitted, does have a lot of merit, I do feel that in certain instances we have been a little bit lax. I would like to have the hon. Minister's comment on this because this is certainly a very touchy subject in my particular district as—I might remind the hon. Minister, and he will agree—the editorial indicated.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we are all agreed. I have already indicated that this was a very tragic circumstance, something that we have never had happen before, at

least in the contemporary history of the hospitals, something we hope will never happen again. As I said at the time, there was nothing to indicate from the behaviour of these two patients that they could be violent.

Of course they were prone to wander away. Any of our patients are prone to wander, but the great majority of them come back home. I think at the present time, out of the 26,000-odd patients on the hospital books of the province, 17 are listed as eloped. This is a very good truancy record.

Mr. MacDonald: Careful now!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Every one of our hospitals has to some degree, in fact a very large degree, the open-door policy. Twenty on elopement at the end of December. This is a very small figure overall. The fact that my hon. friend says the editor of the Woodstock *Sentinel News* believes that I had that reported to me, a short time before the escape—I did not. I did not have that reported to me. I would not have that reported to me. An escape is not reported to me. It is reported to the superintendent and he in turn would report to the division. Reports of this kind do not necessarily come to me. If some tragic happening, such as my hon. friend has outlined, takes place, that is reported to me. Serious or emergency matters are reported to me but not elopements, because we do not look upon elopements as a serious matter.

Some of the patients wander away and get lost; some of them wander downtown and will telephone the hospital and ask to be sent for; but not very many of them deliberately escape in the sense that we think of escaping custody.

The epileptic division at Woodstock is 100 per cent open. There is not a locked door in it except for the protection of the patients at night. They are free to come and go at will. Some of them are denied town privileges but not a great many of them. Even about those who are denied town privileges we do not get tremendously concerned. They are denied those privileges largely because of our fear for them. We have had no reason in the case of these two, at any time, to suspect that they would be violent. It was probably a greater shock to the staff that this young man who has been under the care of the provincial hospitals for something like 14 years. It was a very great shock to the staff to realize that he had done this.

Therefore, I did not know of it, and, even had I known of it, I have made it my policy not to interfere with the professional judgment of the doctors in charge of the patients.

They are, after all, psychiatrists; I am not. They know what they are doing because this is their particular field. I have never practised psychiatry and really I do not understand much of the language they use from time to time. I sometimes wonder if they do. The system is not sacred. We do not look upon the system as sacred. Yes, I've stubbed my toe many times and I'll do it again many many times.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Get a chiropractor to fix it up.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, we'll get him to fix it up. The system is not sacred. We do not look upon the system as sacred. It is one of the tools in our plan for the care and treatment of patients. It has been found all over the world to be very valuable and a very useful tool and it's constantly under study. I did not direct the superintendents to look at the policy again, because they are looking at it all the time. I did ask them immediately after hearing of this incident if in their opinion the system should be changed. Without one dissenting voice they agreed that the system should not be changed, all agreeing that this was a most tragic happening but one that could not be foreseen and certainly not one that would call for such drastic action as this, albeit it was very serious.

The young man, as you know, appeared before the courts and was judged unfit to stand trial by reason of mental disability. Some of our patients get into trouble but I think that if you take our 26,000 population and compare it with 26,000 or the normal population you will find that our patients, by and large, get into far less trouble than a similar number of people from the normal society. I do not think that there is any laxity, indeed I am still of the opinion myself that our staff tends to be just a little bit too strict in their control of the patients. However, this again is professional judgment and I leave it entirely up to them. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, and through you the hon. members of this House that not one of my staff will take chances with liberating any patient or giving any degree of freedom to a patient who they have any cause to feel would be a menace to himself or to society.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that the age for admission of retarded children to the Ontario Hospital's schools is six years to 16. Is this correct, Mr. Chairman? If it is I would like to say this: Very often a retarded child in the home causes a great deal of difficulty to the parents

and other members of the family. He may be over the age of 16 or under the age of six. As a matter of fact, I know some friends of ours who have that problem and the person concerned might be between 25 to 30. I just wonder about that, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: By and large the age was six to 16 but changing circumstances have caused us to change our minds and there is no age limit now. We prefer children who are simply mentally retarded and are posing no problem and have no gross physical disability as well, to wait until they are six to be admitted to a hospital school because we cannot do very much for them except care for them until they are six at least. At that time we can begin to give them such education and training as they are capable of absorbing.

Over sixteen, if the need for admission is there then they will be admitted. They may not be admitted to the hospital school. This will depend on space available to us; but if not, they will be admitted to one of our hospitals. In most cases where a retarded patient is causing difficulty in the home or where there are any extenuating circumstances at all, we pay no attention to the age. If the medical need for admission is there, they will be granted admission as soon as possible.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Chairman; just following along with what I was speaking about: Are mental patients who are a little bit dangerous confined to Cobourg, or which school or mental hospital do they go to?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If they are psychopathic and very dangerous they are usually sent to the maximum security hospital at Penetang.

Mr. Innes: How many do you have there at the moment, sir?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Two hundred and fifty. I neglected to mention something about the editorial saying also that there was no time to call the attendant. I can understand the newspaper editor and I could understand the policeman feeling that time was of the essence in keeping those boys off the bus. We would have been better pleased to see them get on the bus. If they had gone to London or Toronto or Thamesford or what have you we would have found them and probably the tragic circumstances could have been avoided. That of course, is hindsight. It is easy to talk about it now.

The reason we say we prefer that an attendant be called is because the patients know the attendants and are quite willing to accept direction or even orders from them, and it is better all around. We would far rather see the patients wander away. It doesn't really matter how far because we will find them again and the attendants are known to them and are accustomed to dealing with them.

Mr. Innes: Mr. Minister, if you were a constable and you were called by the hospital or the administrator of the hospital and told that there were two mental patients at large, and you were to aid in picking them up, what would you do? Would you say, "We will ignore the call." I suggest, this is a pretty ridiculous statement.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The same hospital administrator called the police force when they were located, to offer assistance and it was declined.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, at what stage are your plans for the conversion of the mental hospital at North Bay to a school for retarded children? And at what stage are the three smaller hospitals that you contemplate putting in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We hope, Mr. Chairman, that the building of two community psychiatric hospitals will be begun this year. Sudbury, we hope, will begin to admit patients within the next six to eight months if our plans go well.

Mr. Troy: And the last question, sir: I understand that in the hospital at London you are changing the operation, particularly in regard to attendants; and supervising attendants are being replaced by nurses. Is that to be the policy in your other hospitals too, where the nurses are taking over in the wards instead of male attendants?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The policy of the department, Mr. Chairman, is to institute unified nursing service. Whenever nursing is carried on in wards the person in charge will be a registered nurse. Where the function of the ward is not essentially nursing, then attendants will be in charge of those wards. This is being worked out now with the association, with the superintendents and the department, and they will be kept fully informed and fully consulted about the plan as it is being developed. It is not only for London; it is going to be done all over our system.

Mr. Troy: When the hon. Minister says the association, to what association does he refer, the civil service association?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The civil service association.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister in his opening remarks before presenting his estimates, indicated that there would be a stepped-up programme in regard to mental clinics in Ontario, and I would like to point out the necessity for speed in this direction. I would appeal on behalf of the city of Hamilton that it receive priority in this regard. I realize that this must be left to the initiative of the medical officers in Hamilton and the city council to get their share of the grants, but I notice that the hon. Minister in his remarks in regard to this programme, stated that the plans call for 27 new clinic teams in the next five years, starting with five this year.

I understand by a brief from the social planning council in Hamilton that in Hamilton, to start to do anything successful in this regard, we would need five teams, set out at 2.5 for adults and 2.5 for children. At the present time I understand that they have just the children's clinic—and it is overtaxed—and no adult clinic whatsoever. I am sure the hon. Minister is aware of the serious cases of violence we have had in Hamilton over the past two years, all of them resulting in death and caused by persons who were mentally ill. The last one caused the death of a mother, a neighbour and a policeman and the eventual suicide of the mentally ill person. And from the inquest of this sad case it was indicated the doctor who had been serving the family for years had recommended mental treatment for the boy, but the mother would not commit him and it went on and ended in this serious tragedy.

I would appeal to whatever the department can do to urge the city council and the medical officers in Hamilton to get on with the job. I saw in the paper a couple of nights ago that even if they started immediately and decided to open an adult clinic, it may take months to get the psychiatric staff to man it, since there is a shortage and they would have trouble in this field. I would like an answer in regard to this point.

But to emphasize my appeal, the brief presented by the planning council indicated that the Hamilton general psychiatric unit has 30 beds, or one for every 9,133 of the city's population. In comparison, Kingston has one per 1,519 population; Ottawa, one per 4,876; London, one per 1,823; Brantford,

one per 2,225; and Windsor one per 4,065. This does indicate that if we can do anything from this end to urge the city of Hamilton to get on with this project, we should do it, because I think the priority lies there, according to the brief of the social planning council.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is completely correct in his assumption that the bar to progress in this area is the lack of professional staff. The department sees to it that bursaries are provided for the training of psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers, and we approve for bursary every applicant who has the necessary training, and more is still available for bursaries. We are doing everything in our power to encourage people to go into psychiatry and the allied studies, and I can think of nothing more we can do. We have enlisted the support of the medical schools in this and I take it the psychiatric section of the profession itself is doing all it can to interest new graduates to go into this field. We have a very well functioning clinic at our Hamilton hospital, which is available to the people in Hamilton.

Mr. Belanger: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the hon. Minister, through you, that last October when he was in the city of Windsor to open the new wing at the IODE hospital, he did announce to the gathering there that the one wing of the IODE hospital would be used for the psychiatric or mental hospital. I would say that this was received with great jubilation in the city of Windsor. And tonight he did refer to the fact that he is going to open up the psychiatric ward. Now, I am wondering what he means by "soon." Will it be within months or will it be years, or what?

We are very much interested because at the present time I think I have found out from the hon. Minister or from his department that close to 500 patients from the Windsor area are in St. Thomas. These people would like to see this hospital brought closer to home, not only because of the fact that they have to travel so far, but also from the standpoint of the patients. I think it would be a booster for the morale of the patients if they were close to home. Therefore, I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister could give us some tentative date that he expects to open some ward?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would advise the hon. member that we are not going to open up the psychiatric unit. The board of the IODE hospital is going to do it with our support. The first sketch plans came to

my desk today and we will do all we can to push forward with them just as quickly as we are able. I cannot give the hon. member a definite time, but I would sincerely hope it will be within months.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister by how many beds, if any, has the hospital in Orillia increased? I realize there were 300 patients moved to Gravenhurst while some old buildings were being torn down. Has the number of beds available actually increased or decreased?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are just beginning to use it. They have used one unit of the new building, which will have a total of 300 beds, just to replace what we took down. There is no intention of enlarging the original size of Orillia hospital. We feel it was big enough as it was. All we are going to do is replace the old accommodation, and then we can empty 300 into this new building, which should be completed by the summer I would feel. Then we will tear down another 300 beds. We are not going to increase the size of it.

Mr. Trotter: Is the hospital at Cedar Springs being fully used? ?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is progressively being filled up. Again this is not dependent upon just getting the patients into the beds. We must adjust them to the operation. We cannot just fill rooms. This cannot be done in a hospital of that type. Also we have to develop new staff to take over the duties. There are 829 patients now. It is two-thirds full, with 829 patients out of 1,200.

Mr. Trotter: My point in asking this, Mr. Chairman, is that there is evidently a growing need for hospitals for retarded children, and I think the brief of the Ontario Association for Retarded Children in 1960 pointed out that the new hospital at Cedar Springs would only at that time take care of the needs known then. These, of course, increased. I think two per cent of the population are born retarded and ten per cent of them need hospital care. Yet there does not seem to be any programme of the government to have increased bed space. I would like to know if any additional hospitals are being planned.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: North Bay will produce about 700 or 800 beds when we can get it converted. I would like to point out certain things which are basic philosophy in this matter. The report that the hon. member

read is two years old, I think. That may seem like a little matter but it is rather an important matter in this area because there are changing concepts and changing ideas constantly. For instance, Dr. Richards, who is an authority on mental retardation, and has been here in Toronto from England as a visiting professor in this field, stated this:

Ontario has a greater number of beds per 1,000 population than either Britain or the United States.

He feels that beds are not the answer to the problem. We are not, for instance, setting up a screening and assessment diagnostic project for every child who is admitted to our hospital schools just with the aim in view of cutting down admissions. We are doing this because we believe, and we have been advised by the experts, that this is a sound medical procedure. We have found by using the clinic at London that a goodly number of children, who perhaps before the establishment of the clinic would have been admitted to one of the hospital schools, have not needed to be admitted. We have also found that the parents prefer to keep them at home so long as they know there is a supportive organization behind them, so long as they can go to the clinic and get a little guidance and counsel and direction in looking after the child.

This is why we are aiming now to ensure that every child before he is admitted to hospital is screened by these clinics. We feel that by taking the word of a man like Dr. Richards we are really on sound ground even in preference to that of the social planning council, knowledgeable and dedicated people though they may be. I think it is worth knowing that, in 1962, Ontario had 98.5 beds for every 100,000 population, and in addition had 3,077 retarded adults in Ontario hospitals. The rest of Canada—and I do not think the provinces can all be considered delinquent—had 58.3 beds for 100,000 or just a little over half of what the province of Ontario had. You can see from this, Mr. Chairman, that the province of Ontario already has almost as many as the rest of Canada put together. To sum up: Ontario 6,237, the other nine provinces 6,856.

We do admit that we need more diagnostic centres, and we are aiming now to that end as part of our work for the immediate future. London, however, is not the only one; we have another in Toronto here which has been operating now for a little over a year. Every mental health clinic in the province does more or less of this work in its own com-

munity, so that we are not completely persuaded that the great need for beds that we believe existed even two or three years ago is present in the same measure that it was. This is another matter which is constantly under study and has to be under study because of the fluid nature of the problem. I cannot see that we are providing any service to the people by simply putting our children in beds, or that this is in the best medical interests of the child.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I approve of the idea of trying to keep the children in the homes if at all possible, but even when you have a child attending a school here in Toronto, once it attains the age of 16 it cannot any longer attend the school and there is no place for it to go. Probably if they are 16 years of age, mentally they would only be about six, but still the government has not provided any facility. Parents need \$100 or \$150 a month to send a child to a private school. Many people do not have the money for the facilities.

Certainly, if the government does not provide a school for them such as Orillia—which is really no longer a hospital-school because it is so crowded, and they do not have any facilities—when the child leaves the school on, say, Beverley Street here in Toronto, I think the problem is not being met at all.

I do not know if the hon. Minister feels that the thesis behind the brief of the Ontario Association for Retarded Children is entirely wrong, but certainly there is much to be done in the building of hospitals for retarded children, and much more in the diagnostic field. I do not feel that the government, especially under these estimates, has come out with any programme, either for building hospitals, for diagnostic services or for providing schools for those children who can still live at home but need some training. I feel that the hon. Minister, when we talk about schools, may switch to hospitals, and when we talk about hospitals he switches to schools. But on the basis of the programme as a whole, I do not think under these estimates for this year that they are giving any indication at all that they intend to deal with the problem as it should be dealt with.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid that the hon. member seems to know more about how the problem should be dealt with than the experts do. I take my advice and guidance from them.

Just as an illustration, Mr. Chairman, of this lack of appreciation of what we are trying

to do, he speaks of the patient who graduates from Beverley Street school. It would be my opinion that when the patient leaves Beverley Street school, it is taken that everything possible has been done for that patient, because this is a sheltered workshop and a training centre. There is no use putting that person in an institution after that. If he goes into an institution it means that he is going to need institutionalization for life.

If Beverley Street school has made an assessment, as it does of all the patients, and if it has decided that the patient has no potential for self-support or even partial self-support, then the patient remains at home, if it is possible to maintain him at home. And a great many of these patients have to be maintained at home or somewhere, unable to do anything but live out as normal and comfortable a life as is possible for them with the residual capabilities, and that is all that can be done. There is no need or no demand—and, indeed, it would be most unjust—to put a person of that kind in an institution. An institution is not just a place of human storage. If we cannot do anything for them, there is not any use of taking them into an institution.

Communities and many people subscribing to the social planning council's concept are thinking in terms of establishing a new pattern of care altogether, in terms of sheltered workshops and hospitals and things of that kind at the community level. And it might well be that this is an area which some department of government may have to get into, I do not know. We do not think that this is a health problem. When we have done all we possibly can for them from the health standpoint, then probably some other agency or some other department needs to take over.

The hon. member talks about my switching from hospitals to schools. I am not, I am talking about hospital-schools. It is a hyphenated word, because this is the place we put our retarded children. We do not put them in hospitals. It is a combination of hospital and school. Indeed, oftentimes our place is more a boarding school or a boarding workshop than it is a hospital, because relatively few of our children are really sick.

Mr. Trotter: But after they reach 16—this is my point—there is no place for them to go other than to an institution, to which I do not think a lot of them should go. I think the age of 16 is too low to cut them off from training. I have two cases in mind where the child could use something, but it still needs the sheltered workshop. Yet once they are 16 they are cut off and they either have to stay at home or go to an institution. And if the

family cannot afford to keep them at home, or both the parents are working, or they want to get further training, they cannot do it unless they have funds. I know where people have paid \$100 to \$150 a month to give further training to their child after the child has had to leave the sheltered workshop at 16. They just cannot carry on.

So I would say that this responsibility is on government. It may be true that it is an educational problem, but it seems unfortunate that only those who have normal children and can pay taxes, can have them educated. Where this breaks off from being health to education is something the government should solve. I do not think that The Department of Health can completely ignore the situation. Because if these patients are not trained they end up as a responsibility of The Department of Health.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, during the past couple of years I have had four or five cases where severely retarded children in Bruce county have tried probably to maim themselves or get into serious trouble. I have approached the hon. Minister about these children, and I just wanted to thank him for what he has done. In every case the department has helped, and certainly this has been appreciated by the parents themselves, the Children's Aid Society and certainly by myself.

Mr. Gisborn: I would like to raise a question or two in connection with the Cedar Springs school. I have had the opportunity two or three times to attend meetings of the Hamilton area association for retarded children and listen to some of its complaints. It appeared to me that its complaints were not getting through; it was making them to the president of the Ontario association and he, in some sense, disagreed with them.

The complaints appear petty in some sense but when the parents of the retarded children decide to form into an organization to familiarize themselves with the problems that the parents as well as the children face, they should be commended and given some attention. They feel that at both Orillia and Cedar Springs they have been received badly by the staff. I understand that sometimes it took some time for them to get the right to go into the institution at any time, that they could provide their own transportation and it is a long distance from Hamilton to both the institutions, but they find, when they get there, they have to wait. They are told to wait until the children are made available. Sometimes it is some length of time, and

then they are confined to small areas in a group to talk to their children or pass what time they would want with them. I think that a different approach could be made.

What they wanted—and they felt it was their right because they had formed an association with some responsibility that they should be able to go to the institution and to the ward and receive their child on the ward. They have asked for this kind of permission and they have been turned down quite flatly without any real explanation. So I would hope that some attention could be given to the problems of the association, even if they may appear petty.

Now, on the overall programme, in regard to retarded children, I would ask this question of the hon. Minister, and this is in connection with the whole pattern and re-thinking in this area. My reading of reports from the Canadian welfare council, the Ontario welfare council and their association is that we are doing the wrong thing. I am not able to say whether they are right or not because I am only a layman on this subject, but they feel that we should get away from the large institutionalized building, get away from having them away from the communities and out into pastures and farm lands, as they call them. I understand the new one that they are contemplating at Palmerston is going to be out in the sticks also. These associations feel that there should be centres right in the communities so that the children could be taken into the community by the parents, the institutional parents, so they know what it is like to go into a store and see a person buy something. They could see what traffic is and they could be taken to a movie, rather than just be left where they can look out and see nothing but pasture.

I understand that the experts feel that the institution should have no more than 100 children in it. I do not know whether this is the proper approach or not, but I would seek some information. If this is the case, we find that Orillia has 2,800 and Cedar Springs 2,300, Smiths Falls 1,200 and Palmerston, they expect, is going to be 300 to 600 when built. Is there any thinking in the department of getting away from this institutional approach and getting them back into the communities on a smaller basis to provide some of this new approach?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, if parents were received badly by the staff at Orillia I certainly have never heard of it, but I will make it my business to find out

about it. If they are having difficulty getting into the hospital, this too is news to me. I cannot conceive of it being possible, but if it is happening I can assure the hon. member it will not continue to happen. It is quite conceivable that parents may have to wait for their children. If any of you have visited Orillia—and I think every hon. member in this House should make it his business to visit more than one of our institutions just to see first-hand, not to depend completely on reports, about what is really going on. If you go to Orillia I can quite conceivably believe that you might wait an hour for your child, because that child is likely down at the lake swimming or playing ball, and is far more interested in doing that than entertaining visitors, because the child is interested in doing what it wants to do at the time. Particularly in the summer, that is where you would find the great bulk of the children. The visiting rooms are small because Orillia was built at a time when ideas were different. With the new unit we hope that we will be able to get larger visiting areas than the old part of the hospital.

I must say as a physician I would not approve of parents visiting the child on the ward, if there is nothing wrong with the child. If a child is able to go to the visiting room and visit with the parents, I certainly would not approve of the parent going to the ward. The ward is a large bedroom with many beds in it and that is no place for visiting. If I were the superintendent I would say very frankly that I would not approve of this, nor would I allow it unless the child was confined to bed.

The welfare council may be right, they certainly have a right to their opinion, that we are doing things the wrong way, but at least we are guided in our actions and our policies and our programmes by those who are, and have been, in this work as a lifetime task and have, I think, some knowledge. We have practically all the people in this field in the province of Ontario working for the government. And I think that surely their opinion—I would be condemned severely if I took the opinion of someone else in preference to these men and women who have spent their whole professional life in this field.

The large institution, of course, has been laid down in our government policy as a thing of the past, but we cannot tear the existing institutions down. We have a tremendous public investment in these institutions and they are doing good work. My advisors tell me that an institution for 1,000

children is not too big, and they are not all persuaded there is not total agreement that an institution smaller than this is the thing. They think we should try it, and this is what we are going to do at Palmerston. It is going to start out as a 300 unit. It will be so constructed that it will be in units of 300, so that each one—there may be a number of them—will be more or less a self-contained unit of 300, dependent upon central services for certain things, laundry and so on and so forth. I think the hon. member's figures are a little bit out and I hope to goodness the welfare council is not publishing the fact that there are 2,800 beds at Orillia and 2,300 at Cedar Springs. This is completely wrong. I think it is 2,400 at Orillia and 1,200 at Cedar Springs.

Mr. Gisborn: To keep the record straight, these figures came from the president of the Ontario Retarded Children's Association.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, I think they have got some misinformation because those figures are not correct.

An institution for retarded children, even if it were only 300, cannot be in the heart of the town. Their abilities are so limited that you have to think of every possible way of making life as pleasant for them as you possibly can, and I can think of no more pleasant type of recreation for those children than to have them able to get out on the green grass and on the sand just the way they are at Orillia. Maybe it is too far away, but hospitals and hospital-schools which, ten or 15 years ago were out in the farmland are now surrounded by cities. Indeed, in one city we have people complaining that the patients are too close to their homes about 50 yards away and I think it is less than ten years that there wasn't a house within a mile of that particular hospital. So you see, the trend—and this trend exists in almost every place where our hospital or hospital-school exists—these places have to be set in a fairly large area because we do need very extensive area for the children.

In the matter of programming, I was rather disappointed by the opening remarks of my hon. friend from Parkdale. I rather got the impression that he felt this government, this department, was doing nothing at all for these children—the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. I couldn't help but recall the clipping that I cut out of the paper a little while ago. It was entitled in a big black headline "Bold New Programme Would Aid Mentally Ill," and this was President Kennedy's idea, President Kennedy announc-

ing to the American nation that they were going to do the things that we have been doing for some ten years now, we in the province of Ontario, and this is our great neighbour to the south.

It's all right, don't groan, don't groan. If you are ill I'll get you a pill. There is no need for groaning; this is fact, capable of being seen and appreciated by those who will open their eyes to look at it. I can spend a great deal of money but it is the use to which I put the money that counts; and the answer is not the spending of money. It is the wise method in which we do spend the money that counts. There are many things we would yet like to do; I have made that very clear to this honourable House, but to give the impression and to cast abroad the impression in this province that the government is doing nothing is really not doing a kindness to those who have patients in our hospitals.

Mr. Trotter: It is window dressing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Window dressing, nothing! Ask the patients. Read the letters that patients' families send to us. Ask the families of patients. Go and visit our hospitals. Go and visit them in company with someone who can explain to you and describe to you what is being done, through a professional eye, and you will be amazed. If your eyes are open you will be amazed at the programmes that are being carried on in our hospitals and our hospital-schools.

Sometime, I think it will likely be in the first week of May, if every hon. member would take the time to go down to Smiths Falls and attend the annual review of the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, Cubs and Brownies, and listen to the bugle band, to see what is being done with those children, to watch them in their daily exercise in the gym—that goes from 7.30 in the morning, I think, until 10.30 at night, never empty, the two gyms, one for girls and one for boys—and to follow the whole programme through the entire institution and then come back, he could not in honesty say that nothing is being done, or that it is all window dressing.

These are things that we should try to make sure of for ourselves, instead of just accepting what is written in reports. The parents' association is an excellent body of people, very interested in this work. They have been very helpful, and are very helpful, to us, but I am quite sure that if you sit down and talk with them they won't leave you with the impression that we are doing nothing. Of course they would want more.

Naturally, every parent wants more for his or her child, but at least they will agree with us, I think, that we are forging ahead—at least in step with other nations and other jurisdictions doing the same kind of work.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, the fact still remains that if parents want to get their child in a hospital for retarded children they are told they have to wait two years. If they have to wait two years, or if it is necessary to see an MPP in order to get your child in one of these hospitals, I say that this government is window dressing and is not telling us the facts as they are. I think it is utterly ridiculous for the hon. Minister to stand up and give us all this soft talk about children playing in the sand, because they are not doing their job. I don't care what the hon. Minister says. Window dressing!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have never yet heard of a parent who was told by anyone who had authority to pass on such matters that they would have to wait two years to get the child in.

Mr. Trotter: They are told it all the time.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Give me specific instances. And furthermore I have no apology. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Furthermore, I don't know why any MPP should feel ashamed or make any apology for the fact that any one of his constituents comes and enlists his aid in getting a child in. Our hon. friend from Bruce just stated the circumstances surrounding five cases that came to his attention. They could have gone through the normal routine but these were exceptional cases; I say to you that I don't believe that any MPP has ever brought anything to me but an exceptional case.

When I was a member in the back benches, I was very happy when some of my constituents enlisted my help to do this, just as I was happy to help to do anything, or find the solution or parts of solution to any problem that faces us. This, I considered, was part of my job as a representative. This I still consider is part of my job; and I can say without equivocation, sir, that no hon. member of this House has ever asked for special consideration for any child in his constituency where that consideration has been given to anything other than the needs

of the child. If the need existed, that child was given as high priority as was possible to give it. That will continue as long as I hold this office.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I say this: It should not be necessary, in order for a child to get in, to come through an MPP. I think that this should be open to anyone. You ought to know, without waiting for me to give you instances. Every person for whom I have applied to you has been on a waiting list for two years; every one of them. All I have to do is go back to my office and get out every one of those letters that I have written. All of those people have been on for two years or more. Some of them have got certificates from doctors. They are only good for so long and they have been renewed time after time. I say to you that it is because the hospitals are overcrowded and, I repeat again and again, you do not have a sufficient programme to take care of the needs. I still say you are window dressing!

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was very blunt in saying what he would do if he was a superintendent, in regard to the visitors going in wards. I am talking, not about regular visitors, but about parents who are in the association and who go on an organized basis. It might be right that they should not go in the wards, but at least there should be some approach to reduce the suspicion they have because they are refused in such a blunt manner. Education, and the right to go, might reduce the need for it. That is one aspect. On the lecture I had from the hon. Minister about going up to Orillia; I want to assure him that I made a trip to Orillia three years ago and spent the whole day there. I saw nothing to make me proud, as a Canadian, in that institution. I hope it has changed since that time.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Did you have your glasses with you?

Mr. Gisborn: I had my glasses with me and I had witnesses with me, and I think my point has been proven since that time. I also had the opportunity, on a telephone call on a snowy night, to go and visit a child that had just come home from Orillia. What we found was most disgraceful. The condition of the child, with sores and dirt and filth on its body. This can be verified, if you disavow what I am saying, so I don't like these lectures about going to see for yourself. We know something about it. I feel that there is a good job being done in Cedar Springs. It is

a new institution. But you will never convince me that Orillia was the kind of institution we can be proud of.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, would my hon. friend tell me if that case that he just mentioned was reported to the department?

Mr. Gisborn: I would assume so, sir. It was not by myself, but I went in attendance with an executive officer of the Hamilton Association for Retarded Children.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And did you see the child yourself, sir?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Then I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that the fact that the hon. member saw it makes me accept his word that this was the condition; but I would find it impossible to believe otherwise. I have to say that, and I can assure you that I will make it my business to find out, because I will not tolerate things of that kind. They are not necessary. If the child was in that condition when he left the hospital this is quite unnecessary. It should not be and will not be tolerated.

Mr. Gisborn: I will assist the hon. Minister to trace the family through the association.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Mr. Chairman, I would just make a few remarks. I am not wanting to damn the hon. Minister. I did have a situation come to my attention. I don't wish to repeat it here. I did write to the Minister at that time. The situation was not good. I think the Minister knows the situation of which I speak. It has occurred to me that possibly we could be short-handed in help there. It could be a case of staff numbers, of staff not being adequate to supervise the patients in the hospital. Would the hon. Minister have any facts which he could give the House which would assure us that we do have sufficient trained staff in these hospitals all the time? I speak particularly of Orillia.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: For 2,602 patients we have 996 staff at Orillia. Our staff ratio, by and large, is one to two and a half patients. It would seem to me that, for the type of patient we have, this is a very good staff-patient ratio.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: The situation which the hon. member for Wentworth East made mention of is something of which I am sure,

if the hon. Minister had known, he may have taken the necessary action. When I relate that to the situation which came to my attention, and which I tried to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister, I begin to wonder if there is not some substance in some of the criticisms and, as the hon. member for Wentworth East has said, if perhaps the department could not go a little further to alleviating the fears of these people by permitting perhaps a little more free access.

I do not want to make any charges here tonight, but the situation which came to my attention was in my opinion very serious. The hon. Minister at that time said—and I agree with him—that it is not possible to keep an eye on every patient continuously. This is a problem. Maybe the staff should be increased or maybe it should be a case of salaries. I do not say that it is or it is not. I do not know. But I think the department might look into this very carefully. I am going to leave it at that.

I would like to make some comment though, Mr. Chairman, with respect to an announcement which was in the *Globe and Mail* on January 22, 1963, wherein an announcement was made that the staffs of Ontario hospitals—the nurses, hospital aids and attendants employed in these hospitals—would receive an increase in pay. Now, I understand that there are attendants, perhaps people doing ordinary labour, helpers, and this type of individual, who were not included in this pay increase. I would say, Mr. Chairman, and I say this as kindly as I can and yet as firmly as possible: I think some of the wages which are being paid to helpers, to attendants in the Hamilton area of which I am familiar, are pretty shameful. Married men are asked to keep a family on wages which are hardly enough to support a single person.

People working in mental institutions as labourers do require a certain amount of experience in going among these people, and I think that to have raised the salary of one group and left this other group which needs it very badly, is not quite right. I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us whether or not any changes are contemplated for these other groups that I mentioned? And I wonder if perhaps, while he is at it, the hon. Minister might tell us the rate of wages, for instance, for helpers or attendants or ordinary labour people in these Ontario hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, there are so many classifications, I am not just sure what the hon. member means by "ordinary labourers." But attendants and hospital aids—

attendants came under the salary increase. The rate for hospital attendants is \$3,031.20. Now, for the first two years it should be understood that this man is actually of little use to us. He is in training, and he is paid \$3,000 for his first year and \$3,120 for his second year of training. When he has successfully passed his examination, and is judged eligible for promotion to attendant 2, he goes from \$3,240 to \$3,900 a year. Hospital attendant 3, \$3,480 to \$4,050. Attendant 4, \$3,750 to \$4,400; attendant 5, \$3,900 to \$4,600; attendant 6, \$4,200 to \$5,000; attendant 7, \$4,600 to \$5,500. Hospital aids also go through two years training, \$2,760 for the first year, and \$2,880 for the second. Then, on successfully passing examinations, \$3,000 to \$3,480; hospital aid 3, \$3,120 to \$3,600. I cannot be sure just what—

Mr. R. C. Edwards: I am speaking of the type of person like a cleaning attendant, a type of person who is responsible for keeping the property clean. Now, this is perhaps the maintenance staff. I am told, for instance, that take-home pay for some of them is slightly above \$50 a week for married men. And if this is so, I suggest to the hon. Minister that the government has a responsibility to lead and if these people were not considered when this increase was brought into being, then they should have been. But certainly there are a group of people whose wages, if they are above the figure that I quoted, are very little above it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am advised that these adjustments recently announced, as the hon. member reported, came out of one phase of the Stevenson and Kellogg study in their report and recommendations. It is my understanding they are studying this next group now. I can only say that we will have to wait for their report and recommendations on that group. Labourers at the present time have from \$2,640 to \$3,120 a year.

Mr. R. C. Edwards: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it is taking a long time to complete a study and it has a very serious bearing on a particular group of people who are only getting an existence wage. The salary scale that is being paid in a place like Hamilton at \$2,500 or \$2,600 a year is totally inadequate; it does not permit these people even to eke out an existence in a city like Hamilton where rents alone would take half of that. So I think if anything can be done to hasten this study by the company that is responsible for it, it should be done. And I think it should have been done much sooner.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I would like an answer to an incident that I promised to look into. It involves an elderly lady—I believe she was 80 years old—who was confined to the Nora Frances Henderson Hospital; I believe it is an active hospital now but I think, when she was originally confined, it was for convalescent and chronic cases. Someone arbitrarily moved her from that hospital to the Ontario hospital. My question is: Who would have the right to do that without consultation with any of the family?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They wrote from the Nora Frances Henderson to the Ontario hospital? What about? They transferred the patient? Was she judged certified mentally ill?

Mr. Gisborn: This I have not been able to find out. She was confined to a wheelchair and senile, I would assume. But there had been no change in the past few years in her condition. The son was notified by the Ontario hospital that the mother was now at that institution in the mentally ill department.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I could say is that I think that is rather high-handed dealing with a patient, but neither my department nor my superintendent could be held responsible for that. The superintendent cannot refuse according to the law, and according to our directions, he cannot refuse to accept a patient duly certified or a patient who presents himself for voluntary admission or for whom admission is sought on single certificate. I would think that the responsibility would lie with the doctor who was looking after the patient while she was still in Nora Frances Henderson Hospital. I can hardly conceive of a doctor dealing with his patient in such a high-handed manner without even discussing it with the family. But this is not the responsibility of my staff at all. I think it was a courtesy on his part that he advised the next of kin that the mother was there. He really should not have had to do that. That should all have been done before the patient was ever sent to the Ontario hospital.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I will submit the name and I would like the department to check out the facts.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us whether we are really going to have a new psychiatric hospital in the city of Toronto. I have gone over it time after time on the various occasions this has been announced and re-announced but there is still no sign of a

shovel going into the ground. When are we really going to get it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would suggest that the hon. member ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) during his estimates. I do not build the hospitals.

An hon. member: Well, you made the announcements.

Mr. Trotter: Well, Mr. Chairman, in a city of this size, a psychiatric hospital, especially a teaching hospital, is needed to a very great extent. The hon. Minister is aware of this and certainly we should have some idea. I can only gather that the announcement we heard from the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) that \$200,000 was going to be allotted, is more window-dressing. It has gone on year in and year out, especially with this hospital, and I can only take it as an indication that nothing is going to be done. If the hon. Minister of Health does not know when a major hospital is going up, I can just assume that the government is trying to pull the wool over our eyes. And like—

An hon. member: There is no doubt about it.

Mr. Trotter: —the biblical prophet we can cry, "How long, O Lord!" It is about time you got around to doing something.

An hon. member: How long, O Matt?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 713 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Before moving the adjournment of the House, Mr. Speaker, may I say that tomorrow we will resume the budget debate and continue with the order paper and with the estimates of The Department of Health, after that the estimates of the Treasury and the civil service.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.50 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX I

Provincial Payments to Sanatoria

(G. W. Innes (Oxford). See page 1380)

	Grant per bed			Grant per day's stay		
	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961
High	\$3,550	\$3,040	\$3,180	\$9.60	\$11.70	\$16.60
Low	1,080	1,090	960	4.20	4.60	4.50
Median (all hospitals)	2,100	2,130	2,660	8.20	9.10	9.30
Mean (all hospitals)	1,980	2,080	2,180	7.60	9.30	9.50
Hamilton	1,080	1,080	900	4.90	6.00	5.90
		(101%)	(83%)		(122%)	(120%)
London	2,400	2,860	3,180	9.60	10.60	11.40
		(120%)	(133%)		(110%)	(119%)
Fort William	1,500	1,120	920	4.20	4.60	4.50
		(75%)	(61%)		(109%)	(107%)
Kingston	2,140	2,140	3,070	8.20	9.80	16.60
		(100%)	(143%)		(120%)	(202%)
Average	1,980	2,080	2,180	7.60	9.30	9.50
		(105%)	(110%)		(122%)	(125%)

(Percentages are the relation to 1959 of the later years' costs.)

APPENDIX II

Sanatoria Utilization vs. Provincial Grants

(G. W. Innes (Oxford). See page 1381)

Year	Number of beds	Number of collective days' stay	Total provincial grants
1959	134	35,000	\$288,200
1960	134	29,300	286,900
1961	134	24,800	412,000

APPENDIX III

Sanatoria Utilization

(G. W. Innes (Oxford). See page 1381)

Hospital	No. of beds at Dec. 21, 1961	Average occupancy	Number of filled beds	Number of vacant beds
Weston	578	70.7%	409	169
Hamilton	387	42.1	163	224
Fort William	328	56.0	184	144
Ottawa	279	50.8	142	137
London	220	74.1	163	57
Sudbury	163	66.5	108	55
Kingston	134	50.7	68	66
St. Catharines	107	87.1	93	14
Windsor	104	44.8	47	57
Brantford	70	68.2	48	22
Cornwall	65	79.8	52	13
Kitchener	45	72.7	33	12
	2,480	61.2	1,518	962

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION L' JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

